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ABSTRACT
This study examines whether there is a strategic intent formulation process available for use by the typical CEO. After a comprehensive literature review it was found that strategic intent formulation could be seen as having two dimensions. Firstly, an individual dimension (CEO's strategic intent formulation) which is not well documented; secondly, an organisational strategic intent formulation dimension, which is well documented. **No strategic intent formulation process for the CEO was found.**

Further investigation showed that the military environment was the only environment that made regular (and well-founded) use of a structured approach for individual intent formulation, as the activation step for strategic planning. This has been designated the “Commander's Appreciation”. The question was then posed to assess whether the Commander's Appreciation used in the military context was prevalent in the business environment, and if so, to focus the attention on the areas of similarity (and differences) as a basis to formulate a model for CEO strategic intent formulation.

In order to draw this comparison, the Commander's Appreciation had to be itemised. Selected, appropriate commanders were interviewed; the collected qualitative evidence was analysed using grounded theory method. The analysis was recorded in primary narratives - the commander’s comment resulted in 4 categories and 74 concepts. These categories and concepts make up the foundation of the research instruments. The mining industry was found to be appropriately representative of the business environment for comparison with the military. The application of the research instruments were conducted within three mines. The qualitative evidence garnered during each case study amounted to interviews with the General Manager as well as quantitative evidence (self-completion questionnaires completed by the staff based on the 74 concepts). The collected evidence was qualitatively analysed using a grounded
theory method and was then recorded as a primary narrative. Further examination of
the three cases’ primary narratives led to synthesising into cross-case secondary
narratives making sense of the evidence.

Additional in-depth examination of the primary narratives led to a higher-order narrative
from which twelve findings were extracted. Reflections about the findings were
consolidated into a theoretical contribution, which in turn underlined the importance of
the need for a CEO Strategic Intent Formulation Process.

A model (Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model (CSIFM)) resolving the lack of
a CEO strategic intent formulation process was developed. In addition, the model’s
suitability was assessed for utilisation within the entrepreneurial and corporate
environment. This assessment provided the following:

- A clear link between the CEO’s intent and Company’s intent concepts;
- It indicated where the CSIFM fits into the strategic management process
  model;
- It showed the necessity for a construct of compliance versus service delivery;
- It highlighted the CEO and staff integration in the process of strategy
  formulation;
- It outlined the range of the CSIFM as part of the application guideline.

As a final point to this research, the importance of the contribution was confirmed and
its limitations and suggestions for further research identified.

**Keywords and Phrases:** Strategic intent Formulation; Strategic Intent; Commander’s
Appreciation; CEO Intent Formulation; Individual Intent Formulation; Intent Model;

Strategic Intent.
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1. CHAPTER 1: RESEARCH ORIENTATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The use of Strategic Management concepts can either facilitate the making of fortunes for stakeholders or it can bankrupt organisations. In the process this can establish or ruin the career of the Chief Executive Officer (Thompson & Martin, 2010:13). Therefore a comprehensive understanding of these concepts allows the CEO to grasp the organisations survival and potential. This realisation places the focus on the CEO’s ability to function at the strategic level. Before analysing the CEO’s role it is important to ask what strategic management entails in this context. According to Macmillan and Tampoe, (2000:2) strategic management:

“…is both a skill and an art. It is a skill because there is a body of knowledge that can be learnt and techniques that can be used with greater or lesser competence. It is an art because it deals with the future that is unknowable and with the hearts and minds of people that transcend reason. Good strategic management requires both clear thought and sound judgement”.

Clear thought and sound judgement indicates that there should be a leader who displays leadership within a strategic management context. Adair (2002: 274) suggests that an important element of strategic management is a process by which a company creates a position of strategic leadership. However, Macmillan and Tampoe (2000:1) suggested that strategic leadership is about the attainment of sustained relative advantage over the competition. This is normally attained during the annual strategic planning
session. It is not unusual to hear horror stories about strategic planning sessions that were a total waste of time for everyone concerned.

According to Hoffman (2007: 29) the management team and staff, spent four days in an off-site planning retreat, led by a consultant. During this session the firm’s senior managers (facilitated by the consultant) developed a company strategy, about which everybody was enthusiastic. However, the strategy was not aligned with the CEO’s intent for the company – the strategy and subsequent implementation plans were never implemented.

Hoffman’s scenario highlights the importance of strategy formulation. In addition it highlights the crucial role of the CEO’s intent in the strategic planning process. According to Louw and Venter (2006:212) the purpose of the strategy formulation process is “to arrive at an agreed view of how the enterprise will succeed in the future”. Furthermore, Macmillan and Tampoe (2000: 70) indicate that strategic intent is “that agreed view and the highest level of purpose of the enterprise”. Therefore it is practical to infer that strategic intent should be regarded as the driver of the strategic planning process, since all meaningful action must originate in a purpose and goal. This notion is supported by Louw and Venter’s (2006:2) strategic management process model (section 2.4.9) where strategic intent is the activation element of strategy formulation. Furthermore, Hamel and Prahalad (1989) state that:

“On the one hand strategic intent envisions a desired leadership position and establishes the criterion that the organisation will use to chart its progress”.

In addition Louw and Venter (2006:1) expound that: “Strategic intent is essentially concerned with the direction in which an organisation wants to go, the type of organisation it aspires to be and how it proposes to get there. When an organisation persistently pursues its strategic objectives and focuses all its resources and competitive action on achieving that objective in order to become a winner in the market-place, then that demonstrates strategic intent”.

However, it can be inferred that both authors are alluding to a company’s strategic intent and not to an individual’s strategic intent (e.g. a CEO). It is not evident is if there is a difference between the company’s strategic intent, the CEO’s strategic intent as well as its formulation and positioning in the strategy formulation process.

This prompts the question – What is the CEO’s role in strategic planning and how will the CEO formulate his/her strategic intent?

Even though there is much more literature that provides various explanations for the CEO’s role in strategic planning, there is much less literature on individual’s (CEO’s) intent formulation (section 2.3.1). The military’s view on intent is focused on an individual, in this case the commander, as they believe that only an individual can have intent and not the organisation:

“The intent states or it should state, just what the commander intends to achieve”. (Slim, 1990:17)

Furthermore Macmillan and Tampoe’s (2000: 72) view of “…strategic intent is seen as the heart of strategy and as the providing of an animated dream for the future… they see it as providing a sense of direction, discovery and destiny for
every person in the company. It is clearly a prime responsibility of top
management to generate such strategic intent.”

In addition Macmillan and Tampoe (2000: 70) state that “Strategic intent is
concerned with the ends and purposes of the enterprise and combines a vision of
the future with the [CEO’s] intent to make that vision a reality”

This subscribes to the involvement of the CEO in the formulation of strategic
intent. In order for the CEO to provide a concise and clear strategic intent,
he/she will have to be able to translate the uncertainty and complexity of the
problems within all environments. Military leaders are confronted on a daily
basis with complexity and uncertainty during their efforts of framing problems.
Business leaders could take a leaf from the military book in describing a
complex situation:

could describe a complex situation with amazing lucidity and sum up a long
exercise or operation without the aid of a single note. He looked straight into the
eyes of his audience when he spoke. He had a remarkable flair for picking out
the essence of a problem and for indicating its solution with startling clarity. It
was almost impossible to misunderstand his meaning, which is referred to as, the
Commander’s intent, a product of the extensive use of the Commander’s
Appreciation Process”.

The above scenario opens the door to the possibility that the CEO could
benefit from using the commander’s intent, or something similar, in order to

1. The Commander’s Appreciation is a process through which the commander obtains a very
clear understanding of the military’s strategic goals and objectives and translates it into
attainable objectives (Malan, 1996:3)
improve his/her ability to express himself/herself succinctly as a strategic leader.

There is a new breed of strategic leaders, according to Adair (2002:125), who have clearly seen the difference between management and leadership. Moreover, they have no doubt that their role is to provide strategic leadership within the company. They apply what General Slim (Slim, 1990:18) called “The principle of Personal Leadership” to their role as CEO, which emerges in the form of a statement of personal commitment. They do this by means of leading the strategic thinking and by taking personal ownership of development of strategy. In so doing, they are fostering a clear, concise direction for corporate strategic planners to develop into implementation plans.

It can be argued that there is a close relationship between the CEO’s personal commitment and the Commander’s intent. Therefore, it is inferred that there are similarities between Montgomery’s view of the commander’s intent and the personal commitment of the CEO. This in turn implies that the Commander’s Appreciation Process, as typically used by Montgomery to formulate his intent, could indeed assist the CEO of a corporate entity in converting his/her personal commitment into a tangible CEO’s intent.

These circumstances provide an opportunity to assess whether the intent formulation process (Commander’s Appreciation), as applied in the military, could also be applied in the business context. This research is a result of the author’s association with both the military and industry. Some of the ideas above offer a parallel between the military and business. In addition to this, it
presents an opportunity for comparison, investigation and benchmarking of formulation of strategic intent.

It is conceded that there are differences between the Military and Business that need to be acknowledged. The use of campaigns as analogies is often confined to the realities which a modern enterprise faces and there is a lack of an acceptable equivalent to the customer (Macmillan & Tampoe, 2000:15). However, the importance of winning and of leadership in this “struggle” for corporate “victory”, supports the parallels in the way the two strategists in question (the military Commander and the Chief Executive Officer), on their respective sides, formulate their intent. There are limited studies that have explored the CEO’s formulation of his/her intent to sustain the company’s competitive advantage. This is one of the few studies proposing a strategic intent formulation process for the CEO to develop consistently a situational awareness of the business landscape, in order to be able to exploit opportunities and to gain the competitive advantage (or as it is designated by the military, the initiative). In addition, this will also enable the CEO’s useful participation in the company’s process of formulating strategy. The researcher’s contribution will be a proposal for a theory and a model for the formulation of the CEO’s strategic intent.

1.2 DEFINITION OF TERMS AND CONCEPTS

Certain terms have been widely used for disparate purposes. Their meanings have lost some of their specifics. To avoid this, and to ensure accurate interpretation, a few terms, concepts and definitions need to be clarified at this point to ensure a firm point of departure for this thesis.
• **Strategy.** Defining strategy is no trivial matter. Commencing with Chandler’s view (Hindel, 2008:225) that expression of strategy is the domain of top management. This necessitated a process to formulate the strategy. Ansoff (1980) obliged with the Systematic Process which was found by Porter (1996) to be too rigid and inflexible. He in turn provided the Generic Strategies in order to help firms create a sustainable competitive advantage. Mintzberg, Lampel, Quinn and Ghosal’s (2002:81) contribution to strategy formulation is seen to be comprehensive as it states that a strategy is a set of objectives, policies and plans that taken together, define the scope of the enterprise and its approach to survival and success “profitability”. Furthermore, to cope with the complex competitive environment, Grattan’s (2002:17) view of strategy is that it is a statement of intent that constrains or directs subsequent activities. According to Michael de Kare-Silver (1997) cited by Macmillan and Tampoe (2008:14) strategy should have only two elements – “future intent and sources of advantage”, Macmillan and Tampoe are suggesting that intent and strategy are inseparable. Strategy, at its most fundamental, signifies a means of achieving one’s own intent whilst frustrating those of the opposition, thus exploiting a mode of winning to secure the future.

• **Intention.** “Intention refers to what the individual is trying to do or says he would like to do” (Jordaan, Jordaan & Nieuwoudt, 1983 (b): 818). According to Allport (Jordaan et al. 1983 (b): 820-822) “man uses his cognitive abilities to form intentions about his concrete wishes (motives) and to devise plans to realize these intentions”. Allport is of the opinion that intention is one of the most neglected concepts in the theories of
motivation. There are short-term intentions such as fetching a glass of water to slake a thirst. We are however focussing on long-term intentions which are often far more important. Examples on a personal level would be to obtain an academic qualification. An organisation’s long-term intention could be to extend their international business interests in the next decade. This would probably include a new strategic direction for the organisation. As a consequence such an intention would emphasis the long-term focus on the intent of the CEO as the primary contributor to the company’s strategy for survival and profit.

- **The Military Appreciation.** “The military appreciation is a disciplined thought process designed to examine all relevant factors and produce the best reasoned solution” (Grattan, 2002:145). The military appreciation is a logical sequence of reasoning. This leads to a solution of a problem, which in this context is a strategic one. The process can be used mentally for simpler problems. In this case, however, the formal written appreciation is regarded as more appropriate for the complex strategic situation (Grattan, 2002:145).

- **Command.** “Command refers to the quality of military leadership” (Gray, 1999:39). A huge amount of literature on military history is about Military Command. The nature of command invariably makes a strategic difference. This is to say, it is a dimension of military strategy contributing to the overall strategic effect. Successful military commanders are significant in their capacity to find, fix and exploit advantage. This makes these concepts fundamental building blocks in gaining the military initiative
in order to realise the competitive advantage. Readers may care to ponder over the Arabian proverb which states that “an army of sheep led by a lion will defeat an army of lions led by a sheep” (Gray, 1999:40). Command for this thesis should be seen as “the authority to employ forces operationally at a specific level. This should be lawful authority that every officer has over men in his charge by virtue of his rank and appointment, area of competence or jurisdiction”.

- **Commanding Officer – Commander.** The term Commander applies to the individual who is appointed to exercise the decisive authority and to assume the final responsibility of being “in command”. It can be elaborated as “the person accountable for, and who holds authority over a group, and of the attempts of that group to achieve a common goal”. This describes the unifying factor of any large group of combatants (soldiers). (Howard, 2000:1). While modern military command systems permit a Commander to control military activities effectively from a distance, (Gray, 2007:176) they also rely on high quality communication systems. The possibility of disruption of the lines of communication requires that Commanders at all levels be trained to use their initiative. It also requires that they continue to fight effectively in accordance with broad strategic directives based on the Commander’s intent. Furthermore, O’Neill and Horner (1981:285) highlight the importance of the Commander being able to seize the initiative thus emphasising the value of well-trained manpower to a military force. It is suggested that intensive training and regular implementation of the Commander’s Appreciation should enable a Commander to formulate and implement his/her intent.
• **Chief Executive Officer.** *An organisation’s Chief Executive Officer is the most visible and important strategy manager* (Thompson & Strickland, 2003:21). Ultimately the CEO is responsible for leading the task of forming and implementing the strategic plans. What the CEO views (his intent) as strategically important is usually reflected in the organisation’s (intent) strategy after his/her considered approval. He/she thereby expresses his/her personal commitment to attaining a particular strategic objective within the organisation as intent.

• **The Commander’s Appreciation.** “*The process through which the Commander obtains clear understanding of the military’s strategic goals and objectives and translates it into attainable objectives*” (Malan, 1996:2). The Commander’s Appreciation is his/her personal stamp on the planning and implementation of the campaign/operation (Malan, 1996:2). Although he might use his staff and even his subordinates to advise him, it is his/her product; the embodiment of his/her understanding of the relevant military situation; his/her intellect and his/her mastery of the operational art.

• **Commander’s Intent.** *Strategic intent is a brief directive, usually in written format that outlines the basic purpose of any given operation; it describes the desired end-state and is thus the unifying factor for any large group of soldiers*” (Howard, 2000:1). In the military, literature intentions are expressed in formal orders, providing the context of future plans and actions. The military’s use of the term Commander’s intent (or intention) has a specific meaning to the ears and minds of trained soldiers. A trained soldier is unlikely to confuse the meaning of the word intent with the words...
objective, purpose, vision, and task or aim (Howard, 2003:2-4). “The intent states or it should state, just what the Commander intends to achieve” (Slim, 1990:17). The word intent is explicitly used in oral or written briefings with very clear connotations.

- **Strategic Intent.** Clear intent can provide clarity of purpose and a guideline for continuity of goals within an organisation adapting to internal and external pressures (Hamel & Prahalad, 1989:66), which will be achieved in the environment in which the strategist (CEO) finds him/herself. Furthermore, according to Macmillan and Tampoe (2000:70) strategic intent is concerned with the ends and objective of the enterprise and combines a vision of the future, with the intent to make that vision a reality. Therefore intent is treated as being synonymous with the manner envisioned for achieving favourable outcomes. This supports Slim’s (1990:17) view that it is the crux of “what the strategist intends to achieve” thereby emphasizing the original (practical) promise of strategic intent. This study make use of Mintzberg, Ahlstrand and Lampel’s (2009:219-21) view of active management by the CEO that expresses strategic intent as: “focusing the organisation’s attention on the essence of winning, motivating people by communicating the value of the target, leaving room for individual and team contribution, sustaining enthusiasm by providing new operational definitions as circumstances change and using intent consistently to guide resource allocations”.
1.3 BACKGROUND TO STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND INTENT

According to Macmillan and Tampoe (2000:13) strategic management requires both thinking and action from the leader. Furthermore, strategic management is only present when action follows thought. Although thought on its own may be intellectually stimulating, it is not strategic management. Furthermore, the safari through strategic management literature of Mintzberg et al. (2009) has led to the packaging of strategic thought into three prescriptive schools and seven descriptive schools. This review will focus on strategy formulation and the CEO’s role within it, pertaining to the different schools.

- According to the design school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:29) strategy formulation is a purposeful process of conscious thought by the CEO. The strategy is to be exclusive to the company within its present context and resides within the ambit of the CEO.

- The planning school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:54) crafts strategy by providing clear models and methods on how to do strategic planning. It has been suggested that this rigid process has little need for intuition or synthesis from the CEO. This view is support by Mintzberg (1994:273) who believes that rigid strategic planning can often prevent strategic thinking. According to Langley’s (Mintzberg, 1994:271) intensive study of planning:

  “…the call for strategic planning is really a plea for leadership and direction. Strategic planning is universally viewed primarily as a means of making strategic decisions. People therefore imagine that a mere formal process can generate strategy, but this is the incorrect solution to the problem. The CEO
may agree to do it but this will not transform him/her into a person capable of
taking strategic decisions and formulate strategic vision critical to the
planning process in all organisations. Strategic planning cannot provide this
strategic vision on its own and is totally useless without it”.

Mintzberg’s argument provides the following insights: firstly, not anyone can
take strategic decisions and formulate a strategic vision. There is need for a
strategist. Secondly, this strategist has to conceive the intent, which is critical
for strategic planning. What is not indicated or alluded to, is how the
strategist formulates this intent? What actions are needed to convert this
intent into tangible objectives in order to activate a strategic planning
process?

• Furthermore, according to the positioning school (Mintzberg et al.
2009:87) strategy formulation is based on analysis processes promoted by
Michael Porter. This provides the CEO with analytical techniques and
frameworks. It is inferred that, these analytical techniques and frameworks
assist the CEO to shape his/her awareness of the business landscape.
What is not evident is how the CEO uses them and if there is a
synthesised process for techniques and frameworks; or, if it is left to the
individual CEO to choose or group. This is also where consultants are
active in defining the process of strategy formation. If consultants can
define the process for strategy formulation then the CEO can as well.

The descriptive schools are aimed at providing insights into the nature of
strategy.
According to the entrepreneurial school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:141) a clear vision of the future, is created and exists in the mind of the leader. It is suggested that this can be linked to the CEO’s intent. What is not evident is how the CEO formulates this intent. Strategy formulation within the entrepreneurial school is deliberate for long-term direction, but emergent in detail. This shows that the CEO has a current awareness of the business landscape in order to accommodate evolving activities. What is not evident is if the CEO’s awareness is developed from a formal process or not. Adair (2002:159) creates a future vision:

“You need to share your strategic overview and strategic ideas with your operational leaders leaving them free to plan and act in an opportunity-centred, entrepreneurial way …as a strategic leader you can reduce risk by holding these kinds of discussion with your top team …by revealing your thinking in that way you will convey to operational leaders what decisions you expect them to make…”

The cognitive school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:181) considers strategy formulation as a cognitive process which takes place in the mind of the strategist. It is once again suggested that this can be linked to the CEO’s intent. There is an underlying push by the CEO to change the mental maps of key managers as this would expedite successful implementation of the strategy.

The learning school’s (Mintzberg et al. 2009:217) view of strategy formulation within a complex and unpredictable environment is based on lessons learnt. Furthermore, the learning school recognises the
importance of the emerging as opposed to deliberate strategy formulation. Therefore, strategy formulation and implementation contribute to each other within an iterative process resulting in an adaptive company. This CEO awareness is the driver of the iterative process.

- The power school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:257) is similar to Whittington’s procedure school, where strategy formulation is negotiated by the powerful within the enterprise. Furthermore, it is important to determine the interaction between stakeholders, Board of Directors, CEO and the external environment.

- The culture school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:281) is similarly to Whittington’s (1993) systemic school where strategy formulation is experienced as a collective process. The company’s culture holds the success or failure of the CEO. It is therefore essential that the CEO understands the company culture in order to enable implementing change and cultures potential sources of competitive advantage. Culture is the foundation on which the CEO’s intent will be able to permeate the company.

- The environmental school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:304) can draw parallels with Whittington’s evolutionary school due to its reactive process to strategy formulation and clustering in distinct niches where they will remain until resources become scares and die. The CEO’s awareness of the business landscapes should overcome closure.
• The configuration school (Mintzberg et al. 2009:318) formulates strategy as a process of transformation from a stable environment to the next. The CEO will drive the process and formulate the intervention strategy.

It is concluded that these prescriptive models are relevant to the needs of practising managers in order to help them form strategies and to take action, whereas the descriptive schools provide understanding of the strategy’s nature. The practising manager therefore, needs to display good strategic thinking in order to formulate useful strategy. According to Macmillan and Tampoe (2000:25)

“…if strategic thinking does not lead to action and meet or improve customer needs, it is a waste of time and resources”.

As a result, strategic management requires a particular way of thinking and mental discipline of the leader. According to Adair (2002:262-264) an effective strategic leader displays:

“…practical wisdom, is an independent thinker, thinking appropriately about means and ends, concerned with the importance and not the trivial, can integrate legacy with strategic ideas, instil creative thinking, sees the whole picture, disentangles the essentials in a complex situation, translating strategic thinking into action and intent”

These aspects describe the requirements of a military leader. This enables the researcher to draw parallels of strategic thinking in business and the military. The relevant similarities of these leaders together emphasise winning, the importance of leadership and taking action to achieve desired results (Macmillan & Tampoe, 2000:15). Furthermore, if the leaders’
approaches are alike, then the military’s model of strategy formulation can be applied as an important starting point for the exploration of business strategy formulation, commencing with the military leader’s approach to strategy formulation. According to Tom and Barron (2009:265-266)

“...the superior Commander decides what and why he wants to achieve. The aim to be achieved may be given to the Commander by the government, or be left to him to work out alone. He explains this to his subordinates so that they know the mission and can grasp the purpose behind it. Together, the mission and the purpose constitute the Commander’s intent that will drive all planning and action. Defining the Commander’s intent is generally the most important and creative contribution of the Commander in the process of designing and implementing a winning strategy, and its implementation via various plans”.

In the military literature, intent and indeed intentions are expressed in orders, providing the context of future plans and actions. Strategic intent, according to Hamel and Prahalad (1989:64), is made up of two steps;

firstly “It is the heart of the strategy and provides an animating dream for the future”; secondly, developing strategic intent for a company commences within an active management processes that include:

“...focusing the organisation’s attention on the essence of winning, motivating people by communicating the value of the target, leaving room for the individual and team contributions and using intent consistently to guide resource allocation”.
In addition Louw and Venter (2006:46) provide another way of explaining strategic intent “as a combination of vision on the one hand and mission on the other”.

Furthermore Sullivan, Gordon, Harper and Michael (1996:104) argue that “…strategic intent is what you are working to accomplish in the Company”.

It seems quite clear that both the military and business subscribe to strategic intent as fundamental in gaining competitive advantage and ensuring company survival. Prahalad and Hamel (1994:12) provide the elements of developing company strategic intent. However, the military conducts their campaign planning process to formulate the “company intent” and the Commander’s Appreciation is used for the formulation of the Commander’s intent. Business conducts the strategic management model process, but has nothing similar to the Commander’s Appreciation for the CEO.

Business does not separate the company’s intent formulation from the CEO’s intent formulation. What is also not evident is what process will be used by the CEO to formulate his/her intent. Could the military Commander’s Appreciation assist the CEO in his/her endeavour to improve their awareness of the business landscape?

1.4 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The strategist of today suffers from information overload in the pursuit of the realisation of competitive advantage, often only managing to perpetuate a reactive mode for survival.
There is no strategic intent formulation process for the business strategist. As strategic intent presently resides within a particular individual’s mind (the CEO) or that of the consultant or management group who is involved in developing the organisation’s strategy.

In contrast, the Military Commander has a formal process called the Commander’s Appreciation which he/she uses to solve military problems.

**Problem Statement**

How will the CEO formulate his/her strategic intent in order to gain the initiative to ensure Competitive Advantage?

**Name the Problem**

There is no CEO strategic intent formulation process.

This problem was not fully understood at the time of the research as there is a lack of empirical research results pertaining to CEO’s formulation of strategic intent. The literature did not provide a clear framework on which to base the CEO’s strategic intent formulation process. The Military Commander’s Appreciation was used as reference. In the current ever-changing business landscape it has become evident that the CEO has a need for his situational awareness to be synthesised rapidly, in order to elicit an appropriate response.

With the implementation of an intent formulation process, the CEO will have a fully synthesized grasp of the business landscape, both internally and externally, as part of an iterative process. This activates a proactive stance for the CEO opposed to maintaining a reactive one. In the process, this provides
a solid foundation on which to act appropriately and in the best interest of the company.

1.5 FORMULATION OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study focus will be on how the individual CEO’s intent formulation is conducted and where it will enter the strategic planning process. This will also include what role it will play for increasing the CEO’s situational awareness and what contribution the CEO will make, if any, in gaining the initiative for realising the competitive advantage. This problem is examined through case study research in order to answer the following research question:

**Research Question**

To assess whether, the Commander’s Appreciation used in the military context also prevails in the business environment, and if so, to focus the attention on the areas of similarity (and differences) as a basis to formulate a model for strategic intent formulation.

Hence, the following sub-questions were formulated to support the above research:

- Is there a process used by the CEO to translate mandate into a competitive advantage?

- To what degree can the CEO exploit business opportunities to gain the initiative?

- How can the Commander’s Appreciation contribute to the CEO’s situational awareness?
• What lessons can be learnt from the Commander’s Appreciation to enable the corporate and/or entrepreneurial CEO?

1.6 THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The following specified research objectives have been identified in order to address the research question:

• To produce an in-depth synthesis of the existing literature pertaining to Strategic Intent Formulation

• To investigate the research questions through collection of evidence from knowledgeable informants in a number of case studies.

• To assess the extent to which the CEO has developed a formal process in formulating his/her intent and the link to the strategic management process

• To produce an analysis of the impact of strategic intent.

• To uncover the CEO’s role in the activation of the Strategic Management Process.

• To develop a new CEO strategic intent formulation theoretical contribution (In order to formulate a model for possible utilisation by the CEO in all phases of company development).

1.7 THE IMPORTANCE AND CONTRIBUTION OF THIS RESEARCH

The contribution of this research is focused on the development of strategic intent by the CEO. The limited prior research in CEO strategic intent
formulation shows the CEO’s lack of structure in synthesising an understanding of his/her business landscapes. This study adds to the CEO’s ability to formulate his/her awareness of the relevant business landscape, to synthesise it and to produce his/her intent for dissemination and integration into the company’s action plans. A few aspects deserve to be emphasized:

- The research provides its departure point from the military campaign planning process. This is important, as it provides the framework within which the Commander’s Appreciation resides. The Commander’s Appreciation is the only formal intent formulation process found for use by a strategist. In order to establish what strategic formulation comprises of, it was found necessary to itemise the Commander’s Appreciation. This itemisation has provided a set of categories and concepts that make up an individual’s strategic intent formulation. These categories and concepts can be used as a foundation for further initiatives in individual strategic intent formulation.

- This study provides an analysis of the categories and concepts prevalent in descriptions of individual strategic intent formulation in a number of case studies. To ascertain:
  
  o whether the CEO could convert the Board’s mandate into tangible deliverables;

  o to provide insight into the alignment of crises and risk management activation and contingency planning within the company; and,
o to provide insight into the ability of the CEO to limit reactive action to short turn-around times thereby promoting a proactive stance.

o (Note. The study also provides, as a by-product, an indication of possible skills required by the CEO.)

- The theory developed provides an explanation of the problem. A model is proposed, supported by guidelines, which provides a firm foundation from which the CEO can imbue innovation, flexibility and agility of mind. This research is important to the academic community as it provides further insight into individual strategic intent formulation. Furthermore, the model and guidelines could provide the typical CEO with a practical solution. These contributions add to the body of knowledge of strategic management.

1.8 DELINEATION AND LIMITATIONS

1.8.1 Delineations

The use of the SANDF Commander’s Appreciation process will be used as the basic military input. The SANDF Commander’s Appreciation has been incorporated with elements of the USA and UK Commander’s Appreciation processes. The researcher is a qualified Military Commander, trained in the SANDF Commander’s Appreciation and therefore has access to this process.

As this study is conducted within the RSA, the choice of the locally developed Strategic Management Process Model (SMPM) will be used (Louw & Venter, 2006). This forms part of a limited view in the literature suggesting that strategic intent is to be the first step in the Strategic Management Process.
The comparison was only carried out within the Mining industry and the Military environments, as they had similar planning processes. The use of the mining fraternity enabled corporate benchmarking and made the results feasible for larger organisations.

### 1.8.2 Limitations

It is appropriate to reflect holistically on the work and to outline improvements that could be made. Reflection on the study, as it progressed through its various stages, made the researcher aware of a number limiting factors, many of which were beyond his control.

- There is a paucity of academic literature on an individual’s strategic intent formulation. This was surprising, given the fact that many researchers have written on strategic management, strategic intent and the positioning of the CEO in planning. At the time of the empirical data analysis, the CEO’s strategic intent formulation had not been formally researched. Therefore there was no baseline from which to carry out this research.

- A further limitation was the exclusion of many knowledgeable informants. The inclusion of the USA and UK Commander’s and college staff could have offered additional views and insights. Incorporating these members would have been impractical and unfeasible in the study due to limitations of access and concomitant high costs. In order to overcome this, SANDF officers who had successfully completed the SANDF Commander’s Appreciation and who had been members of the SA Army College staff, who trained in the USA and UK were interviewed. In addition they were co-authors of the document “SANDF Commander’s Appreciation”.
• This study was cross-sectional in nature and involved single research episodes. A longitudinal study that could show the involvement of the typical CEO over many planning cycles could be explored during further research.

1.9 CHAPTER OVERVIEWS

1.9.1 Chapter 2: What Has Gone Before

Sequencing of the literature review commenced with the origins of early thinkers who contributed to Military and Business (War, Strategy and Human Behaviour) and in so doing provided the first anchor on which to build a foundation. This was then refined by a historical perspective of core, classical scholarly contributions to the body of knowledge to do with War, Strategy, Business and Human Behaviour, thereby providing both context and depth. This was concluded by an unyielding base from which relevant theories and concepts used in Psychology (Human Behaviour), Strategy, Business and the Military were cross-examined, culminating in an in-depth analysis of the concept “Strategic Intent”. This shaped the boundaries from which the contributions of the strategists and the strategy formulation process were interrogated resulting in the highlighting and positioning of the identified research gap concerning “Strategic Intent formulation”, thereby clarifying the specification on “what is to be researched”?

1.9.2 Chapter 3: Appropriateness of Methodology

In this chapter the various research approaches were assessed to assure appropriate research combinations were used in the research. The discussion commenced with qualitative and quantitative research. The research
philosophies amounted to an epistemology and interpretivism, focusing on an inductive approach. The applicable strategies were case studies supported by grounded theory, within a mixed method in a cross-sectional time horizon. The collection of data, semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, web information and planning documents was looked at. A discussion on ethics in research followed, concluding with an appropriate design grouping.

1.9.3 Chapter 4: Research Methodology

This chapter shows the implementation of the appropriate designs. This commenced with the construction of the evidence collection instruments and testing. Then the determination of the population and sample in which the evidence would be collected was determined. After the collection of the evidence, the qualitative data analysis discussion commenced with grounded theory, its capability and criticisms.

Furthermore, it was explained how the researcher managed the collected data. The reporting approach found suitable for a mixed method was the use of narratives. The development of the primary narratives and higher order narratives followed. Reflection on the higher order narratives led to finding and development of a theoretical conjecture. The evaluation of the research was based on a discussion of biases, validity, reliability and generalisability ending off with the importance of ethics.

1.9.4 Chapter 5: The Commander’s Comment

This chapter is the primary narrative of the itemisation of the Commander’s Appreciation. This commenced with the confirmation of the sample used. The data was collected via semi-structured interviews and analysed in accordance
with a type of grounded theory approach. The insights of the knowledgeable Commanders on the Commander’s Appreciation manifested into twelve themes, from which four categories and seventy-four concepts were distilled. These categories and concepts were mapped in order to ensure that relevant information was collected. The construction, testing of questions linked to relevant information and conversion into the research instrument followed.

1.9.5 Chapter 6: Making Sense of the Evidence

This chapter is a higher order narrative, an aggregation of all the case primary narratives and their comparisons.

The primary case narrative was constructed from the integration of the sources, planning document, interviews with the general managers, questionnaires of the staff and organisation background info websites. The data analysis was based on a grounded theory approach. The narrative was constructed from a triangulation of the interview transcripts, the questionnaires by the staff and other sources linked to each concept. To ensure that the concepts were assessed an agreement group and disagreement group were established.

The higher order narrative compared the three cases’ in terms of the categories from which a synthesis and holistic research view was developed.

1.9.6 Chapter 7: Findings and Theoretical Conjecture

The chapter shows further reflection of the Commander’s comment (Chapter 5) and on the making sense of the evidence garnered (Chapter 6) in order to gain a deeper understanding of the research. A number of key findings
became apparent. Those findings have led to capturing of essential similarities and differences which presented a crystallized understanding of the prevalence of the Commander's Appreciation concepts within the mining fraternity. In addition, it leads to the development of a theoretical conjecture, juxtaposing the CEO and the development of the Conceptual Strategic Intent formulation Model.

1.9.7 Chapter 8: Conclusions

This chapter draws the research to a conclusion by reflecting on the importance of the theoretical contribution. In addition, the researcher made use of a research audit trails (Intellectual Audit Trail and Physical Audit Trail) in order to ensure that the theoretical contribution was grounded within the empirical evidence. This in turn provides an appropriate foundation for suggestions on further research, ending off with the study conclusion.
2. CHAPTER 2: WHAT HAS GONE BEFORE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Strategic Management is a field of study that is the subject of endless debates. One of the elements that have received considerable research interest over the years, as academics and practitioners sought a better grasp of its impact, is strategic intent.

This chapter analyses the contributions of many thought leaders in the field of strategic management, to comprehend the vast literature that has gone before and in the process to confirm the existence of the research gap. In order for this to be successful, it is necessary to extract from strategic management the concepts and other pertinent information to create an understanding and positioning of strategic intent.

Five sections have been determined to outline the focus. Each section will interrogate the literature via a particular question and in the process, make the information manageable and relevant.

- **Section 1.** *Is strategic intent a new concept to realise competitive advantage?* This section focuses on establishing the links that strategic intent has within the strategic management concepts, to determine its ability to provide competitive advantage.

- **Section 2.** *What is the strategist’s impact on strategic intent in realising success?* This section’s focus is to determine the link between the strategist and strategic intent.
• **Section 3.** *Is strategic intent the driving force for gaining the initiative?*

This section’s focus is on how a CEO in Business will translate strategic intent into operational reality - the area of interest and influences.

• **Section 4.** *Is strategic intent an effective solution for Strategy Formulation?*

This section focuses on how strategic intent is formulated - its placement in strategy formulation, planning and implementation processes.

• **Section 5.** *Concluding the Literature Review.* The focus here will be to provide a succinct summary of insights into scholarship of strategic intent, re-affirming the research gap within the body of knowledge. This chapter ends with positioning of the research focus and re-affirmation of the study contribution.

### 2.2 IS STRATEGIC INTENT A NEW CONCEPT TO REALISE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE?

Establishing a grounded link between strategic intent and competitive advantage requires an examination of various strategic management concepts. Meekings, Dransfield and Goddard (1994:17) place the examination into context by suggesting that:

> “Today’s managerial challenge is translating strategic intent into operational reality quickly enough to meet market needs. In practice however, most large organisations struggle to translate their strategic intent into operational reality with pace and vigour.”

Even though Meekings et al. (1994) suggest that it was a business management process that was needed to operationalise strategic intent with
pace and vigour, one could argue that only an individual could have and could express intent. Furthermore, it is also suggested that only an individual could “drive” strategic intent. This view is also supported by Macmillan and Tampoe (2000:78) when they cite Simon (1964) and Cyert and March (1963) who:

“….have suggested that it is not possible for an organisation to either have a purpose or an intent… their view is that only individuals can have intent and purpose”.

This is borne out by Hamel and Prahalad’s (Mintzberg, 2009:220) view that …

“strategic intent envisions desired leadership…”

Therefore, the focus will be on leaders, leadership, strategic thought and the associated strategy that will keep the company competitive. It is leaders with strategic thought that drive processes to formulate strategy and leadership that will inspire the teams to implement it. The origins of a particular strategy and its leaders therefore need to be placed into perspective and context in order to determine relevance.

Although origins of strategic leadership are found in the military, discussing these roots could be frowned upon in terms of its appropriateness (Cohen, 1997:227; Hough & Du Plessis, 2001:19). It would be useful to consider their contribution to strategic thought in the process of the activation of strategy (Adair, 2002:35). According to Henry (1996:129) Generals seemed to monopolise the term strategy and frequently debated this issue and expressed opinions in their memoirs, causing it to be regarded to a great degree as mostly a military topic.
In contrast, the business interest in strategy seemingly started seriously in the 1960’s with Alfred Chandler. His main contribution was to explain the relationship in an organisation between strategy and structure (Mintzberg et al. 2009:37). Chandler emphasised the importance of creating a strategy for a business before framing its organisation structure, which in turn could be traced back to military practices according to Grattan (2002:76). It was only in 2002 that Mintzberg et al. (2002: 371) made a direct reference to the battlefield when they said “life is a battlefield held with clear winners and losers” suggesting that strategies of war could be applied directly to the challenges of everyday life.

Over the years, strategy became a well-used term within the business world (Thompson & Strickland, 2003:23). Strategy formulation has become an issue not only in military and business circles but also in general society. Owing to this over-popularisation of the concept ‘strategy’ it is often used inappropriately. There seems to be one point, however, upon which both the military commander and businessmen agree: “If you want to win then you’d better get your strategy right”. Hence, strategy could be seen in its simplest form as “the way to win”. This could be taken to indicate that winners must have a strategy for success (whether that need is acknowledged or not).

“Effective strategy making connects acting to thinking, which in turn connects implementation to formulation. We think in order to act, but we also act in order to think. We try things and the ones that work gradually converges into patterns that become strategies”. (Mintzberg et al. 2009:76)
Probably the most significant contribution within all the areas of strategy formulation researched could be attributed to Mintzberg’s (1994:24) question whether “…realised strategies are always intended”?
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**Figure 1: Forms of Strategy**

A graphical depiction (Figure 1) is required to shed light on the essence of Mintzberg’s question (Mintzberg, 1994:24). The following can be extrapolated from Mintzberg’s views:

- Organisations develop plans for the future (intended strategy) and strategies also evolve as patterns out of the planners’ past (realised strategy).

- Intentions that are fully realised could be called deliberate strategies.

- Intentions that are not realised at all could be called unrealised strategies.

- What is not apparent, are the evolution of emergent strategies, Mintzberg’s third case (Mintzberg 1994:25), which nonetheless contribute significantly to the realised strategy:
“…which is called emergent strategies, where a realised pattern was not intended”.

These categories come from the strategic management theory which, according to Drucker (2006:34) can be based on rational and intuitive thinking, in addition to being deliberate or emergent in style. In support, Howard (2003:3-5) demonstrates that a military order produced as the response to a superior’s order can be seen as deliberate strategies and those produced in response to the situation are emergent strategies. Thus both the Business and Military are involved in the process of realising strategy.

Emergent strategies can grow into big strategies arising from little ideas (initiatives), emanating from strange places (Mintzberg & Water, 1985:259) not to mention at unexpected times where almost anyone in the organisation can prove to be a strategist.

Therefore, if almost anyone could be seen as a strategist, intended strategy could be attributed to a personal action (Hinterhuber & Popp, 1992:108). Consequently, the link between intended strategy and personal action amounts to intent and intention; both of which requires a creator or originator (Hitt, Ricart, Costa & Nixon 1998:62). This creator or originator could be linked to an individual (the military Commander or the CEO from business) or to a group of individuals (the Management Team or Management Consultants) when it is required to formulate the intent within the global market (Hitt, Tyler, Hardee & Park, 1995:17).

In order for formulation of intent to be competitive, two identified contributing areas are necessary: Firstly, there has to be someone to conceive the intent
on the individual level. The CEO would be the appropriate individual as far as this study is concerned. Therefore it would be fair to suggest that the CEO’s conceived intent could quite acceptably be referred to as the CEO’s Intent.

Secondly, there has to be an action by the individual in question to translate his/her intent into a plausible implemented action (plan) resulting in a realised strategy (Beer & Eisenstat, 2000:36).

2.2.1 Converting Strategy to Real Intention

Strategies as plans are formulated in order to somehow get into the mind of the strategist or to find out what is really intended (Thomas, 2007:51).

According to Mintzberg (1987:21) a ploy strategy takes us into the realm of direct competition where threats, feints and various manoeuvres (which could be linked to military concepts of operations) are ploys to be considered by the strategist. Although it may be true, the strategist still needs to reconcile the dynamic notions of strategy as a ploy, with the static notions of strategy as patterns (Mintzberg, 1978: 938) in order to create a seamless transfer of his/her intent. In other words he/she merges the effects of intended strategy within a turbulent environment.

Strategy, however, is not going to turn around a crisis situation on its own. It is up to the top management’s ability to package his/her intent effectively to ensure implementation. The “packaging” amounts to his/her ability to aggregate the environment and to create an understanding thereof enabling him/her to formulate their intent and so, finally translate that intent into implementable strategy. According to Goold (1996(a):95) the success of proposed strategies are of more value for testing strategies than for
generating new ones (Chan & Riess, 2004:157). This will enable the strategist to map the opportunities and means.

According to Clausewitz (Holmes, 2007:150) the uncertainties and hazards that made war unpredictable and actions uncontrollable were not barriers to be eliminated but opportunities to be grasped and exploited. Mintzberg’s (1990:187) design school underpinned this view that strategy represented a fundamental congruence between external opportunity and internal capability. Consequently, it becomes apparent that strategy is not an abstraction, it is born of action by the leader (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2007:213) and it has a very real intention of improving the fortunes of an organisation. This will only be possible if the top management of that organisation (whether military or business by nature) have the ability to unify decision-making, choice and trade-offs.

Image theory is a unifying theory of decision-making (Mintzberg & Westley, 2001:92) for individuals creating personal decisions in the context of the organisation (Grattan, 2002:134). However, decision makers need experience and common sense, both of which are costly to acquire (Millet, 2006:52). Decision-making is therefore treated as a simple option and choice model. As a result, another theory known as game theory (Lynch, 2006:52) attempts to explore the interaction between the individual and the organisation’s internal and external environments (Nicholson, 2005:60). This is the foundation on which the leader builds his awareness and ability to respond to the turbulent environments encountered by him/her with an appropriate strategy.
Therefore the essence of strategy formulation lies in the ability of the leader to make trade-offs in a competitive environment by choosing what to do or not to do (Augier & Teece, 2008:268). This once again re-establishes the importance of the leaders’ awareness of the business landscape to be kept up to date. This awareness will enable the leader to respond with relevant and appropriate decisions. This last point infers that, without trade-offs there would be no need for choice and thus no need for strategy. Strategy therefore includes creating ‘fit’ amongst a company’s activities and its leader’s intent thereby ensuring the success of a strategy which depends on doing many things well (Porter, 1996:75).

If there is no “fit” amongst activities there is no distinctive strategy and little sustainability (Hough, Thompson, Strickland & Gamble, 2008:226). Management therefore reverts to the simpler task of overseeing independent functions (Cokins, 2004:127) which in turn would promote disconnect between management’s decision-making ability and the operational effectiveness of the organisation for future competitiveness.

2.2.2 Future Competitive Advantage - Value Creation

An analysis of competitive advantage is thus an intrinsic part of strategic management (Hough et al. 2008:74-76) rather than a separate exercise as it is often presented (Smit, Cronje, Brevis & Vrba, 2007:87). This analysis cannot be performed linearly but only through an iterative process, leading to possible strategies which have to be tested against the company’s capabilities and competitive position (Wallin, 2006:145). This is only
achievable by investment in a capable core team together with commitment to the organisation.

Hamel and Prahalad’s (1990:47) concern with the involvement of all employees, and their impact on the process of strategy and resource allocation, is constantly underplayed. This challenge has been taken up by Robert Grant (cited Segal-Horn, 2004:191) with his commitment to upgrading the business’ pool of resources to strengthen the strategic direction (Hamel & Breen, 2007:23). This would energise the organisation; promote creativity and innovation, as engines of competitive vitality.

Furthermore, Michael Porter’s article “Competitive Advantage to Corporate Strategy” (Mintzberg et al. 2002:433) discuss in a most insightful way, various overall corporate strategies including portfolio management, restructuring, transferring skills and sharing activities. This thought process deals with tangible interrelationships amongst business units which are conceived in terms of value change (Chan & Riess, 2004:154-155). In order to be truly competitive (Finkelstein, Harvey & Lawton, 2007:231) strategy requires commitment of significant resources. Commitment necessarily exposes a business to strategic risk and the possibility that it may have committed reasonably, but wrongfully.

This poses the question of where the value will be found. Chan and Riess (2004) guides our insight as follows: The new frontier in value creation lies in carefully and deliberately enabling operating divisions to pursue outsized returns, without having to merely accept the risk that has historically accompanied such boldness (Chan & Riess, 2004:160). Establishing this new
paradigm would demand that most senior levels of the organisation would have to succumb to compelling (new) visions (Collins & Porras, 1996:72). These visions would need to articulate a clear strategic direction with a lucid intent from the organisation’s strategist (Lipman-Blumen, 2005:32).

The strategist’s contribution to gaining competitive advantage is much sought after in business. Once it manifests, it is copied by the herd (Kim, 2007:135) and thus made worthless, necessitating a continuous improvement process to stay competitive. In order to expedite the continuous improvement process the organisation would have to promote originality. According to Floyd, Roos, Jacobs and Kellerman (2005:215) real innovation does not arise from boardroom directives, it emanates rather from people doing their jobs every day, experimenting with different approaches and tinkering with new technology (Epstein & Roy, 2004:28-29). These people are responding to their environments, making adjustments in order to handle the present, rather than making predictions about the future (Hamel & Breen, 2007:116). Therefore the contribution of the strategist has to be a continuous one. Strategists accordingly require a holistic understanding of the situation in order to ensure returns.

2.2.3 Profit Making and Returns

Rumelt (Segal-Horn, 2004:66) argues that long-term rates of return are not associated with industry, but with the unique endowments, positions and strategies (Cyert & Hedrick, 1972:406) of individual businesses. Furthermore, Cokins (2004:98) shows that businesses differ from one another in their performance and profitability, a great deal more than industries differ from
one another. This insinuates that the strategist has a measurable impact on the returns and profits of a company alluding to the critical importance of his/her intent.

It is however conceded that the military would not participate in profit-based theories. This does not mean that the planning and driving of strategy formulation is not competitive. Furthermore, it has to be stressed that the military leader also needs to be attuned to his/her environment making “military profit and returns” often greater due to public interest. A fundamental criticism of profit making theories has been made by Prahalad and Hamel (1993:82-83). They argue that although competitors are important, the emphasis on competitive industry comparison, essential to such theories, is misleading. They simply show where the organisations are weak and without intent (Kim, 2007:136). Such theories do not indicate how the company should develop (Hamel & Breen, 2007:67) its own resources and skills, which is the key strategic task in their view. It should be kept in mind that no one is immune from retaliatory reactions, as this could be seen as a cause-and-effect approach.

Furthermore, Mintzberg and others (Segal-Horn, 2004:76) have also criticised the approach (profit-making theories) arguing that this is simply not the way strategy should be developed and suggesting rather a human resources based theory. To avoid such waste of resources the most effective strategies would be developed by the CEO and his management. They would provide guidance to balance compliance and service delivery (Patel, 2006:120).
Hence management ought to be able to distinguish between two types of “games” (Mintzberg, 2007:275). Firstly, rule-based “games” where players interact according to specified “rules of engagement”. Secondly, free-wheeling “games” where players interact without any external constraints. Business is a complex mix of both types of “games”. The rule-based games theory (Augier & Teece, 2008:195) offers the principle of “for every action there is a reaction”, but it is not proportional or equal as in the case of Newton’s third law of motion. The principle of free-wheeling games theory offers that “you can’t take away from the game more than you bring to it” (Brandenburger & Nalebuff, 1995:57-59) thus necessitating a selection of core competencies that can exploit both approaches.

### 2.2.4 Core Competencies

 According to Mintzberg et al (2009: 218) the origins of core competencies could be traced back to a noteworthy publication by Hiroyuki Itami in 1987 called *Mobilizing Invisible Assets* (1987). In his book Itami argued that the essence of successfully strategy lies in *dynamic strategic fit*. This dynamic strategic fit suggests the alignment of the external and internal factors within the content of strategy itself. Prahalad and Hamel (1994:14-15) expanded on this idea with their new focus on the subject of corporate strategy called core competencies which, in short, are the exceptional things that an organisation does. In other word the source of competitive advantage could be found in the core competencies of the firm.

For that reason, management must nurture selected core competencies in the race of business to stay ahead by positioning strategy at the heart of the
company, driven by the strategic leader’s intent. In the process this must be incorporate today’s dynamic markets and changing technologies (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990:82). If this was not the focus it could unwind into Hypercompetition\(^2\) which is a self-inflicted wound for any company (Mcfate, 2008:17; Porter, 1996:61), instead of the desirable outcomes that are required for changing competitive paradigms within strategy formulation.

Furthermore D’Aveni (2010:131-132) purported that:

“Hypercompetition is more relevant to the companies now as they are experiencing Hypercompetition on steroids. As many companies are in the grip of a particular virulent form of Hypercompetition an upgraded view is called for and this view is the commodity trap. It has the potential to destroy entire markets; disrupt whole industries; and, drive businesses out of business”.

In addition: This happens due to no fault of the CEO or the board of directors as most commoditization results when managers fail to innovate, or issue bad products or deny trends that were already in motion.

However, academic literature reveals the limitations of strategy in trying to predict the future (Hamel & Breen, 2007:67-68). Organisations could, however, be very successful if they rejected the oppressive discourse on management and strategy as propounded by Ezer and Demetis (2007:61). This would be possible if the focus was on “what it was that they could actually do”. One might argue that short-term thinking was possible in a small

\(^2\) According to D’Aveni (1994:213) It is a new idea based on one theme competitive advantage. It is becoming unsustainable because of globalisation and technology disruptions.
or medium-sized company (Mintzberg, 1994:62-64). Therefore, once a company got larger, some kind of structure was necessary.

This supported Chandler’s (1969:39) argument that all successful companies had to have a structure that matched their strategy. Not, as many had assumed until then, the other way around. Ezer and Demetis (2007:60) argued that it was only because “organisational structures” have been institutionalised that such a view became unquestioned. It was, however, possible to organise a large multi-national organisation without a rigid hierarchy (Hitt et al. 1995:16), endorsed by a clear and concise strategic intent visualising the future.

Hence, it is hard to understand the present and the immediate past events that transpire, that could have unanticipated knock-on effects (Nicholson, 2005:61). Therefore leaders who could make some sense of the present are tremendously valuable to their organisations (Widmer, 1980:61). Thus, those who could not understand the present, but who tried to predict the future, were made obstacles to success (Hirai & Summers, 2005:87). We should have admitted that we had bounded rationality with our chronic lack of information and should have stopped trying to mislead ourselves. Therefore it is possible to have a coherent organisation (Collins & Porras, 1991:47) where different parts are working together to execute a short-term vision and in the process a sense of ownership could be created.

In order for a fertile ground for ownership to be created, an organisation must enable people to tinker and make mistakes, learn from these mistakes and to adapt to their fast-changing environment (Floyd et al. 2005:49-51). Hence,
dynamic strategy formulation (Feurer, Chaharbaghi & Distel, 1995:19) cannot be accomplished by the traditional system of central resource allocation and strategy development. It is necessary to move towards a system of distributed strategy ownership (Ghemawat, 1999:136). In such a system, full strategy ownership and responsibility to make a profit allows a truly dynamic approach to strategy formulation.

The concept of ownership of a strategy is based on determining an optimal compromise between closeness to the competitive environment (Kim, 2007:134) and maintaining an overview of the entire organisation by the strategist. In order for the strategist to attain an overview in a turbulent and ever-changing environment he/she would require a strategic intent formulation process. In addition, clarification on whether strategy provided stability or promoted change would be obtained. It would also allow the identification of projects which did not add any strategic value (Chan & Riess, 2004:159) to the organisation.

2.2.5 Change versus Continuity – Abandoning Past Successes

Strategy is technically about maintaining continuity rather than change (Fernandez, 2004:56) but, the strategy process is more often about change rather than continuity. This means moving from a familiar domain into a less well-defined future (Hamel & Breen, 2007:157) where many of the old rules no longer apply. People must often abandon (Jackson, 2004:39) the origin of their past successes and develop entirely new skills and attributes. Managing strategic change is generally far more difficult than it may at first appear as it could realise into opportunity or disaster (Lobe, 2005:69).
Opportunities and disaster are made up of the “ying” (white) and “yang” (black) spaces of life. These are two distinct conditions that could be depicted as two sides of the same coin (Peng & Qi Zhou, 2006:495). The black space encompasses all the opportunities that a company has formally targeted and organised itself to capture, while the white space contains all the prospects that fall outside the scope of formal planning, budgeting and management (Blumentritt, 2006:74). White space exists in all companies and everywhere enterprising people are testing the waters with unofficial efforts to boost the bottom line (Schmitt, 2007:98) thus supporting the emergent approach to strategy formulation and development.

The managers who operate in these uncharted seas are often the ones most successful at driving innovation (Floyd et al. 2005:87), incubating new businesses and finding new markets (Berthon & Pitt, 1996:48-49; Minnick & Ireland, 2005:23). Therefore this value cannot be left to the whims and talents of individual managers (Chan & Riess, 2004:157-158). They are likely to miss out on many of the opportunities that come from exploring the next frontier (Mintzberg et al. 2002:419).

According to Thompson (Abraham & Leavy, 2007:41) the new direction in strategy is innovation, entrepreneurships, governance and ethics. However, engaging the organisation in developing foresight and supporting the process of innovation by giving it a common language and focus is stressed by Hamel and Prahalad (1990:47) as having the goal to build. Therefore, the best possible assumptions are sought, based on the future needed to shape industry’s evolution proactively (Birchall & Tovstiga, 2005:126).
Success of these assumptions requires continuing support from senior management, including the separation of the new venture from on-going activities as well as the willingness to take risks and learn from experiments (Gibson, Hodgetts & Herrera, 1999:384-386). It becomes apparent that investments should be treated as options in order to position the company for making informed investments at some later time, if and when the uncertainties are reduced (Morris, Kuratko & Covin, 2008:68).

The best innovators seem to be able to think broadly (Floyd et al. 2005:43) and to entertain a wide range of possibilities before they converge on any one solution. Therefore, the main point is that emerging technologies constitute a different game for driving established firms, with their own pitfalls and solutions (Cawood, 1984:64). However, new ideas in strategy usually come from managers who go against conventional wisdom (innovators). Semeler cited in Mintzberg et al. (2002:461) suggests that strategic experimentation need not be driven by this sort of approach and requires an overarching interactive intentional vision to accommodate flux.

However, Hamel and Prahalad (1989) argued that innovation in strategy should focus on the “how” of strategy process rather than the “what” of its content. On the other hand, the disposable organisation by March (Floyd et al. 2005:129), explored the obstacles to strategic experimentation and scenarios. So, if innovation is a key to creating “new wealth” (Mintzberg et al. 2002:472), why is “strategy” no longer a big idea in most companies? Why does planning and original thinking seem to command so little of top management’s time and attention?
2.2.6 Original Thinking – Link between Creativity and Innovation

Mintzberg et al. (2002:326) suggest that escaping the intrinsic contradiction of organising is the main impetus to strategic creativity and strategic innovation (Morris et al. 2008:97). This could, however, have modest beginnings. Original thinking in management often takes place away from the limelight (Paparone & Reed, 2008:71) and in fact, original thinking in strategy may not be revolutionary at all. It just has to be an idea that will make all the difference (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2007:276).

Will Information Technology provide the difference (Bakos & Treacy, 1986:112) to success in today’s rapidly competitive environment? This is a question weighing on many business managers’ and military commanders’ minds. Everyone seems to be chasing markets, customer demands, technologies, global boundaries, products and processes (Raynor, 2007(b): 6) and (of course) superior capabilities in combat (struggles for victory against adversaries) (Flowers, 2004:82).

In the midst of this seemingly overwhelming change in the way business is done (Fernandez, 2004:52), managers are being asked to make critical and competitive decisions (Townsend, 2007:26) without a technique, model or tool to grasp the holistic picture in real-time understanding. Managers and commanders are finding out the hard way that the old rules no longer apply (Floyd et al. 2005:135-136). They must understand that the new strategic response is innovation (Cawood, 1984:63) through the advancement of information technologies and entrepreneurship (Hagen, Tootoonchi & Hassan, 2005:59).
The word entrepreneurship is the proponent of the agile mindset approach as alluded to by Brown (2007(b):35) which has also been associated with change (Fernandez, 2004:52) and innovation. Inside larger, more bureaucratic organisations it is often not the boss but someone in an odd corner of the organisation (Floyd et al. 2005:158) who may be an unobtrusive champion for some technology or strategic issue (Hagen et al. 2005:62). This individual could take on the entrepreneurial role. This type of entrepreneurship is better that nothing and fits into the innovation concept even although there is risk within technology.

A critical aspect of risk management is where the product roadmap pushes the organisation to the bleeding edge of technology. Careful assessment therefore is needed in order to ascertain whether the technology is appropriate for enabling the strategy (Bocij, Chaffey, Greasley & Hickie, 2003:353). Furthermore, risk is not just coupled to technology it is inherent in the various dimensions of strategy formulation. Therefore tangible risk can be attributed to technology and intangible risk can be attributed to power and company politics.

Machiavelli’s name (Constantine, 2007:46) has become synonymous with this statement “…ruthless politics, deceit and the pursuit of power by any means…” can be seen as the most accurate account of what is happening in corporate world wide (D’Aveni, 2004:43). However, the corporate governance trailblazer, Sir Adrian Cadbury, provided a concise description of the forces at play at top levels (DeCelles & Pfarrer, 2004:75) of an enterprise as the basic governance issues are those of power and accountability. Therefore the
importance of corporate governance lies in the power (Armstrong, 1995:17) given to the Senior Officers to run the affairs of the organisation. The problem with power is that it needs to be used responsibly (Gomez, 2004:59).

Nowhere are the issues for power and accountability more evident than in the working out of a strategy for an organisation (Hough et al. 2008:177; Shongwe, 2008:99). Checking on the responsible conduct of the organisation is found in the information relayed to all of the stakeholders (DeCelles & Pfarrer, 2004:69) therefore good quality information will encourage responsible conduct (Nicholson, 2005:58). The problem is that such information may be commercially sensitive and confidential. Thus independent advisers, such as accountants deployed in auditing, may be the means of keeping check on corporate conduct (D’Aveni, 2004:39-42). Another way of checking on the conduct of the company could be by the appointment of non-executive directors (Hough et al. 2008:184) who have no other commercial connection with the company.

2.2.7 Stakeholders - Governance Roles in Strategy

A firm’s corporate strategy usually determines the course it will try to pursue over several years (Epstein & Roy, 2004:30). Strategy guides the allocation of financial, logistical and human resources (Townsend, 2007:24). A clear strategy must therefore be a subject that engages the interest of all the members of a firm’s leadership (DeCelles & Pfarrer, 2004:76) including top management, the board of directors and most importantly the Chief Executive Officer (Hough et al. 2008:181-184). This supports the perception that the translation of the mandate of the board into attainable objectives is done via
the CEO and leads to the question, “How is this done?” Presently there is no formal process, highlighting a possible gap in the individual dimension of the strategic intent formulation.

The influence and power (Lynch, 2006:362; Bigley & Wiersema, 2002:719) of the stakeholders to control the strategic direction of the organisation, in general resides within the Chief Executive (DeCelles & Pfarrer, 2004:68) and other Senior Officers of the organisation. More specifically, it is the domain of the Chief Executive who relates primarily to the selection, remuneration (Charan, 2005:59) and conduct of said officials within the organisation. They are also concerned with the relationships (Gomez, 2004:43) with owners, employers and other stakeholders of the organisation (Frigo, 2003:9). Consequently the CEO and Senior Officers act as agents on behalf of the stakeholders within the organisation.

Furthermore, the role of the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer should preferably be separated (Lorsch & Zelleke, 2005:73). The Chairman and Board (Leblanc & Gillies, 2003:6) have a particular obligation to look to the Company Secretary for guidance in regard to their responsibilities. This is looked at within the regulatory and statutory environments (Armstrong, 1995:19) and the manner in which responsibilities should be discharged (Hough et al. 2008:182-184). In addition, once the directors have seen that management’s process (strategy formulation and implementation) is sound and robust (Charan, 2005:176) their questions shift from challenging management conclusions to fostering a dialogue that extends management’s thinking (their intentions) (Hough et al. 2008:182).
It is argued by Louw and Venter (2006:330-331) and Townsend (2007:26-28) that knowing and detecting the early warning signs of trouble, such as strategic initiatives falling short and regulatory approvals running behind schedule developing into threats (Clark, 2007:73), necessitates the activation of contingency planning. This will ensure the longevity of the CEO as opposed to brevity of tenure (DeCelles & Pfarrer, 2004:75), supporting collaboration and partnership over isolation. This should also overcome the misnomer of the board of directors’ approach as promulgated by Lynch (2006:379), that when the company is executing against its strategic plan and all is well, they are successful, but when not, the board will (Lucier, Kocourek & Habbel, 2005:13) probably start thinking about its most important task of when to select a new CEO.

2.2.8 Ethics and Social Responsibility

Shongwe purports that (2008:98) “…some executives are acutely aware that business transactions often have grave ethical implications” making the idea of ethical strategy (Heath, 2007:365) a possible contradiction of moral logic. One should behave ethically (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2007:5), we could say, out of personal conviction and moral feeling, not out of sheer strategic calculation of self interest (Hough et al. 2008:189).

According to Thompson (Hough et al. 2008:189), ethics is fundamental and inherent in the new direction strategy. Therefore ethics should not be an instrument for furthering possible unethical aims (Heath, 2007:371; Miller, 2004:213). Ethics is a question of values (Chan & Riess, 2004:160) and goals, not of methods. Kuper, (2006:36) argues that the corporation or its
managers could have no moral responsibility outside that given by the law (Armstrong, 1995:17). In this perspective, the question of an ethical strategy will not even arise (Heath, 2007:368) thus making ethics a moot dilemma. This calls into question how social responsibility is activated.

Although the term corporate social responsibility (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2007:216) includes the standards and conduct that an organisation sets itself in dealing within its external environment. It needs to be reflected as permeated into the fibre of the organisation and not only visually (Louw & Venter, 2006:317). This is very limited in some organisations. Therefore, if social responsibility has not spread throughout the organisation and resides within the mission statement (Lynch, 2006:370), it is contended that it is lip service, shop talk and window dressing.

2.2.9 Conclusion

Strategic management can either make fortunes for the stakeholders or it can bankrupt companies and in the process trash or promote the career of the Chief Executive Officer. This realisation places the focus on the CEO's ability to function at the strategic level. Meekings et al. (1994) however suggest that a business management process is needed to operationalise strategic intent with pace and vigour. It has become evident that one can argue that only an individual can have and translate intent. Furthermore it is also suggested that only an individual can drive strategic intent. These views are also supported by Macmillan and Tampoe (2000:78) when they cite Simon (1964) and Cyert and March (1963): “….who have suggested that it is not possible for an organisation to either have a purpose or intent… their view is that only
individuals can have intent and purpose”. Furthermore Hamel and Prahalad’s (Mintzberg, 2009:220) view that … “strategic intent envisions desired leadership…” Therefore, the focus is on leaders, leadership, strategic thought and relevant strategy formulation that will keep the company competitive. It is leaders with strategic thought that will drive processes to formulate strategy and leadership that will inspire the teams to implement it.

2.3 WHAT IS THE STRATEGIST’S IMPACT ON REALISING SUCCESS?

2.3.1 Strategic Leadership

The quest to uncover the secret of successful strategic leadership possesses an aura of romance and mythology that is deeply ingrained in the western culture (Smuts, 1952:165; Huczynski, 1992:19; Mintzberg, 2004(a):22; Dulewicz, Young & Dulewicz, 2005:78). Nevertheless, if strategic leadership is of such vital importance to the strategy process, the organisation’s direction, its success and competitive advantage, it needs to be integrated with best practices from seminal strategic thinkers (Kets De Vries, 1996:489). This view has, as a consequence, the renewing of the engagement with the previously referred to military strategic thinkers.

The conventional notion about military leadership is that it is probably wrong (Burpo, 2006:69) and that if military leadership has anything to offer business leaders, it flies in the face of conventional thinking (Rossouw, 2003:239). It is perceived that leadership in battle consists mainly of running around and shouting orders (Cohen, 1998:12). If this were true, military leadership would not be something to emulate (Whiffen, 2007:110). Requiring someone to
obey orders simply because one is in authority (Kellerman, 2005:43) is not good leadership, whether in or out of uniform.

For centuries commanders (Bryant, 1959:69), managers and academics have been captivated by the relationship between organisational leadership styles (Bratton, Grint & Nelson, 2005:265) and success thus exposing and suggesting that leadership is dragging business down (Weymes, 2003:327). According to Miralbal and De Young, (2005:40) these companies embrace the notion of a single isolated leader who is supposed to charge heroically ahead formulating the grand strategies, making the tough decisions, pulling off the great mergers and simultaneously downsizing to save expenses. Frequently, such people sweep into companies where they have no history, to save the day and fail dismally. The failure is due to their ability of attaining a comprehensive awareness of the current situation. The military in contrast makes use of the Commanders Appreciation (Malan, 1996:13) to ensure continuity when commanders are relieved in the line Hirai and Summers, (2005:91). This necessitates an exercised proficiency of the Commander’s Appreciation by the new commander in order to gain insight and ensure continuity. This poses the question of whether there is something similar in the business world.

It can be stated that this was not found to be the case within business. The only useful parallel for the Commander’s Appreciation would seem to be the MBA programme. Mintzberg (2004(b):145) states that the MBA programme “prepares people to manage nothing”. Synthesis not analysis is the very essence of management. The MBA course teaches only analysis. “Robert
McNamara (Ford) and Jeffery Skilling (Enron) were brilliant analysts and star students, but they made lousy leaders”. MBA graduates, according to Mintzberg (2004(b):146), are persuasive and smart, not committed to particular industries but to management as a means of personal advancement. This is exacerbated by the lack of a process and tool for the new CEO to activate in order to bridge his inability to synthesise his/her analysis (Hirai & Summers, 2005:87). He/she might well have the MBA education, however synthesis is lacking (Mintzberg, 2004(b):85).

According to Hinterhuber and Popp, (1992:112) every company with a problem needs leadership and more leadership, in contrast Mintzberg who (2004(a):22) states that many have too much leadership. They need less leadership, maybe even an older kind of leadership, but essentially it must be appropriate and relevant leadership. Hence, organisational leadership (Bratton et al. 2005:95) takes a variety of forms as strategic intent is transformed from an individual commitment to a collective reality within any organisation (Smith, 1994:70). How does this leadership and individual commitment reside with the company’s leader or strategist?

2.3.2 The Premise of the Strategist- Military and Business Comparison

According to Gray (1999:50) a good strategist requires a vast subject knowledge supported by an agile mind (Brown, 2007(b):42) which leads to the question, ‘Who is a strategist’? In theory (Hinterhuber & Popp, 1992:106) each environment should have only one strategist. Strategy, according to Clausewitz (Bassford, 1994:1889-1891), insists that each organisation can only afford one person, not in a vacuum, to act as strategy maker. Therefore
according to Gray, (2006:19) if this strategic function (the provision of strategic direction, vision, mission, culminating in a verbalised intent) is lacking, strategic effect will merely be the culmination of tactical and operational outcomes.

However, a strategist worthy of the name is a person “who [can] see even though he or she cannot possibly be an expert in all [dimensions] of the big picture [in terms of] evolving [emergent] conditions within war [and business]” (Gray, 1999: 52). This also rings true for business thus justifying a comparison between the strategist in the military and one in business (Patel, 2006:81; Hinterhuber & Popp, 1992:110). This places the commander as well as the CEO well into the realm of strategist.

The strategist (Commander/CEO) is not concerned per se with each function’s detailed planning. According to Wallin, (2006:124) the strategist should orchestrate capabilities, in all geographical environments, across all dimensions and in all nature of conflicts in order to mitigate the threat. This can be true for both military and business environments which points out that the job description for the strategist is exceedingly, intellectually demanding (Birchall & Tovstiga, 2005:23). A soldier needs peacetime and intellectual security, so that he can practise his profession. This is possibly due to the Douhet’s glance made up of “look at the past, look at the present and [lead] leap into the future” (O’ Neill & Horner, 1981: 4-8). These actions take place formally within the Commander’s Appreciation process. This may upset doctrines which have become dogmas and clearly need extensive intellectual
interrogation (Mansoor & Ulrich, 2007:47). However peacetime strategists solve old puzzles (Hussey, 1994:186) and predict learning into the future.

It is suggested by Campbell and Alexander (1997:48) that strategists fall into three categories: firstly, those that focus on operating issues; secondly, those that focus on gazing into the future; and thirdly, those that focus on behaviour and culture. Hence ideas such as Hamel and Prahalad’s (1990) strategic intent fall into the last category, as do the theories of many purveyors of ‘mission and vision’ thinking. The strategist’s job is to plot the best course through an environmental influx, as an organisation grows, in order to stress the force of history on an organisation (Hinterhuber & Popp, 1992:112; Patel, 2006:45). Greiner (1998:55-57) drew from the legacies of European psychologists who argued that the behaviour of an individual was determined primarily by past events and experiences rather than by what lies ahead.

Although the pertinent lesson according to Mintzberg, (2004(b):48) is that managers need to think at least as carefully about what they do not know, as about what they think they do know, as well as their strategic commitments for strategy creation (Raynor, 2007(a):5). Both Mintzberg and Quinn (Mintzberg, 2007:23) view the strategy creation process as one of evolution and learning, indicating that there are ways to create strategy other than by formal planning (Clark, 2007:75). We can focus on two approaches: in particular, one labelled “visionary” (Westley & Mintzberg, 1989: 18-21), the other “learning”. The former is dependent on a single creative strategist (executive) and the latter on a variety of actors capable of experimenting and
integrating information relevant to strategy formulation (a staff of military planners supporting a military commander) (Mintzberg, 1993:37).

However, for most executives (Mintzberg, 2004(b):231) concerned with strategic management, the primary interest will always be, “What should we do now” Mintzberg (1994:256) would advocate that they try something, see if it works and learn from the experience. Strategic management thinking should be useful with the selection and use of proof of concepts, simulations and pilot studies (Boulton, 1984:126). According to Ambrosini (1998:186) none of this is to deny the vitality of following through whatever strategy is chosen, the willingness to learn from the experience and refining of the chosen strategy. Here Mintzberg’s (2004(b):135) crusade is both valuable and important, particularly for the managers who might otherwise suffer from tunnel vision.

According to Clark (2007:72) there is no contest between planning and learning (Goold, 1996(b):101) but rather what could be seen as collaboration. Furthermore, Quinn (Goold & Quinn, 1990:46) tends to place greater emphasis on the role of the Chief Executive and Senior Management team in general as central strategists. Mintzberg (2007:145) on the other hand tends to place a little more emphasis on others who feed strategy up the hierarchy, especially in his discussion of the grass-roots approach to the process (operations and implementation focused).

### 2.3.3 The Strategist – Core Leadership Competencies

According to Hindle (2008:282-284), Kenichi Ohmae internationally renowned for his thinking about strategy rather than about operations, wrote a book
called “The Mind of the Strategist”. Here he set out to show how an exceptional Japanese strategist used vision, intention and intuition to turn ideas into actions. This linked the strategist’s ability to gain initiative for the company’s advantage with the formulation of strategic intent. Timing was the critical success factor therefore posing the question, “How and what impact does this have on the organisation?” Japanese firms look to the longer-term whereas western firms, driven by the demand of their stock market, are more focused on the short-term. Rodolphe (2007:106) argued that this difference led western companies to pay too little attention to their strategy development which impacted on their integrity for the organisation’s success.

Integrity for leaders is obviously more than simply telling the truth or the honesty of placing the team’s agenda before one’s own (Heine, 2008:134). Therefore leaders with integrity need courage and confidence in the activities of the people they lead in order to transcend themselves. However, courage in leadership is also about having sufficient confidence in oneself and in one’s team so as to give them the latitude and autonomy to perform well (Golemen, Boyatzis & Mckee, 2002:43-47). In addition, according to Golemen et al. (2002:56), research on leadership established that to a significant degree what distinguished outstanding managers from the rest was emotional intelligence (Abrahams, 2007:87). Hence for the leader to be the strategist he/she must be capable of seeing what others do not see, possessing considerable insight into the environmental threats and opportunities to socialise strategy (Brown, 2007(b):36).
Abraham and Leavy (2007:39) argued that the ability to socialise a strategy was the real test for the successful implementation thereof. However, affected organisations may have senior managers (Mintzberg, 2007:57) sending their strategic vision down the hierarchy, while from below, creative people may be sending strategy initiatives back up. Effective organisations do both with no apparent negative consequence. Consequently, major risks in strategy process formulation and implementation exist while the middle management may get caught in between (Mintzberg et al. 2002:96).

Based on this situation, what is the impact on competitiveness for the organisation? In a firm that competes through strategy implementation (Raynor, 2007(a):216), the leader needs to be an organisation man, a great organiser and motivator of people in their activities. Here the job is to implement rather than formulate strategy (Mintzberg, 1994:391). Thus the extent of the improvement in the plotting of strategy or formulation by the strategist depends on the maturity of the organisation, the participants, the process itself and of course, the data used. Good strategy formulation requires honesty (Mintzberg, 2004(b):93) and clarity about the roles involved.

2.3.4 Conclusion

The responsibility for strategy formulation and success resides with those who head the company and can be referred to as the company’s strategic leader/strategist. The strategist therefore needs to be a leader, with tasks that are different from executive and managers, lower down the hierarchy. Strategists are required to develop and communicate their intent and inspire their followers.
The strategist’s participation in strategy formulation is a human activity which is affected by mental limitation, human frailty and issues of personality. Their processes can be deliberate or emergent in style, supported by the use of rational and intuitive thinking. In contrast, this could increase the strategist’s conflict between the use of rational thought, planning, intuition and merely muddling through. Nevertheless, there is a tendency in both the military and business to opt for deliberate, well-considered and rational methods. Although intuition is not entirely absent, it is more prevalent within the individual entrepreneur.

What is required is leadership. Therefore, it is essential that future strategic leaders first prepare themselves and then hone their qualities on which they can be identified, as, credible leaders need to be recognised. This could be realised with investment in appropriate training and support of mentors. It would seem that the business and the military differ significantly in this practice. On the one hand, the military executive development is built on three pillars namely academic knowledge, self-development and learning through experience. On the other hand most companies acknowledge that they are poor developers of executives.

Strategic leadership is built on self-developmental tendencies and self-awareness. Therefore the identification and development of leader traits is a forerunner to practice. The cost benefit has to be weighed against the losses caused by incompetence and inexperience at the strategic level.

Although business leaders will not need physical courage as their military counterpart might, there are no differences of mind-set attributes and abilities
between those leading in business and those required to lead in the military. The strategists in the military stress the importance of intent, but the business strategist seems less certain of their ability to formulate their organisation’s intentions with the same degree of precision. Business is more likely to express its intentions in terms of mission or vision, but not as intent. The strategist’s realisation of success is determined by his/her ability to formulate intent.

2.4 IS STRATEGIC INTENT THE DRIVING FORCE FOR GAINING THE INITIATIVE?

2.4.1 What is Intention and Intent?

According to Mantere and Sillince (2007:407) intent is a psychological concept and is held by a conscious subject (individual) capable of forming intentional states. These mental states should be connected and realised within an external reality (Searle, 1983:67) such as a business. Expansion of intent within the business according to Mintzberg et al. (2009:220) encompasses an active management process that includes:

- Focusing the organisation’s attention on the essence of winning
- Motivating people by communicating the value of the target
- Leaving room for individual and team contribution
- Sustaining enthusiasm by providing new operational definitions as circumstances change
- Using intent consistently to guide resource allocation
In contrast, the military refers to intent as the Commander’s intent which is a brief directive, usually in written format that outlines the basic purpose of any given operation (Howard, 2003:1). It describes the desired end-state and is thus the unifying factor for any large group of soldiers. Expansion of the Commander’s intent by Howard (2003:2-4) provides the following insights:

- In the military, literature intentions are expressed in orders, providing the context of future plans and actions.

- The military’s use of the term intention or intent has a specific meaning to the ears and minds of trained soldiers.

- A trained soldier will not confuse the meaning of the word intent with the words objective, purpose, vision, task or aim.

- The word intent is explicitly used in oral or written briefings with very clear, unequivocal connotations.

Doubtless, intent contains a conviction to achieve a certain state of affairs in the future (Bratman, 1999:135-137). In the fields of strategy and psychology, there exist a number of theories and concepts which are used by members of both the Military and Business (Handy, 2002:52) in order to discuss future-oriented behaviour. This approach is defended by Howard (2003:7) who stated that intentions are constantly realised through a plan of action that directly guides future behaviour.

According to Robbins (1993:221), in the late 1960’s Edwin Locke proposed that an intention to work towards a goal is a major source of motivation.
“That is, goals tell an employee what needs to be done and how much effort is needed to be expended”.

Hence, people will decide (Stacey, 2003:352) on that expended effort, alluding to the theories of strategic choice, the learning organisation and psychoanalytic perspectives on organisations. In addition, this provides the opportunity to regard intention as a theme that organises the experience of being together (Smith, 1994:75). It becomes clear that intentions emerge in relationships just as any other organising theme does (Kim, 2007:132). This therefore necessitates a need for some sort of formulation process either mentally or written in order to expedite the choice.

Intention and choice according to Mohanty, (1972:146) are not lonely acts but themes organised by relationships at the same time. Where does this leave human free will? According to Skinner (Coleman, Butcher & Cason, 1984:70) the response that any individual can make to a gesture is both enabled and constrained by the history of that person’s relationships as reflected in his/ her current silent conversations with him/ herself, “I am not free to choose, to do what I am not able to do”. However Jordaan, Jordaan and Nieuwoudt (1983(a):145) advocate that an individual is free to respond to a gesture in a number of different ways that fall within the repertoire available to him/ her which amounts to experience and tacit knowledge.

Furthermore, Mohanty (1972:231) thinking about human relationships as a self-organising complex responsive process does not therefore mean that individuals have no free will (intent) (Searle, 1983:168), it simply means that
people have freedom to respond within the constraints\(^3\) of who they are and the relationships which they are in (Tuomela & Miller, 1988:371-373). This leads to the questions, “What is the CEO’s relationship with his/ her intent and its formulation in the constraints of the organisation?” In addition, “Is there a relationship between the CEO’s intent and the Company’s intent?”

2.4.2 Assigning Strategic Intent- (Merlin) Future First Perspective

Mantere and Sillince (2007:411) conducted a thorough conceptual analysis of strategic intent in order to understand to whom intent was assigned. Their early key finding was that while strategic intent is used in many papers in a loose way, very few papers give explicit definitions (or guidelines for assigning) of strategic intent. It is as if the concept is taken to have a generally accepted, non-problematic meaning (Hitt et al. 1995:17). Furthermore, Mantere and Sillince (2007:409-410) found that the definitions given for strategic intent in terms of who possesses it, are in conflict. Indeed Mantere and Sillince (2007:409-410), the authors on strategic intent (as shown in Table 1), seem to be in disagreement over whether the driver and creator of the strategic intent is the top management, executive team or others. This is not the case within the military. Grattan (2002:77-97) argues that strategic intent is clear about ends, it is flexible as to means and as a consequence it leaves room for improvisation. Achieving strategic intent therefore requires enormous creativity with respect to means, making it a pivotal task of the commander’s function, as well as that of the planner. It is

\(^3\) According to Tuomela and Miller (1988:372) constraint is based on the individual’s reference framework and tactic knowledge.
suggested that intent is assigned to the strategist (CEO and Commander) and resides within their mandate to instil this within the organisation.

However, according to Smith (1994:67) Merlin had an uncanny ability to comprehend the future and provides an apt metaphor for the ‘future first’ perspective adopted by leadership that successfully instils strategic intent in the organisation. According to Smith (1994:69):

“The Merlin factor is the ability to see the potential of the present from the point of view of the future. It is the ability to enlist people throughout the organisation as ambassadors who listen, speak and act on behalf of that future, and it is an absolute commitment to performance breakthroughs that explode the existing cultural limits on what is possible.”

Leading from the premise of strategic intent as the end-state (Pitt, 2001:11) requires one to think and plan backwards from that envisioned future in order to take effective action in the present (Smith, 1994:73). However, leaders who employ the Merlin factor are engaged in a continual process (Smith, 1994:81) of revealing the desired future in the competitive opportunities of the present (Hamel & Breen, 2007:159). This starts with a personal vision of the organisation’s future (Smith, 1994:81) which confronts the shared reality of its existing culture (Ice, 2007:171). As other members of the organisation make their own commitment to this vision, it becomes strategic intent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser no</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of intent</th>
<th>Subject in possession of intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Prahalad and Doz (1987) | **Goal for which one cannot plan, long-term goal, long-term orientation**  
- Intent is used here to describe long-term goals and aims rather than detached plans  
- Strategic intent is crucial to affirm the aims of goals for which one cannot plan  
Note: It is important to separate that orientation (strategic intent) from strategic planning or strategies. Strategic intent allows for a firm to build layers of competitive advantage painstakingly, to accomplish long-term goals (52). | **Top management**  
- No mention of employee involvement  
- Firm action and intent discussion only in singular form. A firm’s strategic intent allows it to think of resources and competitive advantage differently and to deploy them with greater imagination (52). |
| 2     | Hamel and Prahalad (1989) | **Shared obsession to win**  
- Companies that have risen to global leadership began with ambitions that were out of proportion to their resources and capabilities... but they created an obsession with winning (achieve success) at all levels of the organisation and then sustained that obsession over 10-20 years quest for global leadership- we term this obsession strategic intent (64). | **All organisational members**  
- It is hard to imagine middle managers (or blue-collar employees) waking up each day with the sole thought of creating more shareholders wealth. They might feel differently given the challenge to “beat the Benz” the rallying cry of one Japanese auto producer (66) — strategic intent using a metaphoric approach Pitt 2001:5 Military Commander’s concept (Malan 1996:15). |
| 3     | Prahalad and Hamel (1994); Hamel and Breen (2007) | **A dream, an emotion, a distillation of strategy, a goal, a mission**  
- The dream that energizes a company... strategic intent is our term for such an animating dream (129). As the distilled essence of affirming strategic architecture, strategic intent also implies a particular point of view about the long-term market or competitive position that a firm hopes to build over time in the coming decade or so.  
- It holds out to employees the promise of exploring new competitive territory... Hence it conveys a sense of discovery. Strategic intent has an emotional edge to it. It is a goal that employees perceive as inherently worthwhile. Hence it implies a sense of destiny (129). | **All organisational members**  
- It is not the cash that fuels the journey to the future, but the emotional and intellectual energy of every employee (127)  
- Strategic intent must be a goal that commands the respect and allegiance of every employee (133). |
| 4     | Burgelman (1983) | **A prophesy, foresight by the CEO**  
- Prahalad and Hamel (1990) have explained the success of companies such as Canon NEC and Ericsson in terms of | **CEO**  
- Based on the Chief Executive Officer pg 25. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serno</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of intent</th>
<th>Subject in possession of intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competencies)</td>
<td>• development of core competencies.&lt;br&gt;• Their explanation depends to a large extent on strategic intent based on the Chief Executive Officer’s (CEO’s) superior foresight (25).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Burgelman (1996) (Decision-making)</td>
<td><strong>Top management decision</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Strategic dissonance (misalignment between a firm’s strategic intent and strategic action), strategic inflection point, (the change of one winning strategy into another) and strategic recognition (the capacity of top managers to appreciate the strategic importance of managerial initiatives after they have come about but before unequivocal environmental feedback is available) are the three interrelated key concepts that answer the question of how top management can decide on strategic intent in high-technology industry (12).</td>
<td>CEO&lt;br&gt;• The strategic intent of the CEO who sets ambitious targets within a 10 to 20 year time horizon (8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stacey (2003) (Themes)</td>
<td><strong>Communicating</strong>&lt;br&gt;• An intention may be expressed explicitly or implicitly in a propositional theme. When managers communicate statements about strategic direction, mission, vision and values they articulate propositional themes (352).</td>
<td>Groups of People&lt;br&gt;• Intention then emerges in the conversational life of a group of people. A simple individual does not have an intention rather the intention as individual expresses has emerged in the conversational interaction with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Smith (1994) (Vision)</td>
<td><strong>The Merlin Factor</strong>&lt;br&gt;• The ability to see the potential of the present from the point of view of the future. It is the ability to enlist people throughout the organisation as ambassadors who listen, speak and act on behalf of that future, and it is an absolute commitment to performance breakthroughs that explodes the existing cultural limits on what’s possible (69).</td>
<td>CEO&lt;br&gt;• Starts with a personal vision of the organisation’s futures which confronts the shared reality of its existing culture as other members of the organisation make their own commitments to this vision it becomes strategic intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Howard (2003) (Directing towards an end state)</td>
<td><strong>Intent in the Military</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Commander’s intent is a brief directive, usually in written format that outlines the basic purpose of any given operation: it describes the desired end-state and is thus the unifying factor for any large group of soldiers (1).</td>
<td>Commander&lt;br&gt;• Evolution of commander’s intent in the military… theoretically, orders explicitly incorporate Commander’s intent and will convey it to subordinates, as it is disseminated ideally backed by briefing and rehearsals provide for assurance of the individuals understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serno</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Definition of intent</td>
<td>Subject in possession of intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9     | Louw and Venter (2006) (Gavin Staude) | **Activating the planning Process**  
• Strategic intent is the first indispensable step in the strategic planning process. | CEO- Planning team  
• The implication of the word “indispensable” of course is that in the absence of strategic intent the rest of strategic planning process is going to be in jeopardy (69). |
| 10    | Mintzberg et al. (2009: 220) **Realisation Intent** | The concept also encompasses an active management process. | CEO- Planning team  
• Focusing the organisation’s attention on the essence of winning, Motivating people by communicating the value of the target, Leaving room for individual and team contribution, Sustaining enthusiasm by providing new operational definitions as circumstances change, Using intent consistently to guide resource allocation. |

Source: Adapted – Mantere and Sillince, 2007:409-410

*Table 1: Previous Literature indicating who has the Intent*
2.4.3 Strategic Intent - Pyramid of Words and Positioning

Different groups of people will interpret strategic intent in their own way and some of these terms tend to overlap in their meaning. It will therefore be useful to use MacMillan and Tampoe’s (2000:71) pyramid of purpose (Figure 2) to provide grounding in terms that are associated with strategic intent in order to improve communication and a firm departure point of what makes up the company’s strategic intent.

![Figure 2: Language of Strategic Intent](image)

2.4.4 Link between Strategic Intent and Vision

According to Mantere and Sillince (2007:408) the most striking difference between vision and strategic intent is the degree of collectivity. According to Kotter (2002:143) many authors describe strategic intent as a phenomenon circulated at multiple organisational levels, while a vision is more clearly a top management leadership tool often ascribed to single visionary leaders. In contrast the view on visionary leadership according to Mintzberg et al. (2009:141) implies a strategic
leader with a personal vision for the future of the organisation or at least a broad idea of strategies for pursing the company vision. In the military, however, strategic intent is directly deduced from the Commander’s Intent and provides conceptualisation of the end-state of the mission in general for all the participants involved in that mission (Howard, 2003:7).

It is suggested that the link between strategic intent and vision supports the notion of CEO intent (personal vision) and company intent (company vision). Furthermore, the strategist activates the management process with his/her personal vision in order to formulate the company vision. In order for this to transpire, the context needs to be taken into consideration as to what can impact on the transition of the CEO’s intent into Company strategic intent.

2.4.5 Influences on Strategic Intent

According to MacMillan and Tampoe (2000:72), strategic intent in practice requires acceptability of stakeholders, consistent with the history and culture of the enterprise and must stretch beyond its present aspirations and practices. This tends to be based on inspired supposition of the future which includes vision, mission and goals all pointing towards the transition of intent. Figure 3 shows the key factors expected to impact strategic intent development in practice. Therefore, it may be contended that leadership is required to develop strategic intent that is understandable and acceptable to the various stakeholders of the company. Hence, the company’s history and culture will be the key to unlocking the potential of the strategic intent. However, it is the responsibility of the leader to ensure that the company intent is “stretched”. It is suggested by Macmillan and Tampoe (2000:72) that strategic intent may be in part based on an inspired guess of what the future will be like by
combining evolving trends and deliberation effort in order to affect the future. This inspired guess can be clarified with the introduction of a CEO’s intent formulation model to assist in making sense of the future.

![Diagram of Influences on Strategic Intent](image)

**Figure 3: Influences on Strategic Intent**

However, future development as purported by Louw and Venter (2006:57) and supported by Mantere and Sillince (2007:407) is that strategic intent is determined by the extent to which an organisation’s vision, mission and ambitious objectives contribute towards their business positioning and winning within the market place. As suggested by Hamel and Prahalad (1990:39) the concept of strategic intent was used in the business context while Sullivan and Harper (Segal-Horn, 2004:18) argued that strategic intent was what you are working to accomplish. Strategic intent is therefore more specific, more quantitative and more limited than vision (Mantere & Sillince, 2007:413). Strategic intent could envision a desired leadership position (Smith, 1994:68) and establish the criterion that the organisation will use to chart its progress (Kim, 2007:135).
Hamilton, Eskin and Michaels (1998:408) view of strategic intent as a leadership position accounts for purpose and continuity of goals within an organisation which adapts to internal and external evolutionary pressures (Smith, 1994:68). Furthermore, Mantere and Sillince (2007:421) as well as Ice (2007:170) proposed that a clear strategic intent gives managers a rallying point around which to make decisions about the future of their organisation. Therefore the impact of a new strategic intent will affect internal culture, starting with people throughout the organisation (Ice, 2007:173).

Hence, strategic intent informs and shapes how a business defines itself and where it finds its unique strategic advantage (Hitt et al. 1995:16). However, Mantere and Sillince (2007:407) argued that in order to realise the promise of strategic intent as a widely circulated phenomenon in organisations, the achieving of coherence between multiple intents is often the most viable option rather than one large intent. In contrast, Smith (1994:68) claimed that this would make it difficult to take responsibility for changing every aspect of the business inconsistent with the realisation of the new strategic intent. A suggestion was that strategic intent has two dimensions: firstly, an individual intent and secondly company intent both of which are intertwined. This is articulated in the management’s challenge of explaining and mapping the individual’s intent to that of the company’s intent.

Today’s managerial challenge is in translating strategic intent into operational reality (Meekings et al. 1994:17; Kim, 2007:136) quickly enough to meet market needs. In most cases, however, the fundamental business management and strategy formulation processes which reside in the hands of the CEO are at fault (Meekings et al. 1994:17).
In order to overcome this disconnects between the CEO’s ability to react and strategy formulation process is the operationalisation of strategic intent. This necessitates the activation of a credible strategic intent formulation model for the CEO, through which he/she can inject pace, rhythm, tempo and method to deliver on the organisation’s strategic imperatives.

2.4.6 Conclusion

In the fields of strategy and psychology, intent contains a conviction to achieve a certain state of affairs in the future. A number of theories and concepts exist which are used by members of the Military and Business in order to discuss future-oriented behaviour. This approach however, follows the view that intentions are constantly realised through a plan of action that directly guides future behaviour. Hamel and Prahalad’s use of the concept of strategic intent in the business context as cited in Mintzberg et al. (2009:220) encompass an active management process that includes, focusing the organisation’s attention on the essence of winning, motivating people by communicating the value of the target, leaving room for individual and team contribution, sustaining enthusiasm by providing new operational definitions as circumstances change and using intent consistently to guide resource allocation. This is not the case within the military. Grattan (2002:77-97) argues that strategic intent is clear about ends, it is flexible as to means and as a consequence it leaves room for improvisation. Therefore achieving strategic intent requires enormous creativity with respect to means, making it a pivotal task of the commander’s function.

In the military, intentions are expressed in orders, providing the context of future plans and actions. According to Howard (2000:1) the Commander’s intent is a brief
directive, usually in written format that outlines the basic purpose of any given operation; it describes the desired end-state and is thus the unifying factor for any large group of soldiers. The military’s use of the term intention or intent has a specific meaning to the ears and minds of trained soldiers. A trained soldier is most unlikely to confuse the meaning of the word intent with the words objective, purpose, vision, task or aim.

In order for strategic intent to gain the initiative, two contributing areas are necessary. Firstly, there has to be someone to conceive the intent on the individual level. For this study, the CEO will be the appropriate individual. Therefore it is fair to suggest that the CEO’s conceived intent should be referred to as the CEO intent. Secondly, there has to be an action by the CEO to translate his/ her intent into a plausible implemented action (plan) resulting in a realised strategy. The translation for the CEO intent into Company intent is the quandary faced by the CEO. It would be practical to investigate the usefulness of strategic intent’s effectiveness in strategy formulation.

2.5 IS STRATEGIC INTENT AN EFFECTIVE SOLUTION FOR STRATEGY FORMULATION?

2.5.1 Strategy Formulation in Perspective

Although Andrews as cited in Mintzberg (1990:179) wrote that strategy formulation is itself a process of organisation rather than the masterly conception of the Chief Executive Officer’s ability to talk the board of directors into pro forma approval, announces it as fixed policy and expects it to be promptly executed by subordinates under conventional command and control procedures.
According to Mintzberg et al. (2002:52) the first rule of strategy formulation is to see things as they are and not how you want them to be. Do not pay attention to what people say; judge them by their actions. Hussey (1994:187) sees these actions as "strategic manoeuvres" that the CEO has designed. Furthermore, Sun Tzu (Krause, 2005:29) said that being unconquerable lies within oneself and the ability to understand the larger environment with practical wisdom. However, Levitt (2004:142) has argued that effective global strategy is not a bag of many tricks but the successful practice of just one “trick”, i.e. product standardisation, which, according to him, is the core and lies within developing a standard product.

Hamel and Prahalad’s (Segal-Horn, 2004:378) prescription for a global strategy contradicts that of Levitt even more sharply. Instead of a single standard product, they recommend a broad product portfolio with many products so that investments on technology and distribution channels can be shared. Ansoff (1965:36-39) proposed a matrix of four strategies: market penetration, product development, market development and diversification. These were hardly comprehensive. Nevertheless, Porter (Lynch, 2006:467) introduced what would become the generic strategies of today i.e. cost leadership, differentiation and focus, sometimes called niches which are open to any business.

Ansoff (1980:140-142) focused on extension of business strategy whereas Porter focussed on the identification of business strategy. Porter (Akan, Allen, Helms & Spralls, 2006:46) made a bold claim that there were only three fundamental strategies that any business could undertake, which is why he called them generic. However, strategists concentrating on the resource-based view now regard generic strategies as being largely historic and suggest going back to the drawing board for

For that reason it is urgent (Lynch, 2006:450) that a more productive dialogue about strategy-making takes place between the executive leadership and business intelligence environments (Bratton et al. 2005:97) thereby providing direction to the team responsible for creating critical market place insights, and the managers in other functional areas who work with them (Fahey, 2007:4-6). This suggests greater focus on the intellectual dimension of the individual leader within the organisation as an integral part of strategy creation. Hence, we often speak of the levels of strategy, corporate, business and functional (Mintzberg, 1978:942). We rarely acknowledge the fourth level which is the level of individual action where strategies get translated into realized programmes (Mintzberg, 2004(b):268). This has been affirmed by Tegarden, Sarason, Childers and Hatfield’s (2005:84) view that many frontline employees of organisations cannot make a connection with the company’s strategy and their job.

2.5.2 Cultural is the Key to Connect Intent with Success

According to Thompson and Martin (2010:237) this connection is based on the fact that the leader has not recognised the fundamental importance of the prevailing cultures of the business. These cultures can either be enabling or inhibit individual action. Therefore both environments’ leaders need to create a culture that has a shared intent and shared belief on the ways of doing things in the company or else people will find it difficult to align and commit to their intent. In the military, subcultures exist for a good reason within the Army, Navy and Air Forces as it takes different kinds of people to operate effectively in each environment. Furthermore,
according to Toms and Barrons (2009:169-171) the Commander of a multinational force must take account of the things like the use of English as the working language, widely different military cultures, different operational procedures and standards of measurement.

A similar approach is used when companies expand into new countries and markets or merge. They then have to accept multiple cultures within one firm. Hence, the question “Is there room for sub-cultures to coexist and add value to the Company?” The simple answer is “yes”; commanders and managers at all levels create their own team culture. It could however be inferred that there are as many cultures in a regiment/ company as there are commanders/ managers. This will only be desirable if they all are contributing to the leader’s intent. This was achieved with a multi-cultural appreciation and interpersonal sensitivity ending disputes and allowing more people to feel valued. Similar multi-cultural sensitivity can be extrapolated to the business environment in order to understand customers.

Strategic management therefore seeks to align the firm’s activities with that of its external environment (Mintzberg, 1994:74). At the heart of this management approach is the leader, strategic planning system and the firm’s culture within an environment that is in a state of flux (Park, 2007:84; Fernandez, 2004:55). It is therefore important that managers learn whether strategic planning enhances firm performance in cross-cultural situations (Rosen, 2000:156). Furthermore Jackson, (2004:173) claims that there is a direct relationship between culture and planning, where culture moderates the planning performance relationship (Mintzberg, 2007:176-179). Hence specific cultural values were found to account for some of the

Ice (2007:173) argued that firms benefit from strategic planning integrated within the culture and implemented (Fernandez, 2004:57) via change management. Therefore, for over thirty years a plethora of studies has examined formal long-range or strategic planning (Langley, 1988:47). According to Mintzberg, (1993:39) when things go well and there is a good deal of formal planning, people have a tendency to attribute success to their own efforts and failure to external factors which is in fact exactly what the conventional “pitfalls” of planning are all about.

2.5.3 Appropriateness of Strategic Planning

Hamel and Prahalad, (1989:68) in their competing for the future, warn that traditional models of strategic planning tend to become formulaic and ritualistic. This view is also shared by Mintzberg (1994:159) and Hough et al. (2008:248-249). Therefore strategic planning is better thought of as emergent (Carr, Durant & Downs, 2004:82) rather than deliberately designed, thus making the strategist’s involvement in current affairs of paramount importance and relevance in strategic planning. Mintzberg (1994:40) advocates a less formal type of strategic planning, urging new roles for planners (strategists) as catalyst, communicator and coordinator, thereby promoting flexibility and an agile mindset of the strategist, resulting in a proactive paradigm (Mcfate, 2008:19). According to Hornsby, (2005:94) previous strategic planning was seen as directing strategy formulation from the centre, led by specialists in staff roles. However, Liedtka (2008:246) finds that it is now more about coordinating strategies as they develop from within the business, communicating adopting strategies and monitoring their implementation (Bonaventre, 2008:68). Therefore
as Rumelt (Hodgkinson, Whittington, Johnson & Schwarz, 2006:480) puts it, “a good strategy does not need constant reformulation” but as Mintzberg, (1990:179) states, it does require monitoring and corrective action in support of alignment to reality thereby accepting that in real life the process of formulation and implementation are intertwined.

2.5.4 Implementation – Putting Strategies into Practice

Although implementation covers the activities required for an organisation to put its strategies into practice (Mintzberg, 1987:16-17), there are several basic elements to this process, including general objectives and specific plans. The necessary finances, accompanied by a monitoring and control system to ensure compliance during the implementation process (Kober & Paul, 2007:432), is required. It is therefore useful to draw a distinction between different types of implementations (Lynch, 2006:615). There are three major approaches: namely the comprehensive, incremental and selective approaches. These approaches clarify the differences between competing through strategy and competing through strategy implementation (Hitt et al. 1998:49). A strategy is superior to the extent of its fit between the competitive environment and the organisation’s capabilities (Egelhoff, 1993:38). Furthermore, successful implementing of that strategy necessitates that the manager has a current awareness of the business landscape, as adversaries frequently do not compete in the way one expects them to. For example, US firms tend to compete by implementing unique business strategies (Augier & Teece, 2008:167); whereas the Japanese firms tend to compete by implementing strategies that may not be unique, but they tend to do this better than anyone else.
In order to gain the competitive advantage, according to Egelhoff, (1993:39) it is important to recognise that both modes of competing create a unique and superior business strategy and excelling at strategy implementation constitutes strategic behaviour (Augier & Teece, 2008:287). However, it is not that one is strategic while the other is tactical or operational (Wallin, 2006:278). Strategy implementation frequently involves getting tactical, as well as making use of operational behaviour in order to strongly support key strategy elements (Mintzberg, 2007:189). Both competitive modes could fundamentally influence or alter a firm’s strategic position in its competitive environment (Egelhoff, 1993:49). Implementing strategies can therefore be a nightmare, as people worry about how it will affect them and do not want to understand how it is dependent on their efforts to deliver components of strategy (Watzon & Wooldridge, 2005:156). Grouping the efforts to gain the initiative requires an intent formulation process. Presently, the only environment that has a formal intent formulation process for the strategist is the Military. This is called the Commander’s Appreciation and forms part of the campaign planning process.

2.5.5 The Campaign Planning Process - Operational Level of War

According to Gray (2007:19) throughout history, warfare has developed from mere clashes between sizeable numbers of rival forces to more organised ways of conducting battles. Barno’s (2007:40) view is that without a relevant planning process the application of capabilities will be futile.

The South African Department of Defence’s experiences confirmed Barno’s view. It was found necessary to construct an appropriate Campaign Planning Process⁴. The SANDF Campaign Planning process comprises a step-by-step approach in order to

---

provide guidance for the planning staff, as well as to gain insight into the role and responsibilities of the Commander (Military Strategist). Table 2 (Laubscher, 2000:23) juxtaposes elements of the SANDF campaign planning process with insights into the aims and outputs of each stage of the process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of the campaign planning process at the operational level of war</th>
<th>Explanation of Each Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Stage 1**: Review of the situation | The Commander and planning staff must be prepared to acquire relevant information from a wide range of sources through deliberate efforts to enable a holistic and conceptual approach.  
**Outputs**  
- Establishing awareness of the situation  
- Initiating supporting activities |
| **Stage 2**: The Commander’s Appreciation and Brief | The Commander’s Appreciation and briefing forms a crucial stage in the whole campaign planning process. It is during this stage that the Commander puts his personal stamp on the campaign by formulating his intent. The command briefing (promulgating his intent) is the most important event in the whole campaign planning process, where the Commander takes the stage and where it is his opportunity to convey visionary and inspiring military leadership in respect of the planning and the execution of the campaign that will follow. The command briefing is therefore the end result of a thorough process of analysis and the application of joint operational art by the Commander.  
**Outputs**  
- Military – Strategic Analysis  
- Conceptual Analysis  
- Formation of the Campaign/Operational Concept  
- The Commander’s Brief |
| **Stage 3**: The formulation and selection of the campaign’s joint broad options | The formulation of joint broad options for the conduct of the campaign within the parameters of the commander’s campaign concept is aimed at providing the Commander with possible broad solutions to the military problem at hand. The typical views are usually described from the “own forces” point of view; as well as the “opposing forces” point of view.  
**Outputs**  
- Detailed analysis of the guidance obtained from the Command Brief  
- Formulation of campaign broad options  
- Presentation and selection of campaign broad joint options |
| **Stage 4**: The development of campaign joint options | The aim of this stage is to develop feasible joint options for “own forces” as well as for the corresponding joint options for the “opposing forces”.  
**Outputs**  
- Developing campaign joint options  
- Presentation and selection of joint options |
| **Stage 5**: Development of campaign joint course of action | The aim of the development of the campaign joint course of action is threefold:  
- To develop the selection of the option to ensure |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser no</th>
<th>Stages of the campaign planning process at the operational level of war</th>
<th>Explanation of Each Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of all the changes and additional guidelines received from the Commander during the preceding presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To finalise command and control arrangements in terms of subordinate commands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To finalise/coordinate real-time arrangements where applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outputs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of &quot;own forces&quot; and &quot;opposing forces&quot; joint course of action for the campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the joint course of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commander’s provisional decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Stage 6: Development of campaign joint support course of action</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The aim of the joint support course of action is to indicate how the specific military staff department will support the selected campaign joint course of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outputs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop campaign joint support course of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the joint support course of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commander’s provisional decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Stage 7: Optimising campaign planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimising campaign planning is the critically important part of the campaign planning process as it subjects the campaign course of action to a final thorough scrutiny (including using simulations, or dissecting likely contingencies) plus critical analysis with the aim of exposing deficiencies in planning of the course of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Output.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimising of the campaign plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaching end state of optimising campaign planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commander’s approval/rejection of the optimising of the campaign planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving the Commander’s approval for the plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commander’s final decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Stage 8: Effective campaign planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The aim of effective planning is to enable subordinate commanders to conduct tactical planning at the outset of the campaign, as well as during the campaign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outputs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Command Directives from the Commander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplementary orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragmented orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted From Malan (1996)

**Table 2: The Campaign Planning Process**

This study will focus on the Commander’s Appreciation, specifically stage 2 of the campaign planning process (as indicated by the shaded area in Table 2). The importance of the Commander’s Appreciation for the military is clear as it provides the Commander with a tool to formulate his/her intent from which to activate the
campaign planning process. Thereby the Commander ensures that his/her intent is interwoven into the detailed planning of the operation. The Commander’s Appreciation can be seen as the hinge on which the success of the operation turns and needs to be placed into context.

### 2.5.6 The Commander’s Appreciation

The Commander’s Appreciation is the commander’s pride (Tom & Barrons, 2006:344; Grattan, 2002:144; Malan, 1996:12). It is his/her personal stamp on the planning and execution of the campaign/operation. Although according to Grattan, (2002:167) he/she might use their staff officers and subordinate commanders to advise them, it is his/her product, the embodiment of his/her understanding of the relevant military situation, the product of his/her intellect and demonstrates his/her mastery of the operational art (Malan, 1996:3). The Commander’s Appreciation comprises four phases that will be discussed in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Explanation of the Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | **Phase 1**: Military - Strategic Analysis | • Commanding at the operational level is an art. The essence of the art centres around the Commander’s interpretation of the guidance received from the military strategic authority, as well as his awareness of the external environment in which his campaign/operation will be conducted.  
• This analysis allows the Commander to determine the external environment within which he achieves his goals. It sets the parameters into intangibles which have an effect and influence on the conduct of military operations. |
| 2      | **Phase 2**: Conceptual analysis of general factors | • The Commander conceptually analyses the general factors to determine their influences on the operational level’s operating systems.  
• Analysis of the general factors leads the Commander to the “what” of what has to be done to achieve the desired end-state which he defined in the previous phase.  
• This ‘what’ is closely linked to the elements contained in the defined campaign/operation end-state  
• The conceptual analysis of the general factors is concluded with an integrated main conclusion (which represents a synthesis of the conceptual analysis of the general factors against the background of the foundation of conclusions reached at the end of the military strategic analysis). |
| 3      | **Phase 3**: Formulation of the concept of operations (using metaphors) | • The “own forces” campaign/operational concept is the broad framework of “what” the Commander visualises must be done to solve the military problem. |
• The “own forces” campaign/operation concept is preceded by a formulation of the campaign/operations concept of the “opposing forces”.
• “Own forces” concept comprises the operational vision, commander’s intent and the commander’s guidelines for implementation and planning.
• The campaign/operation concept is the product of the Commander’s conceptual approach towards warfare.
• This will therefore consist of the approach concept, or the concepts he adopts and will be supported by the design concept which will act as the building blocks for the campaign or operation.
• The campaign/operation concept needs to be broad enough to facilitate the formulation of several options, yet specific enough to give definite guidance to the planning and implementation of the campaign/operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Phase 4: Command briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- During the Commander’s command briefing, the Commander conveys the product of his Commander’s Appreciation to his staff officers and subordinate commanders (where the situation allows that) telling them WHAT needs to be done to solve the military problem.
- It also serves the purpose of ensuring that the staff officers (and subordinate commanders) understand the primary military problem and what needs to be achieved, thereby creating a firm basis for subsequent planning.
- The command briefing also serves to give guidance to the planning staff, within the framework of the ‘what’ that has already been defined with the exception of what the Commander says. HOW is clarified in the process. The way he states it, is of utmost importance.
- It is expected of him to radiate confidence and to inspire his staff (and subordinate commanders) to ensure the successful execution of the campaign/operation.
- Presenting the command briefing in itself is regarded as something of an art and serves to display the Commander’s military leadership. It signifies his ability to convey his visionary thinking and to instil in his subordinates a feeling of trust and belief in what has to be achieved; and, what is to be planned and executed in order to satisfy the desired military end-state.

(Source: Adapted from Malan: 1996)

Table 3: Explanation Phase of the Commander’s Brief

Although the process can also be applied mentally for simpler problems, the written appreciation is considered to be more appropriate for addressing complex strategic military situations (Clark, 2007:75).

2.5.6.1 Role of the Commander’s Appreciation

At the operational level of war (Barno, 2007:39) the Commander’s Appreciation plays a critical role and can be summarised as follows (Malan, 1996:12-16):
• It is the process that the Commander uses to understand the applicable military strategic goals and objectives. He/she then translates these into operational and tactically attainable objectives.

• It is where the Commander visualises the grouping of subordinates, tactical formations/units, grouping of the means of sustainment of the particular force, as well as the projection of combat power – this includes the allocation of military resource and the ensuring of competitive advantage.

• It is where he/she indicates his/her vision and intent for the orchestration of tactics throughout the campaign/operations with regard to both sequencing and prioritising of activities.

2.5.6.2 Commanding at the Operational Level or Tactical Level

There are differences between commanding at the operational and tactical levels of war (McFate, 2008:12). The difference amounts to placing the emphasis on the holistic picture on the operational level, rather than becoming enmeshed in the tactical details, supported by a reliance on the Commander’s judgement, instinct and intuition (Morris, 1992:23). Furthermore Malan (1996:12) emphasises that commanding at the operational level of war requires the commander to sequence end states and efforts in a deliberate effort to ensure an output at the strategic level.

This helps to build the responsibilities of the operational level commander (Grattan, 2002:147). In order to focus his/her appreciation, it is important to understand the primary responsibilities of the operational level commander (Slim, 1990:17). This leads to the question, ‘What is the correlation between the responsibilities of the commander at an operational level with that of the CEO?’
• Interpreting strategic guidance could be seen as the interpretation of the board of director’s expectations into profitability, competitive advantage and innovation by the CEO.

• Determining areas of operations and operational objectives – mapping the board’s expectations to the external environment thereby determining opportunities and linking this situational awareness to the internal capacity to determine markets and objectives.

• Orchestration of tactical activities – making use of strategies to achieve the operational objectives.

• Allocation of critical resources – coupling of capabilities and capacities (internal) to achieve external objectives and to enable tactical conduct of operations.

• Sustainability – ensuring optimisation of innovative actions and survival of the organisation.

• Commitment of operational level reserves – ensuring the addressing of contingencies that have arisen only if necessary.

2.5.7 Linking Strategic Planning Military- Business

At this stage, it has become evident that the CEO and Commander both have a strategic planning responsibility. What is now required is a suitable strategic management process in business that can be equated with the military campaign planning process. This strategic management process needs to deliver on strategic intent. The question is: “Does a process similar to the military’s campaign planning process exist within the business environment?”
Yes, Louw and Venter’s (2006:2) Strategic Management Process Model (SMPM) as depicted in figure 4 provides the framework for understanding the overall strategy formulation process (analysis, development, implementation and monitoring) in realisation of the organisation’s strategic intent.

This provides the sought after link between the Military Campaign Planning Process and a Business Strategic Management Process.

In Figure 4, the Strategic Management Process Model (Louw and Venter 2006:7), provides the strategy formulation framework for business required by this study. The following discussion will confirm its suitability.

- Commencing with Stage (1) The Introduction of Strategic Intent thus answering “What do we want to become?” This is seen as part of the Commander’s Appreciation Stage 2. What is not visible is the role of the CEO in the strategic intent formulation. The introduction of the question “What is the target?” to visualise an understanding of future perspective shows that there is a gap between what we want to become and what the desired target is.
• Stage (2) Strategic Analysis answers “What is our current situation?” by looking at the macro environment, industrial environment and internal environment - to achieve a thorough understanding of competitive forces in order to enable the development of competitive advantage. This is linked to Stage 1 of the campaign planning process ‘the review of the situation’.

• Stage (3) Strategy Development thus answering the questing “Where are we going?” by looking at corporate strategy, business level strategy and global competitive advantage to integrate strategy development at different levels. The can be linked to Stages 3 - 8 of the campaign planning process.

• Stage (4) Strategic Implementation and Monitoring answers the questions “How are we getting there?” and “How are we doing?” by looking at strategic leadership and organisational architecture to achieve success and effective performance.

Furthermore it is confirmed by Staude in Louw and Venter (2006:69) “…that strategic intent is the first indispensable step in the strategic planning process. The implication of the word indispensable, of course, is that in the absence of a strategic intent, the rest of the strategic planning process is going to be in jeopardy”.

This raises the question of what benefits the organisation will derive from having a strategic intent. According to Staude (Louw & Venter, 2006:69):

• “It is the strategic intent which clarifies where and what an organisation wants to be in the future and which provides focus, as well as a sense of direction and destination”.

However, what is not visible is the relationship of this strategic intent to the strategist of the organisation. Furthermore what is his/her contribution, if any, to the formulation of the strategic intent? It is contended that there are two intents: that of the CEO and that of the organisation.
• “The strategic intent serves as a benchmark for resource allocation”.

Although this notion can be supported, it is also suggested that the resource allocation will enable strategic intent achievement and will reflect positively or negatively on the CEO's ability to function at the strategic level.

• “The organisation's strategic intent serves as a benchmark for strategy formulation”.

As stated, it will focus strategy formulation. However, this will be done without ownership of driving the strategic intent. This is subject to the assumption that the organisation's strategic intent is the sole intent. Furthermore, I contend that there are two types of strategic intent: (1) The Organisation's intent as referred to here, and (2) the Strategist's intent, also referred to as individual commitment (Smith, 1994).

• “The organisation’s strategic intent provides inspiration and motivation which contributes directly and indirectly to strategy implementation”.

This will only be possible if the strategic intent is originated/created by an individual and in our case the strategist (the military Commander or the CEO of the business environment), as it takes an individual to inspire and motivate people to change their attitudes. This once again reaffirms the possibility of individual strategic intent and the fact that it drives or at least impacts on the formulation of the organisational strategic intent. According to Bates' (2009:3) view on business leaders considerable value is placed on visionary leadership “…connecting people with purpose and passion towards a common goal…”. Furthermore Mintzberg et al. (2009:141) state that visionary leadership implies a strategic leader with a personal vision for the future of the organisation or at least a broad idea of the strategies for pursuing such a vision.
• “In the process of developing its strategic intent and gaining an understanding [of what business they are in], organisations get to understand their relevant environments”.

I am of the opinion that an organisation cannot attain an understanding; it is individuals within the organisation that acquire understanding. Based on this view, the question is - who in the organisation requires a current awareness of the business landscape. It is suggested that ownership has to be assigned to the strategist, to formulate his/her own understanding of the business landscape via relevant conceptual factors. This would enable the CEO to have a current understanding of the business landscape. He/she would be able to “adjust”/shape the strategic intent and in so doing would gain the initiative for the realisation of the competitive advantage.

• “(The) Process of developing an understanding of the “business they are in” will minimise the risk of the organisation making strategic errors of either omission or commission.

This will only be accomplished if a proactive paradigm resorts within the strategist (whether a Commander or a CEO). His/her strategic intent will continually adapt the organisation’s strategic intent to that of the environment, which is usually in a state of flux and turbulence, enabling the exploitation of opportunities, mitigating risk and limiting the impact of ineffectual strategies.

2.5.8 Conclusion

A warning came from Hamel and Prahalad (1989:68) that models of strategic planning tend to become formulaic and ritualistic. This provides the opportunity to promote strategy formulation based on individual action where strategies get translated into realised programmes. However, prevailing cultures could either enable or inhibit individual action; therefore both environments’ leaders need to
create a culture that has a shared intent and shared belief on the ways of doing things in the company. According to Mintzberg (1994:40) this is a less formal type of strategic planning, urging new roles for planners (strategists) as catalysts, communicators and coordinators, thereby promoting flexibility and an agile mindset of the strategist, resulting in a proactive paradigm.

A proactive paradigm will be achieved through strategic planning driven by individual (the strategist’s) intent. Presently, the only environment that has a formal individual intent formulation process for the strategist was found within the military’s campaign planning process set out in the Commander’s Appreciation (Malan, 1996). In addition, Louw and Venter (2006) provided a business strategic management process model that could be equated with the military’s campaign planning process providing a tenuous link between the Military Campaign Planning Process and Business Strategic Management Process. It is quite apparent that within the Military environment, the strategic intent formulated via the Commander’s Appreciation is seen as an effective basis for strategy formulation. Hence, this study’s focal point is to assess the prevalence of the Commander’s Appreciation in the business environment and then, to assess its ability to assist the CEO in formulating his/her intent.

2.6 CONCLUDING THE LITERATURE REVIEW

2.6.1 Summary of Strategic Intent Insight

The following points will show an awareness and better understanding regarding strategic management with a focus on strategic intent, thereby providing an opportunity to position my research.
• Strategy has been borrowed from the Military environment’s writing published some 3000 years before the rise of big business in the nineteenth century. Strategic leadership developed into its first full-blown form in the role of the Military Commander over the centuries.

• Socrates believed that a good “Businessman” would make a good “General” (Strauss, 1972:72) backing the notion that Business could contribute to the Military in both the individual and the corporate domains. The converse view was first explored by Xenophon who viewed the Military as a support to business thereby reinforcing the link between the Military and Business.

• According to Xenophon, Clausewitz and Liddell-Hart (Bond, 1997:62) the uncertainties and hazards that made war unpredictable and uncontrollable activities were not barriers to be eliminated, but were opportunities to be grasped and exploited.

• Strategy is an abstraction leading to action and it underpins a very real intention of improving the fortunes of an organisation, focusing on the emergent and deliberate approaches, resulting in intended strategy. This manifest in two elements: that of the individual (commitment) and that of organisation (collective reality).

• The acknowledgement of the fourth level of strategy - individual action - in which grand strategies get translated into their practical implications by an individual and in our case the strategist (either the military commander or the CEO).

• The profoundest truth of war is that the issue of battle is usually decided in the minds of the opposing Military Strategists (as stated in the respective
Commanders’ intent), not just by the actions of their men/women. This provides the platform to investigate if the business “battle” – as alluded to by Mintzberg is decided in the mind of the Business Strategist (CEO intent).

- Strategic management can either have a positive or negative impact on the fortunes of companies and stakeholders. Furthermore it can ruin or promote the career of the Chief Executive Officer. What has become evident is that only an individual at the strategic level can have and pivotally translate intent, thus confirming it as the CEO’s role.

- Therefore, in both the fields of strategy and psychology, intent contains a stated intention to achieve a certain state of affairs in the future. This is only possible if there is someone to conceive intent on an individual level and to translate his/her intent into plausible implemented action (or plan) resulting in a realised strategy. It can therefore be inferred that it is leaders with strategic thought that drive processes to formulate strategy and leadership that will inspire implementation by the teams.

- For that reason, it is essential that future strategic leaders first prepare themselves for strategy formulation as this will increase their credibility. The cost benefit that has to be weighed against the likely losses caused by incompetence or inexperience at the strategic level is likely to be too high.

- Business leaders will not need physical courage as do their military counterparts, nevertheless it can be said that there is no difference of mindset attributes and abilities between those leading in business and those required to lead in the military.
• However, it has become evident where the military strategist stresses the importance of intent, the business strategist seems less certain of his/her ability to formulate intentions with the same degree of precision. Business is more likely to express its intentions in terms of mission or vision rather than intent.

• The new frontier in value creation therefore lies in carefully and deliberately enabling operating divisions. This demands that the CEO produces a compelling vision which articulates clear strategic direction and could be seen as elements of intent construction.

• Competing in the near future one needs strategic intent, thereby making traditional models of strategic planning formulaic and ritualistic. Furthermore prevailing cultures can either enable or inhibit individual action. In both environments leaders therefore need to create a culture that has a shared intent and shared belief in the ways of doing things in the company.

• The strategist (both Military and Business) needs to visualise and plot the big picture despite turbulent conditions, reconcile conflicting aims and redirect people’s energy in support of attaining higher common purpose. Hence the strategist must also show a willingness to learn from experience and inspire people to innovate, improve, grow, explore, change and influence their surroundings. This supports the notion that the strategist (Commander and CEO) has intent, thus alluding to an intent formulation process which can be mental or written.

• Both the Military and Business agree that driving their business or trying to operate from a multiple strategic intent as advocated by Mantere and Sillince
(2007) implies a dilemma. It is unclear on which strategic intent to focus as Ice, Smith, Tom and Barons oppose Grattan who promotes core intent from the highest level, providing direction and boundaries. This will produce conflicting priorities, wasted resources, indecision, frustration in the workforce and confusion in the market place.

- The CEO gains insight and ensures continuity of a situation or environment, especially when new or taking over a current concern. The Military name this “relief in the line replacement of leaders” during the battle which has a formulated process to ensure continuity and understanding. This is called the Commander’s Appreciation. According to Mintzberg “synthesis not analysis is the very essence of management and the MBA course teaches only analysis”. There is no such process in business. The “Commander’s Appreciation” presents a gap requiring further investigation. This offers the opportunity to assess whether the intent process (Commander’s Appreciation) in the military prevails in business.

- Presently, the only environment that has a formal individual intent formulation process for the strategist was found within the military’s campaign planning process amounting to the Commander’s Appreciation? Furthermore, Louw and Venter (2006) provided a Business Strategic Management Process Model that could be equated with the military’s campaign planning process. This provides the link between the Military Campaign Planning Process and Business strategic management process.

- It is apparent that within the Military, the strategic intent which is formulated via the Commander’s Appreciation is seen as an effective solution for strategy formulation. Hence, this study’s focal point is to assess the prevalence of the
Commander’s Appreciation in the business and its ability to assist the CEO to formulate his/her intent.

2.6.2 Conceptualisation of Strategic Intent - Key Concepts

After reviewing currently available literature it has became evident that strategic intent can be seen as a concept to realise competitive advantage. In addition it has become apparent that strategic intent can be expanded upon. I therefore purport that there are two types of strategic intent (1) Company Dimension – Company Intent and (2) Individual Dimension – CEO Intent.

Figure 5 shows a conceptual model displaying the two dimensions: firstly, MacMillan and Tampoe (2001) - language of strategic intent, which provides a foundation on which to build. I have coined this “Company Intent”. Secondly, it is suggested that there are concepts that contribute towards the establishment of the “CEO’s intent”. This is fundamentally a product of the literature review, describing the key concepts and their relationships to the CEO’s strategic intent which will be integrated into the research instruments.
2.6.3 Research Gap within the Body of Knowledge

The convergence of the SMPM (see section 2.5.7) and the Military campaign planning process (see section 2.5.5) is represented in Table 4.

Table 4 consists of the campaign planning process steps indicated in yellow on the left-hand side and the SMPM steps indicated in light green on right-hand side. It has become evident with this mapping that the Commander has the Commander’s Appreciation Process (serial 2 stage 2) to formulate his/her intent. On the other hand, there is no strategic intent formulation process for the CEO as depicted by the hashed circle presenting a gap in the present body of knowledge for the strategic intent formulation.

Furthermore, this has provided the opportunity to see whether the Commander’s Appreciation could assist the CEO in bridging the gap. In the process, a link was established to assess the prevalence of the Commander’s Appreciation within the business environment. This led to the formulation of the following research question:

**Research Question**

To assess whether the Commander’s Appreciation in the military also prevails in the business context, and if so, to focus attention on the areas of similarity and difference as a basis to formulate a model for strategic intent formulation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser no</th>
<th>Steps of the campaign planning process at the operational level of war</th>
<th>Layout of the Commander’s Appreciation</th>
<th>Elements of the Strategic Management Process Model</th>
<th>Strategic Management Process Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | • **Stage 1**: Review of the situation                              | • Review of the situation – data pack formulation | • Macro environment  
• Industry environment  
• Internal environment | • Strategic analysis |
| 2      | • **Stage 2**: The commander’s appreciation and brief               | • Military- strategic analysis  
• Conceptual analysis of general factors  
• Formation of the campaign/operation concept  
• Commander’s brief |                                                                 | • Strategic intent – this is based on the organisation’s purpose and goals |
| 3      | • **Stage 3**: The formulation and selection of the campaign joint broad options | | | |
| 4      | • **Stage 4**: The development of camping joint options             | | | |
| 5      | • **Stage 5**: Development of campaign joint course of action       | | | |
| 6      | • **Stage 6**: Development of campaign joint support course of action | | | |
| 7      | • **Stage 7**: Optimising campaign planning                         | | | |
| 8      | • **Stage 8**: Effective campaign planning                          | | | |

*Table 4: The Mapping of the Research Problem*
2.6.4 Positioning – Research Focus

The research focus can be graphically depicted on the SMPM with the establishment of the gap as shown in figure 6.

Figure 6 displays the gap as a pink arrow (left top corner) pointing towards the blue arrow (in the centre), stating the question “How is intent formulated by the CEO?” The blue arrow (pointing down) indicates that strategic intent is the activating element of SMPM. However, according to the researcher, this strategic intent is made up of two dimensions ie “the Company intent and the CEO’s intent”. In an attempt to answer the question, “How is intent formulated by the CEO?” The green arrow (top right-hand side) pointing towards the blue arrow is thus showing an answer - a model for the formulation of CEO strategic intent.
2.6.5 Conclusion

In the light of the above, this study is a further step in providing new insights and in expanding on the body of knowledge regarding “strategic intent”. It brings together a number of key concepts in order to develop fresh understanding. Through the investigation of the research question, a model for the formulation of individual strategic intent (original work) will be provided. In so doing, an attempt will be made to answer the problem statement: “How does the CEO formulate his/her strategic intent in order to gain the initiative that directs the company intent?” The next chapter will provide an appropriate research design.
3. CHAPTER 3: APPROPRIATENESS OF METHODOLOGY

The conclusions in business and management research should offer advice to practising managers as to how to conduct their business and management practices more efficiently and more effectively. (Remenyi, Williams, Money & Swart, 1998:68)

3.1 CHAPTER LAYOUT

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007:5) described research as “...something that people undertake in order to find out things in a systematic way, thereby increasing their knowledge”. This is applicable to both academic research and research in general. If research is indeed systematic and organised, then a clear design and an appropriate set of research methodologies are required. For this reason, Chapter 3 will discuss research design appropriateness and Chapter 4 methodology application as show in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Methodology Chapter Layout
This chapter’s layout (Figure 7) facilitates the necessity that knowledge be obtained, within appropriate procedures, in order to be valid. Many scholars will argue (Flyvbjerg, 2006:223) as to which procedure can be considered appropriate. It is evident that choice of philosophies, design and methods are very important considerations for any research. Therefore Table 5 will expand on Figure 7 by presenting the expected contribution of each element:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Element (Figure 7)</th>
<th>What is the Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Introduction      | • Focus on the research problem and question.  
                                 • Provide a stance on the research question. |
| 2   | Research School of thought and practice | • The discussion between qualitative and quantitative.  
                                 • Selection of appropriate approach. |
| 3   | Research Philosophy | • The positioning and discussion of philosophies and approaches.  
                                 • Selection of the most appropriate approach. |
| 4   | Research Design (The overall approach-which designs will be used) | • Discussion of reporting classification selection.  
                                 • Conceptual overview of possible research strategies/designs, selection and their applicability.  
                                 • Discussion of a model and conceptual framework.  
                                 • Provide a research design consolidation table. |
| 5   | Ethical Consideration | • Provide ethical considerations.  
                                 • The ethical considerations are placed in a feedback loop. Illustrating that if there are ethical problems within the method and design both will be amended. |
| 6   | Research method (Chapter 4) | • Present the exact adaptation and application of the research designs selected.  
                                 • Proving sequencing of actions in probing the thesis statement.  
                                 • Justification of the research instruments.  
                                 • Data collection within Population and Sampling.  
                                 • Time horizons.  
                                 • Offer analysis techniques and justification. |
| 7   | Evaluation of the research | • Generalisation, validity and reliability. |

_Table 5: Methodology Chapter Layout Contributions_

The Hoffman (2007:29) scenario as depicted in Chapter 1 puts forward the question “What is the role of the CEO in strategic planning”?

In answering this question Hoffman provided the following explanations:

- The CEO has the plan in his head and then communicates it to the firm for implementation.
• The CEO wrote the plan himself and thereafter issues instructions for its implementation.

• The CEO hires consultants to facilitate the strategic planning.

These explanations were found to be inappropriate, necessitating further analysis and investigation of the literature to determine the CEO’s role in the strategic planning. On completion of the literature review it became evident that strategic intent could be seen as a new concept by which the CEO could realise competitive advantage. This in turn provided a connection between the CEO and the company leading to questioning the type of connection that strategic intent provides to the CEO and whether there was any evidence to support this link. MacMillan and Tampoe (2000:71) propounded the existence of strategic intent within a company, driven by the CEO’s intent. This supported the notion that there were two types of strategic intent; company intent and CEO intent. This in turn posed the question of how the CEO formulated his/her strategic intent, which formed the foundation of the problem statement shown below.

**How will the CEO formulate his/her strategic intent in order to gain the initiative to ensure competitive advantage?**

In order to put forward a coherent logical, clear and persuasive argument of the problem it is best explained by Hofstee’s concept of a thesis statement used to focus the investigation (Hofstee, 2006:19).
The strategic intent formulation process offers the strategist an effective solution by which to gain the initiative for realisation of competitive advantage.

The following research question will be used to focus the research within a specific area, in order to put forward a persuasive argument of the thesis statement:

To assess whether the Commander’s Appreciation in the Military also prevails in the Business context and if so, to focus attention on the areas of similarity and differences as the basis to formulate a model for the strategic intent formulation

The successful arguing of the thesis statement is entrenched within the means by which the research question is answered and the sources of the evidence collected and analysed. This poses the question: “Which type of evidence data would be more appropriate: qualitative or quantitative?”

3.2 RESEARCH SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT AND PRACTICE

The quantitative versus qualitative debate continues (Scholz & Tietje, 2002:3) on which evidence is appropriate within any research. It is important to acquire an understanding of the differences between qualitative and quantitative research. This understanding will commence with an interpretation of both terms.

On the one hand, quantitative methods, as stated by Corner (1991:719), are most commonly “represented by experimental research design, where causal
relationships between variables are examined and analysed to determine statistical probabilities”. In addition Saunders et al. (2007:406) promote the essence of “quantitative research methods as statistical results represented by numbers”.

On the other hand, qualitative methods, as framed by Saunders et al. (2007:470), seek to “examine phenomena in context, generating theory from perspectives, encouraging a study design where the researcher” and subject are part of a “two-way process in which understanding unfolds in the development of the theory”. This is expanded on by the explanation of Remenyi et al. (1998:228) that “in some cases the evidence cannot be reduced to numbers and any attempts to do so would not be useful. In such cases, statistical techniques are not sensible and hermeneutic approaches are preferable”.

Furthermore Hancock and Algozzine (2006:7) stated that there were numerous distinctions between quantitative and qualitative research. In order to help our understanding, let us consider the following attributes of the two schools of thought, as shown in Table 6 below (Corner, 1991:720).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of the Schools and Practices</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft Science</td>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Reductionistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus is complex and broad</td>
<td>Focus concise and narrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Reasoning dialectic, inductive</td>
<td>Reasoning logical, deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning dialectic, inductive</td>
<td>Basis of knowing meaning, discovery</td>
<td>Basis of knowing cause and effect relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of knowing meaning, discovery</td>
<td>Develops theory</td>
<td>Tests theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops theory</td>
<td>Shared interpretation</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared interpretation</td>
<td>Communication and observation</td>
<td>Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and observation</td>
<td>Basis elements of analysis of words</td>
<td>Basis elements of analysis is numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis elements of analysis of words</td>
<td>Individual interpretation</td>
<td>Statistical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual interpretation</td>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>Generalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>Source: Adapted Corner 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Qualitative Research versus Quantitative Research
Although the terms quantitative and qualitative research are both used to identify different modes of inquiry or approaches to research, it is important to understand that there are two levels to which these terms contribute. Firstly, Level 1 is provided by Remenyi et al. (1998:133) as being the nature of knowledge, focusing on how one understands the world and ultimately the purpose of research. Secondly, Level 2 is provided by MacMillan and Schumacher (2001:15) who states that the “terms refer to research methods, how data is collected and analysed and the type of generalisation and representation derived from the data”.

Many of the distinctions between quantitative and qualitative research are not absolute when conducting research (MacMillan & Schumacher, 2001: 16). For this reason it was necessary to combine both quantitative and qualitative research methods in a single study in order to investigate a specific problem. Campbell and Fiske (1959) as cited in Remenyi (2008:7) suggested the combination of methods, in one study of some phenomenon is referred to as triangulation.

Nevertheless, combining both research methods into a single study is more difficult than it may appear; suggesting that there should be a preferred method, supplemented by the second method. The activation of such a lead method can be done with a question such as “which method is more suitable to describing and understanding of complex issues and what is the role of the researcher in this case”? Therefore, qualitative research is concerned with describing and understanding complex issues (MacMillan & Schumacher, 2001:15). This makes the role of the researcher in qualitative research an
active and evolved one, while trying to understand and explain social occurrences in order to solve a problem in context (Saunders et al. 2007:498; Cooper & Schindler, 2003:151).

As my research was to investigate whether the commander’s appreciation would prevail in the business context, the qualitative method, was found to be appropriate as the lead for this research. The question then was focussed on the appropriate research philosophies that could make the most of the qualitative research method.

3.3 UNDERSTANDING RESEARCH PHILOSOPHIES

According to Saunders et al. (2007:101) research philosophy (Figure 8, depicted in the research onion) can be seen as the overarching term which relates to the development of knowledge. The development of knowledge may not be dramatic but modest in answering a specific problem, none the less it is still developing knowledge. It is important to align the researcher, the thesis statement, and the manner in which knowledge will be acquired, developed or attained. Despite this, acquiring knowledge within the business research environment can rarely be categorised into one philosophical domain. The research philosophies adopted contained important assumptions about the way in which the world was viewed (Saunders et al. 2007:102). There are three major ways of thinking about research philosophy as depicted in Figure 8; namely epistemology, ontology and axiology.

• According to Remenyi et al. (1998:282) epistemology is “The study of theory of the nature and grounds of knowledge especially with reference to its limits and validity”. Saunders et al. (2007:102) expand
on this foundation of epistemology as “the concern that constitutes acceptable knowledge in a field of study”. This research contribution was to add acceptable knowledge, thus making epistemology the most suitable choice.

- According to Remenyi et al. (1998:286) ontology is “a branch of philosophy or metaphysics concerned with the nature and relations of being”. In contrast Saunders et al. (2007:108) address ontology as the “concern with the nature of reality”.

- Axiology according to Saunders et al. (2007:110) is “a branch of philosophy that studies judgements about value”.

Epistemology, ontology and axiology are displayed below in a depiction providing the comparative context of research philosophies.

![Figure 8: The Research Onion](source-adapted-the-research-onion-saunders-lewis-thornhill-2007-102)
3.3.1 Applicable Research Philosophy

This research supports epistemology, where the two most influential philosophical positions are positivism and interpretivism. Although they can be used in tandem, the research question determines the selection of the most suitable, thus necessitating further discussion.

3.3.1.1 The Positivist Paradigm

The researcher within the positivism is regarded as an objective, independent analyst of an observable social reality “that it neither affects nor is affected by the research subject” (Remenyi et al. 1998:73). In the limitation of personal bias the positivist researcher follows methodological rules that are independent of the content and context of the enquiry. Proponents of this view would argue that alternative philosophical viewpoints support the reductionist approach by simplifying the real world (Remenyi et al. 1998:35), without considering the human and social situations, which will limit its ability for deep understanding of complex, social or individual problems. This would require something else, inclining towards the interpretivism.

3.3.1.2 The Interpretivist Paradigm

The heritage of this interpretivist research comes from the phenomenological approach which refers to the way humans make sense of the world (Remenyi et al. 1998:94). In addition interpretivists are sometimes described as non-positivist, post-positivist or qualitative, which provides a holistic understanding of numerous variables within the context of the study, thereby making context a critical element (Saunders et al. 2007:106). Furthermore, according to Saunders et al. (2007:107), central to the interpretivist epistemology is “that
the researcher has to adopt an empathetic stance”. The challenge here is to enter the social world of the research subject and understand it from their point of view. Several authors (Lacity & Janson, 1994:137; Perry, 2001:309) would argue that an interpretivist perspective is highly appropriate in the case of business and management research particularly in fields such as strategy, organisational behaviour, human resources and marketing.

Within interpretivism a single objective reality does not exist, necessitating the consideration of multiple realities (Saunders et al. 2007:106). These realities are made up of external realities based on happenings in the physical world and internal realities, subjective and unique to each individual (Remenyi et al. 1998:36). In order for the researcher to derive meaning they will have to tunnel below the surface to understand these realities, therefore making “the researcher’s best tool for analysis his own mind supplemented by the minds of others”.

3.3.1.3 Conclusion

Arguments exist for and against both approaches leading to the question about the appropriate research for this task. This raises the question of whether the data presented in statistical form is any more deserving of authority than that presented in a narrative, embracing the positivist position in the development of knowledge opposed to the interpretivist. The positivist often regards qualitative research as unscientific (Saunders et al. 2007:103). This notion has been challenged and vindicated by the use of phenomenology as a holistic approach for knowledge development (Remenyi et al. 1998:35-37). Interpretivism has recently gained acceptability within the
business environment (Saunders et al. 2007:106) and is consequently selected to be the preferred philosophical position adopted for this research.

### 3.3.2 Approach Inductive versus Deductive Logic

Saunders et al. (2007:117) raise the important point of the usefulness of making the distinction between deductive and inductive logical approaches. Table 7 displays the major differences between the two approaches. The present research tends toward the inductive approach as the investigation is of the meaning that the CEO and senior management contribute to the strategic intent formulation. Therefore what research design would be most appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Deductive Reasoning Logic</th>
<th>Inductive Reasoning Logic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scientific principles</td>
<td>Gaining an understanding of the meanings that humans attach to events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moving from theory to data</td>
<td>A close understanding of the research context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The need to explain causal relationship between variables</td>
<td>The collection of qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The collection of quantitative data</td>
<td>A more flexible structure to permit changes of research emphasis as the research progresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The application of control to ensure validity of data</td>
<td>A realisation that the researcher is part of the research process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The operationalisation of concepts to ensure clarity of definition</td>
<td>Less concern with the need to generalise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A highly structured approach</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Researcher independent of what is being researched</td>
<td>Researcher subjectively involved in the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The necessity to select samples of sufficient size in order to generalise conclusions</td>
<td>The difficulty to generalise in a manner that would reduce subjectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted source. Saunders et al. 2007:116-119*

*Table 7: Major Differences between Deductive and Inductive*
3.4 RESEARCH STRATEGY/ DESIGN

3.4.1 Research Reporting Classification

The philosophy for this research has manifested within the epistemology focusing on the interpretivism supported by the inductive approach. Clarification was required on the reporting classification to be used. Table 8 provides some insight on the definitions of commonly used reporting classifications and the mapping thereof to the research question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Mapped with the Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Descriptive studies| *Is to portray an accurate profile of persons, events or situations* (Robson, 2002:59) | • Find out how the CEO formulates his/her intent  
• The CEO’s participation in the strategic planning cycle |
| 2      | Exploratory study  | *Is available means of finding out what is happening, to seek new insights, to ask new questions and to assess phenomena in a new light* (Robson, 2002:59) | • The use of the Military Commander’s appreciation within the commercial sector –(mining sector)  
• What is happening  
• How will the CEO activate the strategic planning sector |
| 3      | Explanatory studies| *Studies that establish causal relationship between variables* (Saunders et al. 2007:134) | • Not applicable |

Table 8: Research Reporting Classifications

Descriptive studies may or may not have the potential for drawing powerful inferences; but they are inclined to be too descriptive and are compounded by the lack of conclusions and synthesising ideas (Cooper & Schindler, 2003:10). However, descriptive studies are popular in business research because of the versatility across disciplines. Furthermore, Remenyi et al. (1998:35) purport from the phenomenologist view that the world is socially constructed and from this research paradigm descriptive and interpretative are synonymous. Therefore from an interpretivist view we have overcome the
lack of depth with the descriptive study by combining it with the exploratory study (Saunders et al. 2007:133).

### 3.4.2 Conceptual Overview of Possible Research Designs

The following table presents possible research designs to address the thesis statement and their suitability (Remenyi et al. 1998:48-60; Blumberg, Cooper & Schindler, 2005:34-39; Hofstee, 2006:120-131; Saunders et al. 2007:135-144).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Research Designs</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Suitability for this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extended literature reviews/synthesis of scholarship</td>
<td>• Provides an overview of scholarship&lt;br&gt;• Secondary literature&lt;br&gt;• Provides a new perspective on what has gone before</td>
<td>• It takes lot of reading&lt;br&gt;• Can produce something new&lt;br&gt;• Availability of resources&lt;br&gt;• Research bias- as it is the researcher that chooses what secondary literature to include</td>
<td>• Not feasible&lt;br&gt;• Limits the ability to answer practical questions&lt;br&gt;• Will not be able to contribute to business problems&lt;br&gt;• There is no link to the real problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Survey-based research</td>
<td>• To find out peoples options, desires and attitudes&lt;br&gt;• To elicit purely factual information</td>
<td>• The type of questions as well as how the questions are asked&lt;br&gt;• The size and representative volume of the sample&lt;br&gt;• Time and cost factors</td>
<td>• Feasible&lt;br&gt;• The use of a questionnaire would contribute to finding out how the executives, functional managers, supervisors and others experience the strategist’s ability to gain the initiative for realisation of competitive advantage&lt;br&gt;• Interviewing the mine manager and commander would provide direct evidence and insight into their process of intent formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>• The acquiring of detailed knowledge of a specific area&lt;br&gt;• The use of understanding of the concepts first hand</td>
<td>• Risk of losing focus&lt;br&gt;• Generalisability of results&lt;br&gt;• Subjectivity intrudes</td>
<td>• Feasible&lt;br&gt;• This will provide rich evidence of environments contributing to strategic intent&lt;br&gt;• This will provide an environment in which we can apply the investigation to address whether the commander’s appreciation is present and functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Correlation-based research</td>
<td>• The correlation of two or more variables in</td>
<td>• The difficulty of obtaining reliable data</td>
<td>• Not feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Research Designs</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Suitability for this Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comparative analysis</td>
<td>Focuses on two items to find the difference and similarity</td>
<td>Choices of cases. The complexity of many variables generally make conclusions difficult.</td>
<td>Not feasible. This research resides within the social sciences and humanities and promotes complexity. There are many variables that need to be synthesised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is most suitable in an experimental setting where most variables are under control of the researcher.</td>
<td>In the social sciences and humanities where variables are much more difficult to control, making the case for comparative analyses difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>Studies the content of preserved records To discover the unobvious meanings contained in the records Method most suited to quantitative analysis</td>
<td>Limits the range of meaning In sufficiency, quality and quantity of sources Researcher bias. Unreliability of the results.</td>
<td>Not feasible. Although secondary evidence is important, the research is done to answer the real business problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evaluative research</td>
<td>Comes to conclusion about the effect, success or happening of an intervention Structured evaluation Linked to theory to support the evaluation</td>
<td>Be careful to define what is to be approached Requires establishment of appropriate measures You must measure accurately.</td>
<td>Not feasible. This is not an appraisal of a situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ethnographic Research / Participation Observation</td>
<td>Close observation of a group or individual (life history study)</td>
<td>Subjectivity - limits generalisation Difficulty to apply and record results.</td>
<td>Not feasible. The research is based on a real business problem, although it could be regarded as revolving around the CEO. This could be a further development of the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Action research or participatory research</td>
<td>Actively involving the participant in order to solve the problems This collaborative approach turns the participants into co-researchers</td>
<td>Subjectivity is much increased Limiting the generalisability of results The study cannot be replicated.</td>
<td>Not feasible. This focuses on empowering participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Secondary data analysis</td>
<td>Study data collected by previous researchers</td>
<td>Quality, reliability and quantity of data The match between the data being used.</td>
<td>Not feasible. This research requires primary evidence and selective secondary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.3 Research Choices

Table 9 compared suitable research designs which need to be mapped in support of a qualitative/quantitative approach and interpretivist philosophy. In order to improve results, the reliability of conclusions have necessitated that the research choices should be grouped and referred to as mixed methods as set out in Figure 9.

According to Saunders et al. (2007:147) the advantage of using mixed methods (Figure 9) is that it would enable triangulation \(^5\) to take place. The interviews may be a valuable way of triangulating data collected by means of a questionnaire. Focusing on the mixed model research of Saunders et al. (2007:146) quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques are combined with analysis procedures. This means that the quantitative data

---

\(^5\) Saunders et al (2007: 614) defines triangulation as the use of two or more independent sources of data collection methods within one study in order to help ensure that the data is telling you what you think they are telling you.
obtained from the questionnaires “qualities them” and converts the data into a narrative that can be analysed qualitatively (Saunders et al. 2007:146). The research choice has been realised within the mixed methods focusing on the mixed model research as indicated by the red circle in Figure 9. The selected research designs that have been found appropriate for this study have been grouped into a mixed method in Table 10 below. This table also indicates the expected utilisation and contribution of each design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Research Designs</th>
<th>Utilisation and Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Case study                   | • To investigate in the real world, where strategic intent resides  
|        |                              | • Provides evidence of the use or not of strategic intent  
|        |                              | • Provides evidence of a company’s intent and in what role, if any, the individual intent is displayed  |
| 2      | Survey based research        | • Highly-structured questionnaires to provide the evidence how staff experience strategic intent, its formulation and permeation within the organisation  
|        |                              | • Unstructured interviews of the strategist to provide first-hand evidence in support of how they develop their strategic intent  |
| 3      | Grounded theory              | • To synthesise the information that was collected via the Case Study and Survey based research  |

Table 10: Group Research Design

3.4.3.1 Defining the Selected Designs

This brings into the discussion the applicability and utilisation of the group designs (as depicted in Table 10) necessitating the definition of the elements of each design. This helps in promoting an understanding of the use of the terms and in the process formulates a firm point of departure to assess the applicability and to assist discussion of each.

- Case study. Saunders et al. (2007:139) cite Robin’s definition of case study as:

  “A strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a
particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence”.

• Interviews. Described by McMillan and Schumacher (2001:593) as “Interview probes brief questions or phases that elicit elaboration of detail furthering explanation and clarification of responses”.

• Questionnaire. According to Saunders et al. (2007:608) the “general term including all data collection techniques in which each person is asked to respond to the same set of questions in a predetermined order”.

3.4.4 The Applicability of Utilising a Case Study

In order to make case study design applicable for this research it necessitated an understanding of its validity and its’ standing in the business environment.

According to Dul and Hak, (2008:24) “case study research has been advocated as a valid research strategy in marketing (Bonoma, 1985), operations management (McCutcheon & Meredith, 1993), management information systems (Benbasat et al. 1987) and strategy (Mintzberg, 1979; Eisenhardt, 1989; Larsson, 1993)”.

These authors consider case study research as a useful research strategy when the topic is broad and highly complex (Yin, 2003:6); when there is not a great deal of theory available (Dul & Hak, 2008:35); and, when “context” is very important (Saunders et al. 2007:139). Remenyi et al. (1998:167) state that the case study comes into its own when “a how, who or why question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the researcher has little or no control therefore providing conditions for the use of case studies as a research design”.
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The question is, thus to what extent these conditions are applicable to the research question of this research. From the point of view of the CEO in the strategy activation, this broad and highly complex area is compounded by the limited theory that is available on strategic intent as a concept. There is even less available on strategic intent formulation by the CEO. Therefore the research question is placed under investigation in a real world context. The case study design is regarded to be a suitable investigation strategy for this research.

This puts forward the question: “What type of case study would be an appropriate fit”? Insights were obtained from the Dul and Hak studies on focus areas of case studies. A study conducted by Dul and Hak, (2008:20) found that a minority of published case studies in business research are theory-oriented and even less are theory-tested case studies. Most of the remaining case studies could be grouped into two focus areas; firstly, those which describe the design and implementation of some type of intervention, and, secondly, those that illustrate the usefulness of a theory or model to a specific company situation.

Although some researchers are likely to make use of theories or theoretical notion case studies to explain a specific company situation, others studies do not contribute to the development of theories and are labelled practice-oriented case studies (Dul & Hak, 2008:218). This echoes the assertion of Remenyi et al. (1998:68) that “conclusions in business and management research should offer advice to practising managers as to how to conduct
their business and management practices more efficiently and more effectively”. Management practice is defined below as follows:

“Dul and Hak (2008:31) states practice-oriented research is aimed at contributing to the knowledge of specific practitioners responsible for a specific practice. A practice is the real-life situation for which a practitioner has either a formal or an informal responsibility and in which he/she acts or must act. Members of the business community are primary users of the research”.

Furthermore Lundberg (2004:7) cited Lewin’s well-known statement “nothing is so practical as good theory”, theory orientated research and practice orientated research differ to some degree as described in Table 11 below (Dul & Hak, 2008:31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Practice Orientated Research</strong></th>
<th><strong>Theory Oriented Research</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice-orientated research is research where the objective is to contribute to the knowledge of one or more specified practitioner.</td>
<td>Theory-orientated research is research where the objective is theoretical development. Ultimately the theory may be useful for practice in general. Source: Adapted Dul &amp; Hak, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Practice Orientated vs Theory Orientated Research

The CEO can be linked to the specified practitioner, as referred to within the practice orientated research, where the research will contribute to his/her knowledge of the formulation of the strategic intent. According to Dul and Hak, (2008:280) descriptive research process (Figure 10) is defined as:

“A type of practice-orientated research of which the objective is to contribute to a practitioner’s knowledge by identifying and describing not yet known variables, characteristics of the object of study”.
Further Dul and Hak (2008:279) defined comparative case study as: “A study in which a small number of cases in their real life context are selected and scores obtained from these cases are analysed in a qualitative manner”.

Therefore, the case study design can be seen as appropriate in situations where a single explanation cannot provide a complete account of the research topic. One can argue further that case study design will be suitable for achieving in-depth, holistic knowledge of broad, complex phenomena as well as in understanding interactive process relationships, political issues and influences with specific context. It also provides up-to-date information, making it suitable for the study of contemporary issues such as strategic intent formulation with a present day setting.
3.4.5 The Applicability of Survey Based Research - Questionnaires

Within business and management research the greatest use of questionnaires is made within the survey strategy (Saunders et al. 2007:354). Both experimental and case study research designs can make use of survey techniques.

Saunders et al. (2007:354) cite authors such as (Bell, 2005; Oppenheim, 2000) who argued that “it is far harder to produce a good questionnaire than one might think”.

It is therefore of paramount importance that the research instrument is confirmed and verified prior to any collection of information. Questionnaires, as collection instruments, are often once-off activities stressing the relevance of evidence collected in answering the research question. Figure 11 represents the types of questionnaires generally utilised. This research makes use of self-administered questionnaires, controlled by the delivery and collection process.

![Figure 11: Types of Questionnaires](image)

There are conditions that determine guidelines for questionnaire designs which will affect the response rate, reliability and validity of the data collected.
These areas can be maximised by employing the following conditions (Saunders et al. 2007:356):

- Careful design of individual questions
- Clear layout of the questionnaire form
- Lucid explanation of the purpose of the questionnaire
- Pilot testing of the questionnaires’ on a small (sample) group
- Carefully planned and executed administration of delivery and recovery

Saunders et al. (2007:356) provide direction on when to use questionnaires appropriately. Questionnaires could be used for descriptive or explanatory research. These two approaches however have different research design requirements. As the case study would be using the descriptive approach, it is fitting to explore Saunders et al. (2007:356) use of descriptive research.

“Descriptive research such as that undertaken using attitudes and opinion questionnaires and questionnaires of organisational practices will enable you to identify and describe the variability in different phenomena”.

Although questionnaires may be used as the only data collection method, it is usually better to link them with other collection methods in a multiple-method research design (Saunders et al. 2007:356). Deciding what data to collect in the questionnaire is explained by Dillman (2000) as cited in Saunders et al. (2007:356) who have distinguished between three types of data variables that can be collected through questionnaires, namely opinion, behaviour and attributes. The questionnaire will focus on opinion and behavioural variables.
which contain data on what people or their organisations have achieved ito strategic intent formulation and which has them gaining the initiative and competitive advantage.

3.4.6 The Applicability of Survey Based Research- Interviews

According to Kvale (1996:14) an interview is “an interchange of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest”. Linking the purpose of the research to the research design, non-standardised interviews are normally used to gather data, which is usually analysed qualitatively as part of a case study design. This data is likely to reveal an understanding of how the CEO formulates his/her intent. Within interpretative research, interviews play an important part in the collection of evidence as it assists the researcher in capturing events from members who participate within the organisation (King, 2004:20). Various types of interviews as depicted within Figure 12 are grouped along two structural lines - standardised and non-standardised. This researcher has opted for non-standardised interviews on a one-to-one (face to face) basis in order to obtain the data about the strategic intent formulation process first hand from the CEO being interviewed. These interviews are often referred to as qualitative research interviews.
3.4.7 The Model as End Product

The study focus is to provide a model for the formulation of strategic intent used in the business fraternity. It was deemed important to clarify the nature of the intended model, as well as how it was constructed and evaluated. As numerous interpretations and understandings of models exist, the following authors will provide insight on what the model in question refers to:

- Remenyi (1998) cited Baran and Sweezy (1970) where a “model is and must be unrealistic in the sense in which the world is most commonly used. Nevertheless and in a sense paradoxically, if it is a good model it provides the key to understanding reality”.

- According to Botha (1989:51) “a model of a system or process is theoretical descriptions that can help people understand how the system or process works, or how it might work”.

- According Remenyi et al. (1998:285) “models are primarily used for their explanatory power and to help understand the impact of changes in the assumptions that underpin the suggested projects”. 

Figure 12: Forms of Interviews
• Rassol (2000:62) “defines a model as something that is used to clarify relationships in a paradigm in a way that minimises loss of understanding”.

• According to Winsberg (2001:446) “a model of an object is a physical representation (usually smaller than the object) that shows what it looks like or how it works”.

• According to Silvert (2001:261) “a model may also be a system that is being used and that people might want to copy in order to achieve similar results”.

• According to Afuah and Tucci (2003:134) a “business model is a framework expressing the business logic of a firm creating economic, social and / or other forms of value”.

• According to Cooper and Schindler (2003:55) a “model is defined as a representation of a system that is constructed to study some aspects of that system or the whole system. Models defer from theories in that a theory’s role is explanation whereas a model’s role is representation”.

• According to Chesbrough (2006:53) a “business model is thus used for a broad range of informal and formal descriptions to represent core aspects of a business including purpose, offering strategies, infrastructure, organisational structures, trading practices and operational processes and policies”.

In addition Cooper and Schindler (2003:55) provide explanations for different types of model:
### Table 12: Types of Models

Furthermore, models may also refer to abstraction, concepts, and theories (Birta & Arbez, 2007:158), whereas business models and business model designs refer to defining the business logic of a company at the strategic level (Debelak, 2006:124). This refers to a process of generating a model as a conceptual representation of some phenomenon (Rasool, 2000:62), which in this case will be the CEO’s strategic intent formulation process.

Typically a model will refer only to some aspects of the phenomenon in question (Matheson, Bruce & Beauchamp, 1978:11). Keep in mind that two models constructed from the same phenomenon may be essentially different. This may be due to differing requirements of the model’s end-user or to conceptual or aesthetic differences by the modellers and decisions made during the modelling process (Jansen, Steenbakkers & Jaegers, 2007:104). For this reason, users of a model need to understand the model’s original purpose and assumption of its validity. In order to ensure models are used correctly certain conditions will have to be adhered to.

Furthermore, a model is evaluated first and foremost by its consistency to empirical data (Remenyi et al. 1998:285; Debelak, 2006:7); any model inconsistent with reproducible observation must be modified or rejected. However, a fit to empirical data alone is not sufficient for a model to be accepted.
as valid. According to Afuah and Tucci (2003:124-126) there are overriding factors in evaluating a model which includes:

- Ability to explain past observations
- Ability to predict future observations
- Cost of use, especially in combination with other models
- Refutability, enabling estimation of the degree of confidence in the model
- Simplicity or even aesthetic appeal
- Visualization is any technique for creating images, diagrams or animations to communicate a message? Visualization through visual imagery has been an effective way to communicate both abstract and concrete ideas since the dawn of man. Examples from history include, cave paintings and Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Since the model is a representation of the themes in broad terms, it makes interpretations of certain aspects possible (Botha, 1989:52). A summary of the findings should be reflected in the model. Furthermore the model must be able to solve relevant problems and not introduce any itself (Winsberg, 2001: 446). A model that is not well designed may complicate issues and end up being part of the problem and not part of the solution. In order to overcome this, conceptual frameworks need to be used (Botha, 1989:53). A good model has to satisfy certain criteria:

- Does the model answer or address the research gap?
- Is the model simple and understandable?
3.4.8 Theoretical Frameworks

Notwithstanding the usefulness of a model in answering the research question it is also important to understand what will contribute to the formulation of the model. Botha (1989:51) alluded to theoretical descriptions that can help people understand how systems work. In spite of this, how will the description of theory relate to the details of the model and empirical events in the real world (Matheson et al. 1978:11). Botha’s (1989:51-52) assertion provides the link that conceptual frameworks (also known as theoretical frameworks) are a type of intermediate theory that has the potential to connect to all aspects of the inquiry. Remenyi et al. (1998:76) call this type of theory, a Theoretical Conjecture:

“A clear expression of a possible theory that has been compiled by the researcher…”

The theoretical conjecture will serve as map that gives coherence to empirical inquiry. According to Kaplan (1964:145) conceptual frameworks (also known as theoretical frameworks) are potentially so close to empirical inquiry that they take on different forms, depending upon the research question. Furthermore Shield and Tajalli (2006:320-326) have indeed identified several types of conceptual frameworks (working hypothesis, descriptive categories, practical ideal types, models of operations research and formal hypotheses) for the field of public administration. In addition, the frameworks are linked by Botha (1989:52) to particular research fields (exploration, description, gauging, decision-making, explanation and predication). It is also quite clear that if the research statement and theoretical conjecture are in alignment, the model is provided validity.
3.4.9 Design Conclusion

The preceding divergence of information pertaining to the research design “what” now needs to be converged. Therefore prior to the commencement with the method section “how”, a research design consolidation table has been provided in Table 13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Research Design Utilisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Research type</td>
<td>• Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>• Epistemological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>• Inductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Choice Method</td>
<td>• Mixed methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Design/strategies (Data Collection)</td>
<td>• Reporting Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Descriptive, Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Theoretical conjecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>• Descriptive model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>• Deontological View</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Research Design Consolidation Table

3.5 ETHICS

According to Remenyi et al. (1998:228) there are many ethical matters that do not have clear boundaries. It is quite clear that this will provide many grey areas that require clarification. This poses the question on what is deemed important for explanation. Since opinions differ on what is important Blumberg et al. (2005:92) provide the definition of ethics as the “moral principles, norms or standards of behaviour that guide moral choices about behaviour and our relationships with others”.

Saunders et al. (2007:178) contend that research ethics relate to, gaining access, collecting data, processing and data storage, analysing data and writing up the research findings in a moral and responsible way. This means
that the design and method is both methodologically sound and morally
defensible to all those who are involved. Furthermore Blumberg et al.
(2005:145) recognise “the norms of behaviour that guide moral choices” can
in reality allow for a range of ethical positions as depicted in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Ethical Philosophical</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Suitability for the Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deontological View</td>
<td>Argues that the ends served by the research can never justify the use of research which is unethical. (Saunders et al. 2009:179)</td>
<td>Acceptable • Ethical dimension will support the research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teleological View</td>
<td>Argues that the ends served by research justify the means. (Saunders et al. 2009:179)</td>
<td>Unacceptable • The benefit of research findings would be weighed against the cost of acting unethically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Ethical Philosophical Standpoints

To comply with the stringent ethical considerations, as required of this
research, the deontological philosophical standpoint was found suitable. In
addition, any deviations from ethical standards therefore need to be
considered and justified extremely carefully, thus confirming adherence to
ethical considerations as a fundamental element of the credibility, validity and
reliability of this research. This echoes the argument of Saunders et al.
(2007:181) to avoid harm (non–maleficent) which can be seen as the
cornerstone of the ethical issues that confront those who undertake research.
Table 15 below identifies potential ethical issues to be considered and their
suitability is discussed (Saunders et al. 2007:162-202; Remenyi et al.
### Table 15: Overview of Ethical Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Ethical Concept</th>
<th>Main Elements of Consideration</th>
<th>Application and Overcoming of Ethical Restraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Ethical issues during design and gaining access.    | • Concept to participate in a research project is not a straightforward matter.  
• Particular data collection method; does not necessarily imply consent about the way in which the data provided is subsequently used.  
• Informed consent.  
• Physical access to organisations.  
• Access to possible participants.  
• Gaining cognitive access.  
• Obtaining consent from organisational gatekeeper and the intended participants.  
• Providing anonymity and confidentiality. | • Providing a concise introductory letter which clearly explains the research project.  
• Making use of a known contact within the mining industry to act as a sponsor.  
• Making use of a pre – survey contact by holding an explanatory meeting with all participants.  
• Limiting the interview to the General Manager Mining of the 3 mines.  
• Use of questionnaires.  
• Providing assurances of confidentiality and anonymity. |
| 2      | Ethical issues during the data collection.          | • The participants have the right to withdraw and or decline to participate.  
• Participation in anything that will cause harm or intrude on their privacy where this goes beyond the scope of the access agreed upon.  
• Maintenance of research objectivity. | • Making use of a pre – survey contact by holding an explanatory meeting with all participants.  
• Remaining within the negotiated participation  
• Maintaining of confidentiality and anonymity. |
| 3      | Ethical issues associated with data processing and storage. | • Legal consideration to data protection. | • Obtaining permission and compliance with the handling of personal, sensitive data. |
| 4      | Ethical issues related to analysis and reporting.   | • Maintenance of objectivity during analysis stage. This includes selective use of data and misrepresentation of the statistical accuracy. | • Maintaining the confidentiality and anonymity.  
• Use of all data collected.  
• Investigate an organisation in which the researcher has no interest (promoting the dispassionate researcher role). |

#### 3.6 CONCLUSION

The chapter provides a clear research design and underpins its appropriateness to address the research question. This commenced with the differentiation between qualitative and quantitative practices. The application within the research philosophy thus led to the design of strategies in order to
answer the research question. The chapter that follows will provide the application of this design.
4. CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The design framework was provided in the previous chapter. It is now time to explain the plan on how these designs have been adapted and applied in order to probe the research question (outlined in Figure 13) and in the process to gain new insights.
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Figure 13: Research Methodology
Figure 13 shows the research methodology composed of sequential segments. Firstly – the conversion of the Commander’s Appreciation into research instruments. Secondly – the application of those research instruments within the business environment resulting in a theoretical conjecture. This in turn contributes to the formulation of a model. Thirdly – the suitability of the model within the company’s life-cycle.

This was accomplished with data from identified knowledgeable military informants via semi-structured interviews pertaining to the USA Army, UK Army and the SA Army Commander’s Appreciation process. These interviews were transcribed, analysed and presented in a primary narrative (Chapter 5). This primary narrative led to the identification of categories and concepts as the core elements from which the research instruments (questionnaires and interview schedules) were developed. These research instruments enabled the comparison of the Military Commander’s Appreciation in Business.

A case study design facilitated the military - business comparison. The case study data collection utilised four sources - planning documentation, questionnaires, interviews and organisational websites. The interview evidence from the General Manager was carried out by transcription (of the interviews) and administering questionnaires to the staff. Analyses via a type of grounded theory of evidence then took place. The outcome was then formulated into primary narratives per case. Reflection of the various primary case narratives were synthesised into a higher order case narrative of comparison (Chapter 6). After further reflection of the higher order case narrative (Chapter 6) linked to the primary narrative (Chapter 5) of the Commander, findings were extracted, based upon which a theoretical conjecture was derived. This led to the establishment of
the Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model. The model’s suitability for transferability was preliminary assessed.

The following discussion will provide insight into the application of the research methodology:

### 4.2 QUALITATIVE EVIDENCE COLLECTION

Evidence collection for this research was conducted in sequential segments as shown in figure 13.

- Firstly, evidence pertaining to the Military Campaign planning process, focusing on the Commander’s Appreciation for conversion into research instruments.

- Secondly, the evidence collected was from the application of the research instruments as part of a case study in business.

- Thirdly, evidence collected for suitability of the Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model to assess transferability.

The following types of data sources were used during this research:

- **Planning Documentation.** On the Military side, the focus was on the Military Campaign planning process, as the primary source from which the Commander’s Appreciation could be itemised. This itemisation provided the categories and concepts that indicated what information was required to answer the research question (refer Appendix C). This led to the construction of appropriate research instruments. On the other hand, the
Mines’ planning documentation provided insight into the planning process, providing focus to the General Manager’s role within this process.

- **Semi-Structured Interviews.** This provided the opportunity to obtain an understanding of the various campaign planning processes and the function of the Commander’s Appreciation within the military. Both ex and serving members of the military environment, who have authored, lectured and used the commander’s appreciation in military operations and peacetime scenarios were interviewed. The interviews with the General Managers, on the other hand, provided insight into his/her views of strategic planning within the respective mines.

- **Questionnaires.** The questionnaires provided the bulk of the empirical evidence for this study as they offered insight on how the staff of each mine experienced the General Manager’s role within the strategy formulation process of that particular mine.

- **Organisational Websites.** The USA Military\(^6\) website provided access to the latest campaign planning documentation. The BHP Billiton and the Talison Mineral websites provided background information on these organisations.

The above various sources provided an opportunity for data corroboration and a means of triangulation as they supply specific details and arguments which substantiate each other (Barbour, 2008:29).

---

\(^6\) Publication is only available on the TRADOC homepage at Http://www.tradoc.army.mil/pubs
“…interviews provide insightful observation; documents provide stable unobtrusive and exact case information and questionnaires provide explanation of what is in between”.

In order for corroboration to be effective, the case study approach was used. The cases were cross-sectional by nature. In order to improve the probe of similarities and differences, research validity, facilitation of a deeper understanding and explanation of the evidence, cross-case analysis was introduced (Chapter 6).

4.2.1 Development of Interview Schedules and Pilot Testing

The interviewer can be seen as the research instrument within qualitative studies (Kvale, 1996; Lee & Lings 2008:253). Therefore, any researcher conducting interviews requires knowledge of the subject area, the context under investigation and interview techniques.

- It is up to the researcher to prepare a set of questions on the key areas as part of the semi-structured interview schedule (Saunders et al. 2007:316). Effective interview questions contribute to the production of relevant knowledge and in the process establish a positive interview interaction. Kvale (1996) highlighted the fact that the questions asked depended on what information was needed and he therefore provided the following guidelines:

  o Clarification of the study’s purpose and the research question.

---

7 Refer to Appendix C. This is where the commander’s categories are linked to the interview questions and the information it required.
- Designing or planning the methods to obtain the required knowledge.
- Conducting interviews with the aid of an interview guide.
- Transcribing recorded interviews.
- Analysing interview material.
- Verifying research findings.
- Reporting and communicating findings in a written medium.

- The questions were therefore carefully formulated in order to reduce ambiguity and placed into an interview schedule (see Appendix B). These interview schedules were pre-tested, refined, then pilot tested and once again refined. This was done in order to ensure that the potential informants would understand the questions and to confirm the depth of the evidence accessed. This pre-testing provided a check on reliability and enabled schedule refinement.

- In order to structure the interview process “interview schedules” were prepared. The utilisation thereof focused firstly on extracting the understanding of the Military Commander’s Appreciation from the various Commanders. Secondly, this focused on the General Manager’s understanding of his/her role in the strategic intent formulation. Thirdly, focused assessment was on establishing the suitability of the conceptual strategic intent formulation model.
The local interviews were conducted on location for both the Military Commanders and the General Managers of the South African Mines. The Australian mine General Manager was interviewed via skype. Lee and Lings (2008:257) state that,

“The internet is a useful medium for more “traditional” research as it can be used to enhance your ability to contact geographical diverse respondents using email, live messaging, audio or even video”.

Furthermore Lee and Lings (2008:227) view on the use of technology in recoding data where the interviewer

“…uses some kind of electronic device such as a tape recorder, video recorder or in today's high tech world some kind of digital device – such as skype”.

Each interview lasted between forty-five to sixty minutes and was recorded with the informant’s prior permission. The questions asked within this research were open-ended in order to allow flexibility and detailed informant response. The use of leading questions and double questions was avoided and follow-up probing questions were occasionally used to clarify issues and to generate more in-depth answers.

Each interview was transcribed by the researcher subscribing to Lee and Lings’ (2008:228) views that personally transcribing the interviews contributed to the researcher’s intimate connection with the data. Furthermore, the researcher’s presence at the interview has minimised the number of mistakes and misunderstandings within the transcripts. This
also provided the researcher an early opportunity to take cognisance of
issues and their occurrences during transcription.

- The researcher was faced with the dilemma of what was to be transcribed.
  Does one transcribe just words or other utterances and gestures?
  According to Lee and Lings (2008:228-229),

  "Of course if you are using a specific analysis method like discourse analysis
  you will probably utilise a more detailed transcription scheme but I tend to
  focus on the words… pauses and utterance (Um, Ah and the like) primarily”.

  These aspects led to the question of syntax within the transcripts.
  Transcripts were regarded as de-contextualised conversations and the
  pauses and utterances were not noted in transcripts.

In this study, the interview process was regarded as the creation of stories.
The meaning of the informants’ stories was uncovered throughout the
researcher’s interpretation and these were shaped by the researcher into new
convincing narratives with the evidence collected.

4.2.2 Questionnaires Construction and Pilot Testing

Applicability of the questionnaires as a data collection instrument was argued
within section 3.4.5. Furthermore, Lee and Lings (2008:279) emphasised that
the design of questionnaire surveys needed to be balanced in terms of cost,
time, length and relevant information. In this study the researcher complied
with a balanced approach as follows:

- The questionnaire focus was to extract evidence effectively (refer
  Appendix C) from the target group in order to confirm the staff’s opinion of
the General Manager’s role in the formulation of strategic intent.

According to Remenyi et al. (1998:151):

“…depending on the study, evidence may be sought on opinions or beliefs related to behaviours, experiences, activities and attitudes…”

• The target group for the questionnaire was made up of Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others, as members who were directly involved with the General Manager during the planning process.

• The construction of the questionnaire commenced with the itemisation of the Commander’s Appreciation process into categories and concepts. As a product of the semi-structured interview transcripts these were analysed and synthesised into a primary narrative as the foundation for the research (refer Chapter 5). The primary narrative provided themes, categories and concepts in order to ensure that the statements extracted the relevant information which could then serve to answer the research question. It was necessary to map these categories with the statements and the information it would provide (refer Appendix C). From this mapping the researcher constructed a list of possible statements for a questionnaire.

• The questionnaire was a self-administrated, rating questionnaire (refer Appendix D) based on a 6 point Likert scale without a “neither” option. Depriving the respondent of a “neither option” ensured that the respondent made a positive or negative statement. In the process contributing to an agreement group or a disagreement group and enhancing the comparative process between the General Manager’s view and the experience of his/her staff pertaining to each concept.
• The questionnaire could be seen as intrusive and the participants may have been concerned that the questionnaire could land in the wrong hands. I could not ascertain whether their awareness of completing the statements affected their participation and thus indirectly their answers. I am quite convinced that it had some subjective effect.

The questionnaire was tested, refined and piloted for clarity by a focus group. Piloting of the questionnaire for content and context testing was done via a limited pilot study. The data of the questionnaire was written up and analysed to ensure contributions were in line with Appendix C. After refinement and alignment, the questionnaire was found suitable for the planned utilisation, as the content and understanding had been tested and verified. This process contributed towards the validity and reliability of the research instrument.

4.2.3 Population

According to Cooper and Schindler (2003:179) the basic idea of

“…sampling is that by selecting some of the elements in a population we may draw conclusions about the population. A population is the total collection of elements about which we wish to make any inferences…”

However, Remenyi et al. (1998:192) maintain that

“…the sample normally comes from a larger group of individuals or objects called the target population. Even if considerable care is taken to avoid bias, the sample will not be exactly the same as the total population. If another sample were chosen in precisely the same way it would be different. This limits the accuracy of the sample and therefore how much confidence can be placed in statements that can be made about the whole population”.
However, this research was to investigate the formulation of strategic intent by the CEO implying that the population could be seen as any environment with a CEO and a Strategic Management process. This would not be practical or useful as a population for this research. According to Cooper and Schindler (2003:186) “… the relevant population may be apparent from the management problem or research question…”

In this study the population has been indicated in the research question as Military and Business environments, but not all industries can be compared with the military. According to Cooper and Schindler (2003:186-188) population parameters of interest are types of data that can be used to form important sub-groups or delimitations. The following parameters of interest were used to appropriately delimit the industry:

- Industry with similar strategic planning cycles
- Autonomous organisations linked and supported by corporate structures
- Level of management (within autonomous structures)
- Members of line management and staff management participation
- Budgeting in the short, medium and long-terms

Concluding the consideration of the population it was found that the mining industry was most suitable for comparison with the military. This has been justified as follows:

- A mine and a regiment can be seen as autonomous organisations linked and supported by corporate and military strategic HQ’s respectively.
• The mining industry was found to have similar planning processes to that of the military.

• The General Manager and the Regiment Commander are mandated to achieve specified objectives.

• Planning is done in the short, medium and long-terms within both environments.

An appropriate industry was thus identified but selection of the sample of participation deserves more discussion.

4.2.4 Sample

Sampling techniques will enable reduction of the amount of data needed to be collected by considering only data from a sub-group rather than all possible cases or elements (Dul & Hak, 2008:47). Although a case study design was adopted, the selection of the case or cases (sample), organisations and groups (sample) of employers and managers to participate (Saunders et al. 2007:204) need to be decided upon. It was decided to commence with consideration of probability and non-probability and their suitability for this research. Remenyi et al. (1998:193) state that

“...the selection of a random sample is seldom if ever relevant. Thus non-probability sampling which is based on some sort of subjective assessment of the sample is an appropriate approach”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Sampling</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Suitability for the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>• Need to make inferences about population</td>
<td>• Cannot accommodate a small sample</td>
<td>• Not suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Experimental research</td>
<td>• Cannot specify a group</td>
<td>• The research supports an experimental design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Associated with survey based and experimental research</td>
<td>• Needs to represent the population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Technically superior</td>
<td>• More planning required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Probability sampling is superior in theory</td>
<td>• Repeated call-backs to ensure member is contacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time consuming and expensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Breakdowns in application due to – human factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non – Probability</td>
<td>• Provides rich information</td>
<td>• Based on subjective judgmental approach</td>
<td>• Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commonly used within case studies</td>
<td>• Cannot be generalised on a statistically based population</td>
<td>• Supports an information rich environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can generalise population</td>
<td>• Greater opportunity for bias</td>
<td>• Case study approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfactorily meet the sampling objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The use of purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Carefully controlled non-probability sampling often seems to provide acceptable results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Suitability of Probability or non Probability

For this study, Table 16 concludes that non-probability sampling approach is found to be appropriate. This promotes the use of purposive sampling. According to Cooper and Schindler (2003:201), purposive or judgemental sampling enables the researcher to use judgement in order to select cases that will best enable the answer to the research question. Purposive sampling may also be used by researchers adopting the grounded theory (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007:158). Saunders et al. (2007:230) cite Patton (2002) who emphasised this point by contrasting the need to select information-rich cases and individuals. One can argue further with the statement by Remenyi et al. (2008:194):

“…such samples comprise individuals [and organisations] considered to have the knowledge and information to provide useful ideas and insights”.
This study required individuals with knowledge and practical experience of the Commander’s Appreciation within the military. The selection of the participants was purposeful in order to provide individuals who could assist with the itemisation of the South African, United States of America and United Kingdom perspectives of the commander’s appreciation in both operational and administrative spheres.

4.3 QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

According to Barbour (2008:160), the challenge of mixed method design is to allocate weight between qualitative and quantitative data gathering and data analysis and to determined whether or not it could be equal,

“…it may be more realistic to settle for a design that is more predominantly qualitative, but which involves a quantitative component and vice versa”.

Furthermore, Lee and Lings (2008:65) suggested that both qualitative and quantitative data could be useful to interpretive researchers (refer to section 3.3.1.2). As qualitative data analysis is an iterative process, it requires what Lee and Lings (2008:66) described as “reflexivity8 which would assist with the interpretation of data. The data interpretation amounts to empirical material of underlying meaning being unravelled. Interpretation, as Lee and Lings (2008: 58-59) suggested, inferred that there were no clear rules and that the researcher’s judgements, intuition and ability to highlight issues played an important part in the process.

8 This reflexive style allows recognition of the role the researcher plays in actively constructing an interpretation of the social context and how this depends understanding of the specific situation (Lee & Lings, 2008: 66)
This study’s qualitative data analysis process is outlined in Figure 14. The data analysis was carried out using a variant of Glaser and Strauss' (1967) grounded theory method.

- Reading of the transcripts of all segments identified key words/ideas for coding. Coding was done by hand using colours and abbreviations which identified themes and concepts. This led to the establishment of categories and concepts to which themes were coupled.

- With the prioritisation of the themes, the memo creation, concept comparison and reflection were important steps in this process.

- The writing of the primary narrative was based on the key categories that emerged from the interview transcripts as well as complementary details from other sources of the case study evidence.

- Further reflection on the primary case narratives led to a higher order case narrative in order to make sense of the evidence (refer Chapter 6). A second higher order narrative followed, that of blending the comprehension of the research (refer Chapter 7). From this, a theoretical conjecture was distilled (refer section 7.3).
4.3.1 Grounded Theory

In 1967, Glaser and Strauss established the grounded theory methodology as an effort to brace the mandate for generating theory. According to Remenyi (2009):

“Grounded theory is not intended to be used for theory or proposition testing but for theory development”.

Grounded theory provides a rigorous methodical set of rules for data collection and theory generation from empirical data. Nonetheless, grounded theory is one of the most widely used qualitative frameworks in business and management studies (Locke, 2001:67; Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; Remenyi, 2008, Lee & Lings, 2008:214). After reviewing the grounded theory literature, it was decided not to adopt the method in its pure form but instead to focus on its underlying principles. Grounded theory is based on a number of principles that improve the researcher’s conceptual understanding of the phenomenon.
(Barbour, 2008:194 - 225). A number of important grounded theory principles were followed during this research. These include iterative data coding, comparative data analysis and memo creation (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007: 324- 326).

- Data coding was used to identify concepts and themes through the identification of incidents, events and acts by representing them with practically appropriate names.

- The researcher made analytical decisions about the data and related concepts so that they could be grounded into higher order categories.

- Comparative analysis and iterative reflection on what was already coded was required at each stage (Dul & Hak, 2008). This supported Kvale’s (1996) view that continual data coding and recoding as the researcher’s insights develop enabled a new theory to emerge from the empirical data.

- According to Glaser and Strauss (1967:45), theoretical sampling involved collating data to develop and refine emerging categories and not to represent specific populations. In the beginning, theoretical sampling minimised sampling group differences in order to identify basic categories and their properties (Remenyi, 2009).

- Within the comparison of the various cases, theoretical sampling maximised group differences in order to examine category’s ranges, as this diversity strengthened the emerging theory (Remenyi, 2009).
According to Bryant and Charmaz (2007:324) theoretical sampling sharpens concepts and deepens the analysis. The commanders were interviewed until there were neither further contributions from them nor new discoveries pertaining to the theme and categories validating with evidence their density and relationships.

Another important activity was memo writing as this expanded on ideas defined and clarified categories and their interrelationships. Memos assisted with the early commencement of the analysis and provided the basis for theory generation and conceptualisation thus widening the understanding of the phenomenon by the researcher (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007).

According to Glaser and Strauss (1967:32-35) there were two types of theory that could be developed, namely substantive and formal. These are distinguishable on levels of generality. Substantive theory looks at one instant of an event whereas formal theory considers a conceptual area. Having developed theory at a level of abstraction, the researcher investigated further degrees of transferability (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007).

With the evolvement of grounded theory, Corbin and Strauss (2008) developed a strict linear grounded theory approach based on a rigorous set of steps:

- This required data micro-analysis of each word/line and coding its associated meaning. Initially open coding was used to segment the data and to identify concepts, their properties and dimensions.
• **Axial coding** helped establish relationships between categories and sub-categories through examining properties and dimensions and coding along the “axis” of the category.

• **Selective coding** involved delimiting the theory by focusing on the core category. This core category and its relationships with others were explored in order to refine the grounded theory.

This minute data examination was criticised by Glaser (1992) resulting in over-conceptualisation and forcing rather than allowing the theory to emerge. Glaser’s approach was more consistent with the original method. He advocated research’s creativity and a less specific analytical approach in which the central concepts were allowed to emerge through coding (Glaser, 1992; Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Both the processes were used in this research; converting of the Commander’s Appreciation was the original grounded theory however during the case studies, the more selective approach of Strauss and Corbin was used within the case method.

### 4.3.2 Criticisms of Grounded Theory

• To overlook prior theory was not feasible and was in fact impractical (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). According to literature, empirical categories have emerged naturally without being contaminated by earlier research. However failure to examine prior research runs the risk of reinventing the wheel.

• The over-emphasis of coding, according to Bryant and Charmaz (2007), resulted in the relationship between events being broken down and linked
by the researcher’s common sense. Locke (2001) purports that this made it easy for analysis to be lost. This approach ran the risk of emphasising the obvious or creating trivial knowledge.

- Coding cannot objectively represent reality. The researcher’s reference frame was the base-line on which he/she interpreted evidence. The researcher’s prior knowledge and pre-concepts could not therefore be eliminated completely (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007).

### 4.3.3 A Grounded Theory Type Approach to Data Analysis

After reviewing the grounded theory literature and its underlining principles within a case study approach (Remenyi, 1998), it was found to be suitable for this research, however not in its pure form. The researcher leaned towards the Glaser and Strauss (1967) approach as opposed to Corbin and Strauss’s (2008) restricted flexibility and creativity in data analysis. Therefore an approach was adopted which considered prior knowledge in the field and acknowledged the need for creativity in theory development. The use of a grounded theory type of approach is not uncommon and was advocated by Bryant and Charmaz (2007). A number of important grounded theory principles were followed:

- Firstly, during the itemisation of the Commander’s Appreciation process interactive data coding, comparative data analysis and memo creation was used. Consequently, the categories and concepts inductively emerged from data. These were then incorporated into research instruments.
• Secondly, the learning taken from each case study was built into primary narratives. The differences in each case were explored, in order to examine the divergent range of instruments and to consolidate these within higher order case narratives.

• Thirdly, despite reviewing prior strategy formulation process, the expectation of finding a particular type of evaluation process for the intent formulation process was minimised.

This exercise resulted in the itemisation of the Commander’s Appreciation into categories and concepts. Furthermore, a comparative analysis of the concepts prevalent within three business case studies was documented in a higher order narrative. This enabled exploration of that higher order narrative and further provided a way to interrogate the data in producing a holistic higher order narrative in order to blend the comprehension of the study.

4.3.4 Making the Data Manageable

This study has not made use of a qualitative software package to assist in the processing of the data. The establishment of codes, themes and categories were done by hand, in accordance with Remenyi’s (2009) grounded theory workshop. Barbour’s (2008:196) view on the use of technology was that:

“...computer-assisted analysis is not necessarily any more rigorous than manual analysis... it is the researcher and not the medium of analysis that ensures that analysis is systemic and thorough ... rigour is strengthened and enacted through utilising an iterative process... all engage the reader in moving back and forth between provision and revised coded frames and transcripts in order to interrogate themes and build up explanations”.

However, a computer was used to record, store and interpret data. Acceding to Lee and Lings (2008:241),

“…the decision on how to manage your data will also have a major bearing on analysis. When I began qualitative work in 1998 I used no special qualitative software, but I did maintain all my work on computer”.

4.3.4.1 Theme, Concept and Category Creation

The initial step commenced with the printing and reading of the Commanders’ transcripts and the identification of themes. These themes were coded and the transcripts were annotated with these codes by making use of coloured pens and highlights. For practical use the transcripts were placed into the format shown below in Table 17 (Remenyi, 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Transcripts of Interview</th>
<th>Theoretical Memos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Table 17: Example of Transcript Format for Analysis*

On completion of the coding of the Commanders’ transcripts, it was found that some of the themes could be amalgamated. Once the amalgamation exercise was completed, twelve themes were identified. The Commanders’ transcripts were then re-trawled to register and produce a frequency table as seen in Figure 15.
Further reflection necessitated the discussion of each theme in order to create an understanding of the Commander’s Appreciation composition. It then became clear that the themes could be grouped as shown in Figure 16.

In addition, each category (The strategist – leader) consisted of core concepts as shown in Figure 17. These core concepts were used as the research instruments, i.e. content questionnaire (Appendix C) and interview schedules (refer Appendix B).
4.3.4.2 Management of Questionnaire Data

The researcher built an Excel workbook per case in order to correlate the data. Within the workbook a separate worksheet was opened for each case statement (refer Figure 18). The worksheet was divided into vertical planes where the questionnaires were registered and the horizontal planes where the staff responses were registered. The confirmatory column was used to ensure that only one value was used for each statement.
This research focus was the comparison of the staff’s views with that of the General Manager’s in terms of the identified concepts. It was therefore practical to form an agreement group and a disagreement group. The 6 point Likert scale was grouped as shown in Figure 19.

![Figure 19: The conversion of the Likert scale into Groups](image)

The data was then configured into graphs per questionnaire statement, displaying the Disagreement and the Agreement groups (Figure 20).

![Figure 20: Item breakdown](image)

The representation of graphs per item became cumbersome, although it appeared visually attractive. The writing up of the case was done within the
narrative format, making it impractical for graphical representations. Therefore the data, per category, was condensed into a table format (refer Figure 21) which allowed the linking of the literature review theory, additional information in the form of theoretical memos and comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Concept Agreement</th>
<th>Comments and Additional Information (positively and negatively)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discrim in turbulent times</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Memo 1: Planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Memo 1: Reaction time tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>See section 2.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Memo 2: Decision making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>See section 2.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 21: Example of case data for Primary Narrative**

Furthermore, the following task was to place relevant data onto one viewable platform (Figure 22) in order to enable a comparative discussion (refer Chapter 6). A table format was opted for, as opposed to a graph for practical reasons. This table provided the means to compare all the case data and research views in one spreadsheet.
4.3.5 The Use of Narratives – in Case Study

In addition to being an evidence collection design, a case study, according to Remenyi et al. (1998:164) could be used as a vehicle

“...for creating a story or narrative description of a situation being studied in such a way that the resulting narrative represents findings in its own right and thus can be said to have added something of value to the body of knowledge.”

This notion is supported by Yin (2003:23-24) when he said that using the case study in this way constituted a comprehensive research tactic in its own right. That being so, Saunders et al. (2007:504) offer the following definition of a narrative:
“An account of an experience that is told sequentially, indicating a flow of related
events that, taken together, are significant for the narrator and which convey
meaning to the researcher”.

Furthermore Elliott (2005:3) cited Hinchman and Hinchman’s (1997)
definition of narratives where they proposed that:

“Narratives (stories) in the human sciences should be defined provisionally as
discourse with a clear sequence order that connects events in a meaningful way
for a definite audience and thus offers insights about the world and or people’s
experiences… which stresses the importance of attempting to understand the
meaning of behaviour and experiences from the perspective of the individuals
involved”.

Additionally Elliott (2005:186) claimed that the narrative played a central role
in social life. This role of the narrative provided a kind of reflexive bridge
(Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000:162) between the tradition of quantitative and
qualitative research instruments,

“…by attending to narrative’s properties of data …by using narratives to inform
our analysis and most importantly by recognizing ourselves as the narrators of
the accounts”.

Furthermore Elliott (2005:186) purports that “…it is hoped that a common interest
in social change, in social process and in understanding the factors that shape
individual life trajectories may encourage those working on either side of the
qualitative/quantitative divide to engage with each other’s work”.

However, according to Reissner (2008) narratives were a form of knowledge
and communication and they provided a better understanding of complex
situations in a story format. When the story was a persuasive and a logical account of the issues under investigation it developed a deeper meaning. This meaning was based on a narrative’s scheme that supported openness to different interpretations in order to gain a fuller understanding of the situation (Habu, Fawcett & Matsunaga, 2008). Thus phenomena could be placed into context and key relationships explored. Hence, clearly, narratives were a useful means to understanding and making sense of both quantitative and qualitative data. Remenyi (1998:125) purports that:

“Irrespective of whether the emphasis of the research is quantitative or qualitative it is necessary to produce a primary narrative if a theoretical conjecture is to be competently developed… this shows how both these types of evidence may be used to develop the primary narrative”.

Furthermore Elliott (2005:2) stated that “…it was possible to analyse qualitative data using quantitative techniques that resulted in numeric or statistical summaries and conversely it was possible to use detailed survey data to build up case histories of individuals and to present these in a narrative form…”

4.3.6 Development of Primary Narrative

A primary narrative was defined by Remenyi et al. (1998:124) as a

“…detailed textual description of the phenomenon being studied based either on the literature or on a combination of literature and other evidence collected through a grounded theory approach”.
Kvale (1996:201) provided the researcher with two roles - that of narrative finder\(^9\) or narrative creator\(^10\). The role assumed in this study was that of narrative creator. This necessitated working closely with the empirical data, the unstructured transcripts and details from various sources in order to shape a story which could provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

This study created two types of primary narratives namely the Commander’s narrative (Figure 23) and the primary case narrative (Figure 24).

![Diagram of primary narratives]

**Figure 23: Primary Narratives: Commander’s Appreciation**

Figure 23 shows that the Commander’s primary narrative is made up of synthesising of the interviews and theoretical memos depicting relevant planning data. This synthesized view morphed into the commander’s comment (Chapter 5) from which categories and concepts were identified.

---

\(^9\) Kvale (1996:201) Search for a narrative in the data.

\(^10\) Kvale (1996:201) Mould the various happening into a coherent story
This could be seen as the core competencies of the Commander’s Appreciation from which the research instruments were developed. This in turn could be used to assess the prevalence of the Commander’s Appreciation in the business environment.

Figure 24: Case Primary Narrative

Figure 24 shows the formulation of a primary case narrative. This narrative was comprised of the integration of the General Manager’s transcript, the questionnaires’ statistical interpretation and the integration of the theoretical memos. The focus was to provide a narrative that best explained the integration of the literature review concepts, the General Manager’s view and how his/her staff experience his/her intent formulation.

4.3.7 Development of Higher Order Narrative

Advancement to a higher understanding of the evidence involved significant reflection on the empirical evidence and primary narratives. According to Remenyi et al. (1998:126) a higher order narrative was defined as:
“a description which both captured the essential aspects of the information represented in the primary narrative but provided a more parsimonious conceptual framework in which the ideas, concepts and relations have been defined.”

This study developed two higher order narratives. Firstly, an integration of all the primary case narratives were developed into a comparative Higher Order narrative which could make sense of the evidence (refer Chapter 5). Secondly, a higher order narrative that blended the comprehension of the entire research was derived (Chapter 7).

![Figure 25: Higher Order Case Narrative](image)

Figure 25 shows how the three primary case narratives were, upon reflection, integrated into a synthesised higher order narrative.
Figure 26: Higher Order Narrative Blended Comprehension

Figure 26 shows the development of the research Higher Order Narrative required significant reflection about the Commander’s primary narrative and the associated higher order narrative to make sense of evidence. This involved consideration of the following questions:

- “What did the text say about intent formulation?”, and

- “What were the similarities and differences between the military environment and business environment and, what was my understanding”? (as the researcher)

These questions were found to be useful in the establishment of a conceptual separation when examining the narratives which in turn expanded on the interpretation. This led to the identification of principal findings displaying principles common to and comparing the Commander’s and General
Manager's actions and thereafter providing insights into what transpired from the research (refer Chapter 7).

4.3.8 The Development of a Theoretical Conjecture

Further reflection of the higher order narrative (Chapter 7) led to synthesis of findings and the relationship between each of the findings as the basis for subsequently developing the theoretical conjecture. Sutton and Staw (1995:375) summed up a theory as:

“…the connections between phenomena, a story about why events, structure and thoughts occur. Theory emphasises the natural causal relationships, identifying what comes first as well as the timing of events. Strong theory, in our view, delves into underlying processes so as to understand the systematic reasons for a particular occurrence of non-occurrence”.

Furthermore Lee and Lings (2008:37) suggested that researchers should be concerned with the creation of theory. In other words,

“…we should try to develop explanations of what happened in the world, not just observe what was happening.”

According to Remenyi (1998:76),

“…once the grounded theory has been developed, the researcher in business and management studies is in a position to make a theoretical conjecture”.

The theoretical conjecture refers to a distillation of the knowledge acquired through data analysis (Remenyi, 1998:76). The development of the theoretical conjecture was based on further iterative reflection and due to this in-depth analysis a convincing approximation of the reality suggested.
4.4 EVALUATING THE RESEARCH

Weighing up this study from an interpretivist point of view, one needs to keep in mind that the notion of measuring, clearly has connotations of quantification and amounts to issues of (positivist research) validity, reliability and generalisability (Saunders et al. 2007:149). These concepts are regarded by many qualitative researches (non-positivist) as having relatively little significance for judging the merits of interpretive investigation\(^\text{11}\) (Lee & Lings, 2008:65). Remenyi (1998:114) cited Marshall and Rossman (1995) as saying:

“...it has been suggested that the criteria used to evaluate positivist research are all inappropriate and should not be directly transposed onto non-positivist research”.

Furthermore Elliot (2005: 22) stated that “even if the focus was shifted from measurement to description, the researcher must still confront the question of whether the accounts produced in a qualitative study are accurate or valid representation of reality…”

Nevertheless, the interpretivist is more concerned with consistency and integrity of the study design, whereas, the qualitative researcher highlights (Lee and Lings, 2008:237-239; Remenyi, 1998:187)

- the significance of reflecting on all the evidence,
- the ability to make critical assessments of data, and

\(^{11}\) According to Lee and Lings (2008:65) credibility, dependability and transferability are the non-positivist equivalents to validity, reliability and generalisability.
• the imperative for producing convincing arguments and explanations.

There are various approaches of evaluating qualitative research as discussed in the literature. This study commenced its evaluation by examining biases in case studies and then conceptualising validity, reliability and generalisability so as to reflect on the issues of concern for the interpretivist researcher.

4.4.1 Biases – Case Study

Case studies are not perfectly objective due to the biases of both the supplier and the recipient of the information (Remenyi et al. 1998:169). Based on this, the case study method has attracted prejudgments of subjectivity and bias. This has manifested in the perceived tendency that incomplete evidence is used, leading to lack in rigour and objectivity (McCutcheon & Meredith, 1993). However, according to Remenyi et al. (1998:168) such a

“…view ignores the fact that bias can creep into any research tactics including experiments and surveys”.

Bias is everywhere but attempts may be made to minimise it and clearly it is the primary function of the researcher to minimise or at least identify biases to nullify their impact. The question is how to limit the bias to an acceptable level. According to Lee and Lings (2008:239),

“…triangulation is one way in which you can try to enhance validity …it involves looking at the issue from different angles… by using different types of methods or different analysis techniques”.

Remenyi et al. (1998:170) built on this notion, that from a
“…practical perspective, the more the evidence that could be triangulated, the greater the degree of validity”.

In this study, the triangulation approach (as shown in Figure 27) amounted to the synthesis of the General Manager’s interviews, secondary documents and questionnaires per case as recorded in a primary narrative. After this, the cases were compared in order to formulate a synthesised understanding.

![Figure 27: Triangulation](image)

Furthermore, by recognising the fact that bias would not be totally removed, the focus should be on its likely impact (Saunders et al. 2007:149). From a case study perspective, the narrative forms the foundation of the recorded information, therefore all relevant information needs to be accurately and logically sequenced and circumstances having no bearing on the situation should be omitted (Remenyi et al. 1998:169-170).

4.4.2 Validity

Validity from the interpretivist perspective is concerned with how well the research method investigated “what it intends to do” and to “what extent the
researcher has gained access to the informant’s knowledge and meaning” (Remenyi, 1998:115). Furthermore, validity, according to Remenyi (1998:115) who cites Gummesson (1991),

“…who refers to validity as a good fit between theory and reality… the researcher can triangulate a study in such a way as to draw upon multiple evidence- collections methods and use multiple informants and cases in order to demonstrate such a fit between theory and reality”.

Qualitative research is concerned with achieving a congruent understanding between the researcher, his/her informants, and the phenomena involved in the search for research credibility (Barbour, 2008:44). This required the researcher to demonstrate that his/her research design accurately identified and described the phenomenon under investigation. To augment validity of qualitative studies requires discussion of various authors’ strategies:

- According to Lee and Lings (2008:236-238) the researcher needed to show the validity of data generation and his/her interpretation thereof. In order to generate validated data the concern would be focussed on how appropriate the specific research method was for answering the research question and for providing explanations. In this study:
  - To ensure appropriate data a mapping was done to construct possible questions (for both interview schedules and questionnaires) and to indicate their plausible contribution in answering the research question (refer Appendix C).
o Semi-structured interviews were assumed to be a valid data generation tactic as it enabled detailed description of informants’ views. These views amounted to firstly, the Commander’s understanding of the Commander’s Appreciation and secondly, of the General Manager’s view of his/her role in the intent formulation process. In addition, the informants’ transcripts were verified by means of recordings by the researcher, in order to ensure that the evidence provided was accurately transcribed.

o A questionnaire was adopted as a valid data generation tactic, as it extracted evidence from the target group\(^\text{12}\) in order to confirm the staffs’ opinions of the General Manager’s role in the formulation of strategic intent.

o The validity of the interpretation was concerned with how convincing the data analysis process was and the transparency of the researcher’s interpretations. The validity interpretations were enhanced due to considerable care taken during the inputs of the informants and then triangulating evidence into primary narratives. Further reflection on the evidence provided a higher order understanding. Furthermore, the research design was transparent and documented in detail. All interpretation and arguments were supported by direct quotations from informants or referenced to other evidence sources.

\(^{12}\) The target group for the questionnaire is made up of Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisor and Other.
• Various authors suggested the usefulness of internal and external validity when considering the qualitative studies. (Lee & Lings, 2008:194-195; Saunders et al. 2007:137; Remenyi, 2009) in this study:
  
  o Internal validation was enhanced by adopting a constant comparative method and recognising the importance of deviant cases in acquiring a greater understanding of theory development.
  
  o External validation was improved through triangulation. Efforts made to ensure external validity involved data triangulation through the inclusion of various evidence sources, numerous informants and using multiple cases.

4.4.3 Reliability

According to Lee and Lings (2008:210) reliability is made up of an external and internal component:

“Internal reliability is not really relevant to a single – researcher studies, as it refers to whether different researchers agree about the same piece of data”.

“External reliability essentially refers to whether the study could be replicated by other researchers, which is a complicated idea in qualitative research, as it depends so heavily on the context and the research”.

Furthermore Remenyi’s (1998:115) view was that it was important to,

“…point out that since with non-positivist research the concern is to investigate the manifestation of a particular issue in a particular setting, the conditions under which a study has been conducted would be difficult to reproduce”.

In addition Remenyi (1998:115) cited Marshall and Rossman, “who advocate that rather than pretend that research conditions can be replicated, it is much better to accept the particularistic nature of research and follow good practise guidelines…”

Reliability from an interpretivist perspective is concerned with the researcher showing that he/she has not invented or misrepresented data or been careless in data recoding or analysis (Lee & Lings, 2008:67). Various authors (Lee & Lings, 2008:67; Remenyi, 1998:116; Saunders, 2007:159) have provided suggestions to the researcher on how to enhance reliability:

- By providing lucid procedures that were followed in the research that led to the findings,

- By reflection of his/her interpretations constantly as part of the iterative approach,

- By ensuring that all informants have sufficient opportunity to discuss their experiences, and

- By supporting interpretations with evidence and offering a balanced perspective.

This study addressed these requirements. All data was stored in easily retrievable formats and decisions were administered.
4.4.4 Generalisability

The concept of generalisability can be seen as a key part of the debate between positivist and non-positivist research traditions. Saunders et al. (2007:598) hold the view that generalisability was:

“...the extent to which the findings of a research study are applicable to other settings”.

Generalisability, in qualitative research, according to Remenyi et al. (1998:116) cited Gummesson (1991:79), who

“...argues that qualitative research is less concerned with the fact that good qualitative research should enable one to attain an understanding of organisational process”.

Furthermore, Remenyi et al. (1998:117) view transferability as something that,

“...refers to external validity and is dependent upon the researcher stating the theoretical parameters of the research setting being investigated which ties into a broader case making clear the specific organisational processes about which generalisations will be made”.

However, because of the nature of individuals and organisations it is not unreasonable to expect that some findings may be transferable to other organisations as suggested by Lee and Lings (2008:68) that from,

“...an interpretive research, it is quite possible to make some attempt to consider how likely it is that your results could occur in similar and different situations and
whether there were key issues which could affect the occurrence of similar events”.

According to Remenyi et al. (1998), a detailed understanding of the issues in a particular case could form the basis for a better understanding of those issues in other similar settings. Transferability to other settings depended on:

- Linking the setting of the context of the findings with that of the other company’s context where it will be applied.
- The researcher needed to provide detailed description of the context and phenomena so as to enable others to assess the finding’s transferability.
- The researcher needed to provide detailed descriptions of the context and phenomena so as to enable others to assess the finding’s transferability.

This study provided detailed descriptions from which it could be inferred that the finding and model may be transferable to other organisations.

4.5 THE IMPORTANCE OF ETHICS

Ethical aspects, according to Saunders et al. (2007:153), amount to obtaining access to organisations and people, clarifying confidentiality and identifying consequences.

- Approval for access was applied for from management by the researcher.
- The discussion’s with the General Managers, in order to outline who would be potential informants, and to state the research purpose in terms of participating risks and the benefits.
• Confidentiality referred to avoiding attributing comments to research participants in written reports and in oral examinations. This was associated with guarantees of anonymity which required that participants’ identity was not known outside the limits of the research study.

• Consequences refer to likely risks (escalating into issues) and also to benefits of participation.

To ensure the integrity of the research and the researcher, the above guidelines were narrowly complied with and each and every interviewee signed a voluntary consent form, spelling out the expectations, confidentiality and participation that could be expected to arise (refer Appendix P). The purpose of the collection of evidence and data management procedures were clearly outlined. Each informant’s anonymity was respected and guaranteed.

4.6 CONCLUSION

The selected research design as depicted in Chapter three’s application commenced from an interpretivist paradigm, within a predominately qualitative research approach. The purposive sampling provided appropriate cases where data was collected and analysed, resulting in primary and higher order narratives. The transparency and evaluation of the research was ensured in terms of validity, reliability and generalisability as important steps in confirming the research findings. The discussion on the methodology in this chapter has led to the compilation of the primary and higher order narratives.
5. CHAPTER 5: THE COMMANDERS’ COMMENTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The research question focus is “to assess whether the Commander’s Appreciation in the Military also prevails in the Business context”. This requires a trustworthy analysis of the Commander’s Appreciation and the breakdown thereof into core elements. This will then provide a foundation from which key themes can be determined and categorised in order to develop a useful research instrument for the collection of evidence of the participating cases.

My intention was to use my own experiences (of 28 years) as a Commander within the Military as the foundation for the interpretation and itemisation of the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) Commander’s Appreciation into core elements. This approach would not have been sufficiently objective, and would not have supported the academic rigours of objectivity placed on the researcher. The researcher’s curiosity regarding the applicability of the research on how the USA Commander’s and the UK Commander’s Appre ciation were conducted, provided an opportunity to attempt the integration of concepts. In favour of greater objectivity I opted to talk to experienced Commanders who had been trained on the South Africa Army Commanders appreciation, the USA and UK Command and staff courses in order to gain further insights in the “safety” of the greatest possible academic detachment.

5.2 THE SAMPLE

Although the SANDF Commander’s Appreciation was the foundation, it had its origins in the USA Commander’s Appreciation and Campaign Design and the UK’s Operational Estimate Process. In the endeavours to formulate an integrated perspective, selected Officers who had been involved with the SANDF Commander’s Appreciation as author,
lecturer, Directing Staff, Senior Directing Staff and operational practitioners were interviewed. The selection of the participants was purposeful in order to provide individuals who would be likely to enhance the South African, United States of America and United Kingdom perspectives, in both operational and administrative spheres. Although the sample was small, it was varied in terms of insight and understanding of members who had applied the Commander’s Appreciation in combat operations as well as in day-to-day situations. The survey included Officers with experience in the following fraternities: Special Forces, Airborne, Artillery, Technology Training and Technology Support.

The two aspects which they all had in common were the fact that they had been successful in the internalisation of the conceptual thought process as a capacity for problem solving at the operational level of war, as well as and the institutionalisation of the Commander’s Appreciation process within their organisations. During the interviews the following questions were asked by the researcher:

- Explain the role of the campaign planning process?
- What was the role of the review of the situation?
- What was your understanding of the role of the military strategic analysis?
- What were the core elements of the military strategic analysis?
- What was your understanding of conceptual factor analysis?
- Are general factors unique?
- How are conceptual factors determined and by whom?
- What was your understanding of the formulation of a concept?
• What was the role of the operational concept?

• What was the role of the commander’s briefing?

• Who was responsible to communicate the commander’s brief?

• What was communicated during the commander’s brief and to whom?

These questions provided the opportunity to establish a common level of understanding and the interrogation of various aspects pertaining to the Commander’s Appreciation with regard to approach, design, intention and application. In order to synthesise the information that was generated by these questions, use was made of an adapted grounded theory approach to analyse the interview transcripts (refer to Appendices E, F, G, H and I, for transcripts of military officers’ interviews). This chapter could be seen as the primary narrative of the interviews collected from the Commanders.

5.3 THE INSIGHTS OF THE COMMANDERS

An intriguing position the consideration of operational (war) narratives as well as a consequence arose during the commanders’ inclination to intertwine conceptual thinking, experience, creativity, innovation and technology seamlessly in order to acquire his/her own understanding of the context within which the military problem resided. This led to the identification of the following key themes as indicated in the table below:
5.4 THE DISCUSSION OF THE THEMES

The result of the survey has shown that the extraction made, would serve as an acceptable departure point for the establishment of relevant research instruments. The key themes were critical output for the actual research instrument development and were fundamental to the next phase of data collection. It was deemed appropriate to discuss the principal themes of the Commanders’ insights that made up the core elements of the Military Commander’s Appreciation interpretation.

5.4.1 Theme 1: Interpretation of Strategic Guidance

Conceptual thinking was recurrently reported by the informants as the most important issue for Commanders in their endeavour to decipher the strategic level direction.

“…conceptualising can be seen as the instrument through which reality is understood…”.

(Heidi Gunter)

The capacity for this type of conceptual thinking was evident in the commanders who could see and understand the necessity for a paradigm shift, long before others did. In
addition to those commanders who were able to visualise internally the paradigm shifts, its implications and benefits for the military within their external environments. In order to make this happen, the commander made use of the “Commander’s Appreciation” to facilitate his/her cognitive processes.

“…the Commander’s Appreciation to me was almost a natural thing…”. (John Brooks)

The informants further provided the following insights on recognising conceptual thinking within natural commanders:

“I am a firm believer that the commander’s appreciation is a natural thing for only a few people and a nightmare for the rest” … “I would say 5-10% of the officers have the natural ability that needs some unlocking and training, the rest will never adopt the paradigm”. (Pierre Franken)

“Don’t be under the impression that everyone can internalise this methodology [of conceptual problem solving], you would be mistaken… this internalisation is one of the contributing factors that differentiates the commander from a staff officer”. (Heidi Gunter)

• The commander apparently realised that for comprehension of these changes would take place within the intangible sphere and for implementation within the tangible sphere.

• The commander would have to be able to master both the tangible and intangible spheres in his/her undertakings in order to establish areas of interest and influence.

• The commander’s perspicacity would provide stability to and support for him/her to help deal with the turbulence of unexpected circumstances as they arose.

• The commander continuously scanned the conflict area(s), the governmental and interdepartmental landscapes as well as their associated relationships, both globally
and locally, looking at the past, present and future. The focus here would be on his/her ability to interpret the strategic imperatives that resided within the intangible domain into tangible objectives for execution at the tactical level.

- Conceptual thinking would help the commander to proactively align his/her efforts in order to meet the strategic challenges. This would make painful transitions such as reorganisation and regrouping of resources both seamless and acceptable for interpretation.

However, this conceptual thinking alone would not deliver on substantive problem identification or the solution of such problems. It would however activate the commander’s recognition of patterns of complexity encountered in the military context for problem structuring. In order to be comprehensive, the commander needed to blend conceptual thinking, complexity and cognitive strategic decision-making with his/her intention of constructing the problem appropriately.

“Let me be blunt at this point and put the Military Strategic Analysis (MSA) into perspective. It is the cornerstone of the whole commander’s appreciation. If you don’t get this correct, if the problem is not identified and the positioning of that problem is not done properly, the rest of the analysis will be questionable and possibly futile in order to determine clear understandable results which are to be achieved. The commander’s interpretation of the MSA would reveal his [her] primary problem. This cannot be done by anybody else but the commander as this will provide insight into what the mission should be …” (Heidi Gunter)
In spite of this, problems resided within the “Fog of War” therefore the commander must focus to overcome this uncertainty by creating a paradigm shift from an attritional to a manoeuvrist state of mind. This paradigm transition functions at the operational level of war. The informants suggested the following line of reasoning in order to identify a commander with the ability to apply flexibility of mind or the manoeuvrist theory:

“…Complexity is significant to commander as a characteristic of operational problem…

Operational problems are regarded as discrepancy between the state of affairs as it is and the state of affairs as it ought to be, that compels military action to resolve it …” (Tradoc pam 525-5-500)

- The commander displays a superior ability to make sense of the changing environment and its interpretation and provides his/her understanding in a simple and concise manner.

- The commanders should have prepared himself/herself to contribute to a strategic planning process in order to be able to shed light on new opportunities or problem areas within his/her particular area of interest and influence.

- As a rule, the commander exhibits intelligent choices about where, what, how and ‘what thereafter’ with respect to the deployment of resource.

- The commander demonstrates an exceptional ability to turn his/her insights into actions to achieve the correct aim.

---

13 Holmes, T.M. (2007:142). Fog of War- the term seeks to capture adequately the uncertainty regarding own capabilities, adversary capabilities, adversary intent during engagement operation, campaigns. The term is ascribed to the Prussian military analyst Carl von Clausewitz “ who wrote “ the greatest uncertainty of all data in war is particular difficulty, because all actions, must to a certain extent, be planned in a mere twilight, which in addition not infrequently – like the effects of fog or moonshine- give to things exaggerated dimensions and unnatural appearance

14 Department of the Army, Headquarters USA Army Training and Doctrine Command
• The commander displays an ability to align the differences in output of the governmental and military planning at the different levels of war, in addition to the importance of the links between these levels.

• The commander’s internalisation of the environment provides strategic decisions and direction for partnerships/ alliances, acquisitions, additions to core competencies and intellectual property/knowledge for coalition benefits.

• The commander develops strategy, incorporating timing and positioning of resources in order to activate the military’s industry capabilities and acumen for acquiring new military means.

• The commander displays a realistic understanding of the implementation of his/her mission and vision. He/she can map each team member’s abilities and talents for implementation. This approach empowers and energises the team to exceed their potential and to ensure delivery by their efforts.

“The commander, leader or boss is like the conductor of the orchestra … a symphony orchestra … if he does not conduct right, everybody can read their music and play their music at their own time and it will not be a concert [symphony]... it will not be synchronised and it will not sound good … but that commander will direct his people in order to tell them you will play this harp and you will play this violin now and whatever ... this becomes a concert [symphony] and this is integrated and synchronised music …. so it is a synthesising of all the different elements [warriors gifts, capacity and competencies] … as in the orchestra by the commander…” (Andre Coetzee)

• The commander created for him/herself an ongoing cycle of learning, focusing, aligning and implementation. This cycle is continually repeated by the commander in
his/her mind, as he/she internalises and continually improves his/her understanding of the environment through interpretation.

The commander’s convergence of his/her interpretation of the environment into a concept of operations will demonstrate his/her capacity for conceptual thinking, problem structuring and cognitive ability at the operational level of war. Furthermore, all the informants found it to be crucial for the commanders’ concept of operation needs refinement by the military campaign planners (his/her staff). In order for this to transpire, the informants’ departure points were to place the campaign planning process into perspective within the military.

“The campaign planning process is the mechanism through which the military solves problems, big ones, small ones and complicated ones … warfare is not for the faint-hearted … but its’ solving of problems is unique … thus making the campaign planning process an acquired skill …” (Heidi Gunter)

Furthermore “… and they come forward with their plans and ideas; the whole time - what you as commander is doing is evaluating what they are saying against what you [commander] have analysed in your mind and that is in my opinion exactly what a commander’s appreciation is all about…” (John Brooks)

• The planning process is referred to as the Campaign Planning Process, of which there is one fundamental step for activation of the Commander’s Appreciation.

“The Commander’s Appreciation …is his/her [the commander’s] product, the embodiment of his/her [the commander’s] understanding of the relevant military situation and his/her [the commander] mastery of operational art.”15. This will provide the commander with the opportunity to establish favourable conditions in the external environment. For that reason,

---

15 Malan (Col) JD. 1996. The Commander Appreciation at the Operational Level of War. Pg (ii)
this process cannot be delegated. It is to be done by the commander him/herself and nobody else.

The informants were unrelenting, that the layout, techniques and methods of the Commander’s Appreciation for the operational commander and the tactical commander are alike, however:

- The operational level commander’s appreciation focus is more on the holistic picture and sequencing of battles for effect as opposed to the tactical commander’s focus on the detailed execution of a battle.

- This supported the notion that the Commander’s Appreciation process is not for all within the military. This was alluded to by majority of the informants. This led to the question of whether there was an equivalent for the commander’s appreciation within the business environment and whether the commander and the CEO could be juxtaposed. It is proposed by the informants that the commander’s appreciation almost certainly could also assist the CEO, in so far as the commander could be equated with a CEO.

  “…so I think there is a really good place for the Commander’s Appreciation in business … one could call it the business leader’s appreciation in business…” (John Brooks)

  “…absolutely, there was no synchronisation of efforts, with planning resources and prioritisation … everybody was doing their own thing… we needed to do a commander’s appreciation…to understand” (Andre Coetzee)

  “I think that it was critical that there should be a similar process in the private sector to ensure proper analysis and guidance [for] companies in the private sector [by the CEO] …” (Chris Serfontein), supporting the research question of investigating whether the commander’s appreciation would prevail in business.
The informants’ emphasis of the commander’s appreciation was on the holistic understanding of the operational picture with reliance on the commander’s judgement, instinct, intuition and creativity.

5.4.2 Theme 2: Resilient Visionary

The informants made it clear that in war it is the “the man [woman]” that matters - this man/woman being the commander, the person that will spark the decisive difference. Commanders at all levels must have qualities worthy of leadership. The following leadership qualities were identified by the informants.

- The commander must have initiative, if not; he has to orchestrate the situation, his resources, so that he regains the initiative.
- The commander must have the drive to get things done and the momentum to exploit the opportunity on offer, within the situation.
- The commander must have character and ability which will inspire confidence in subordinates.
- Above all, the commander must have moral courage, resolution and determination which will enable him to stand firm when success hangs in the balance.

Harry Truman memoirs “…a leader is a man [woman] who has the ability to get other people to do what they don’t want to do and like it… Furthermore Field Marshall Montgomery’s defined leadership as ¹⁶ “The capacity and the will to rally men and women to a common purpose and the charter which inspires confidence”

• The greatest test of the commander is his ability to inspire confidence in the operational plan, even when inwardly he/she might not be too sure about the outcome.

• The commander must be a good judge of men/women and be able to select the right men/women and place them, in the right place at the right time.

• The commander must monitor and maintain his/her own morale carefully.

• The commander’s passion needs to emit a strong sense of urgency.

• A battle is in effect a contest between two wills – that of the own forces commander and that of the enemy commander.

• It is absolutely vital that a senior commander should keep him/herself from becoming immersed in the details – he/she should be spending many hours in quiet thought and reflection in thinking out the major problems.

• In battle the commander has to think how to defeat the enemy – this was to be done on the basis of a holistic picture ensuring that he/she is not sidetracked. This subscribes to the notion that the military commander dominates the events which surround him/her. Once he/she lets events get the better of him/her, he/she will lose the confidence of his/her staff and when that happens he/she ceases to be of value as a commander.

• A commander, whose daily life is spent considering details, has no time for comprehensive thought and reflection and therefore cannot make a sound plan – this principle applies equally in governmental and corporate life.
As stated by Field-Marshall Montgomery (Montgomery, 1958:87) … *Here lies a man [woman] who died of exhaustion brought about by preoccupation with detail. He never had the time to think because he was always reading papers. He saw every tree, but never the whole wood*. Who formulates strategy?

All the informants pointed out that the commander could be seen as an architect for the development of military strategy. This gives rise to four questions:

- What is military strategy?
- Who develops it?
- How is its relevance determined?
- Is this a concern for everyone?

“… *a Military Strategy according to Basil Liddell-Hart the art of distributing and applying military means [resources] to fulfil the ends of policy*” this was enhanced by Carl von Clausewitz with his view that “the employment of battles, gain the ends of the war”. This posed the question regarding the role of the Commander in the development of such a strategy.

- It was suggested by the informants that the commander’s role in strategy development should be seen as creative art. This art was based on intellectual flexibility within the commander’s frame of mind. In the military, this art is referred to as the operational art of war.

“Operational art is the skilful employment of military forces to attain strategic and/ or operational objectives through the design, organisation, integration and conduct of theatre strategies, campaign, major operations and battles. Furthermore, operational art translates combatant command strategy and theatre design into operational design and ultimately,
tactical action by integrating the key activities of all levels of war within the theatre” (US Army Field Manual, FM100-7).

- In a more practical view, the informants suggested that this “creative art” for a successful commander, articulated vision and had measurable objectives. However, for the transition of a vision into measurable objectives the commander made use of the Commander’s Appreciation:

  “On the operational level the goal was not to kill the enemy, but to provide opportunity for commander on the tactical level to kill the enemy. Your operational objective was to put the enemy in harm’s way…” (Gen Glen Otis FM 100-7)

  o The commander uses the Commander’s Appreciation, to develop his/her understanding of the situation through analysis.

  o Based on the analysis, the commander develops a hypothesis to the problem as a concept of operations in which his/ her intention and vision is materialised.

  “The commander’s initial mental analysis of the problem and what has to be done to solve it … a concept is a mental representation of the commander’s intent…” (John Brooks)

  o This can be seen as a conceptual representation of the commander’s mental picture using creative art through cognitive thought.

Furthermore, the informants proposed the following as required core individual attributes of the commander: cognitive abilities, principles, social skills, capability and problem solving.
• These attributes were supported by intuition, the ability to exercise judgement, instinct and creativity.

• These attributes would hold up the notion that the commander was a strategist who was driven by a predisposition towards action.

• The commander would benefit personally from completing the Commander’s Appreciation cycle of analysis. This would provide him/her with a solid understanding of the situation for action.

• In order for action to be imbedded, the commander was given an opportunity to blend his/her experience into the resultant operational concept.

• The commander’s concept was the first step towards the activation of the campaign planning process.

“The role of the operational concept is the challenge set by the commander to his/ her operational planning staff. To identify the weakness and strengths of the operational concept and accordingly eradicate the weakness and exploit the strengths …these are on the road to formulating the optimised plan… by using this concept as the cornel from which to depart…” (John Brooks)

The campaign planning process would provide the staff with the opportunity to convert the commander’s concepts and guidelines into options.

“The concept interpretation and meaning was triggered within the minds of the people [staff] - it did not help to give your staff exactly what had to be done… there had to be room for creative thinking by the staff …as opposed by military orders which tells subordinates exactly what to do… the concept must still give the planning staff the opportunity to decide on the “how”… possible options to address the “what” of the concept…” (Heidi Gunter)
These options would be presented for approval/rejection to the commander by the chief of staff. The approved/accepted option would be converted into a course of action (strategy) which would be translated into orders, instructions and directives for implementation.

According to Patel (2006: 106) “...those leaders with a preconceived notion towards action appeared to be decisive and have more chance of retaining leadership. Those with a bias towards action, sought positions that required action. This being so, action was to build on a solid foundation for maximum delivery of results”. This led to the realisation of a “can do” and a “can’t do” community.

The informants postulated that the commander’s actions would have to be feasible and acceptable as military contributions to the attainment of governmental objectives. For that reason,

- The commander needed to influence internal and external groups of people towards a specific result or an effect that leads and contributes to a specific outcome.
- The commander had to be recognised by his/her capacity, capability and competence, clear communications and a persisted commitment to deliver military objectives. Is this true for all situations? No, it is suggested that commanders in one situation are not necessarily suitable commanders in another situation.
- What was then the suitability factor for a command assignment? Focus, is seen as the pivotal suitability factor by the informants, thus making the commander’s focus of the utmost importance.

What would the commander focus on in order to enable the attainment of interdepartmental objectives? The commander focused on his/her comprehension of the establishment of the “big picture”. He/she takes decisions on the sequence of
military contributions in order to realise an effect for the achievement of governmental strategic objectives. Therefore the commander needed to be surrounded by people who took care of the details alluding toward the existence of staff or a team. What was this team or staff’s contributions?

- To overcome the meddling in the staff functions by the commander he/she is to demonstrate restraint, trust, courage, persistence, tenacity, determination and synergistic communications skills, as this will bring out the same qualities in the group.

“In spite of the recommendations made by the staff, you as the commander will have to consider all the factors and then get to an option that is feasible, but will surprise your opponents…” (Pierre Franken). The decision-making is within the mandate of the commander.

- The elimination of the interference will only be possible if the commander concentrates on the commander’s appreciation and allows the staff to validate his concept via the campaign planning process.

- The commander needed to energise his/her team and organisation in order to achieve success by example and not by position.

- Even though the decision-making resided with the commander it did not give him/her the right to impede the creativity within the staff team, even if it was unintentional. The commander needed to use his/her expertise as a starting point to encourage dialogue between all levels of decision-making.

- The commander’s brief was the culmination of his/her analysis, which would activate the campaign planning process, allowing the staff to prepare options for presentation to the commander to enable him/her to take a decision.
• The informants emphasised, that the guidelines for planning and implementation will embody the commander’s creativity and intent.

• The commander has to activate his/her capacity to listen to his/her staff and observe their actions.

• The commander has to establish processes and transparency in decision-making to articulate his/her values and visions clearly but not to impose them.

• The commander has to be highly visible and uses the chain of command to get the job done.

• The commander who is appointed to a command/managerial position has the right to command and enforce obedience by virtue of the authority of the position. However, he/she must possess adequate personal attributes to match his/her authority acceptability. Because authority is only potentially available to him/her, will the staff allow him/her to gain cooperation from others by means of persuasion or control of reward?

Informants highlighted that the staff’s assistance within validation of the commander’s concept during the campaign planning process was essential.

• The commander needs to have the ability to hold disparate ideas in his/her mind at the same time and still be able to function.

• These disparate ideas could be seen as two sides of the same coin such as the enemy actions, the own force reaction, until own force can regain the initiative and exploit it.

• The commander could achieve this within a mental set of cognitive processes.
5.4.3 Theme 3: Risk Taking

The majority of the informants held the view that the commander, as risk taker, opened himself/herself to opportunities. This could be equated to entrepreneurship within a business.

According to Zimmerer and Scarborough (2008:5) “…entrepreneur is one who creates a new business in the face of risk and uncertainty for the purpose of achieving profit and growth by identifying significant opportunities and assembling the necessary resources”. The military commander faces risking life and uncertainty with every battle in order to attain the strategic objectives. His/her exploitation of the environment, by identifying significant opportunities, would lead to him/her gaining the initiative in the theatre of operations and sequence forces.

- Linking the business concept of entrepreneurship to the military, could be seen as exploitation of opportunities.

“I was in a conventional unit … Airborne Forces are conventional units, but typically speaking when we are out [in the theatre of operation]… on an operation or a training exercise in the field we are very much an entrepreneurial organisation… decisions are made on the fly …as the opportunity arose and one often does not have a plan for that [following action] … but, because my thinking was flexible and creative versus the more conventional, accepted norm… I was able to act and exploit the opportunity as it arose…” (John Brooks)

- When posing the question ‘for what end would this be feasible within the military’, one informant explained it very aptly, when he stated:

“…for me, success meant access to opportunity, as this will destabilise the opposing forces...” (Pierre Franken)
How would opportunity be exploited within the military?

- The military’s approach to opportunity can at times be seen as the decisive point between winning and losing the battle.

- Opportunity provided own forces an opening to gain the initiative within the area of operations and at the same time strike at the foundation of the enemy. This kept the commander thinking and his/her head in the game.

- Do not ever underestimate the magnitude of the undertaking of exploiting opportunity - you cannot handle it by the seat of your pants. Contingency planning is essential. Make sure that sufficient resources are devoted to planning and execution of the plan.

5.4.4 Theme 4: Personal Problem Solving Process

According to the informants, the commander was defined by how he/she responded in a crisis. The worse the crisis, the more important the commander’s problem solving ability became. Furthermore, this was relevant to any crisis, whether personal or professional. There were key beliefs in problem solving that a leader should put into action. The majority of informants provided the following “building blocks” as the foundation for problem solving:

According to Sir Winston Churchill’s study of Marlborough (Gray 2006: 153) “…the success of a Commander does not arise from following rules or models. It consists in an absolute new comprehension of the dominant facts of the situation, at the time and all the forces at work; every great operation of war is unique. What is wanted is a profound appreciation of the actual events. There is no surer road to disaster than to imitate the plans of bygone heroes and fit them to novel situations”. This meant that the commander was not relevant and was planning for the last war.
• Problem solving was a higher order cognitive process that the commander would use to identify and shape the problem. This would lead to decision-making which could be regarded as an outcome of the mental process (cognitive process) leading to a selection of a course of action from a number of options.

• In the military, the problem solving process for the commander was referred to as the Commander’s Appreciation. This led to real-world problem solving for the commander. This real-world is not just limited to his/her combat side, but included administrative and interdepartmental dimensions as well.

• Complex problems also known as “wicked problems” necessitated the military to start studying problems on the operational level as opposed to the tactical level. This provided the insights on complex problems, which were seen as difficult. These difficult problems had characteristics of their own – such as, lack of clarity of the situation, multiple goals, complexity (large numbers of interrelations and decisions), and dynamic unpredictability.

The resolving of problems requires a direct attack on each of these building blocks. However, according to some of the informants, problems could be addressed by the following lines of attack:

• Finding a solution to the problem in a simulated environment before applying it to the real world provided the commander with an option to refine and institutionalise the plan within an implementation environment together with all the role players. This would support mission command at the lower command levels as it reinforced the desired end-state and it would provide the commander with flexibility.

“I am a believer that you get leaders at all levels and we were fortunate enough in the South African Military to be exposed to independent [mission command] leadership very early
on...in the operational area … let loose as an 18 year old section leader… so what did I have to do … I had to make an appreciation... and that is nothing other than a commander’s appreciation at a really minor level… ” (John Brooks)

- The commander and his team suggested a large number of solutions or ideas combining and developing them until an optimum was found.

- The commander broke down large complex problems into smaller solvable problems.

- The commander provided possible explanations of the problem. In addition he/she tried to prove the explanation’s feasibility, in some contexts. They would either disprove the assumption or improve on its’ development.

- Solutions were first approached directly or creatively by the commander. Then the planning team was allowed to synthesise, seemingly non-matching characteristics of different options, into a higher order solutions - something totally new.

- Assessing the output and interaction of an entire system and transforming the problem into another problem for which a solution exists.

- Employing existing ideas or adapting existing solutions before choosing an action at each step in order to move closer to the goal.

What permeated these possible lines of attack was that the problem solving process differed across knowledge domains and levels of expertise of the commander. Consequently, the commander required a broad range of skills in order to contribute to problem solving within the modern military warfare, modern economy and technology. The informants indicated that the military workplace was changing, as were the skills
that commanders had to have in order to be able to adapt with the times. The commander was seen as the change agent in order for this to happen:

“… even in the majority of instances in the Army, where I can recall significant changes it was because of strong leaders, strong individuals; obviously they all had support bases that could supplement the appreciation, but one needed a strong leader to say this is where we have to go and then actually have the guts to formulate, communicate and implement … so the commander's appreciation, in that sense, is critical because the individual had to determine where we had to go…” (Pierre Franken)

• The commander had to have sharpened his/her ability to think through problems and surmountable challenges in a state of flux. This was only possible if he/she was exercised in the commander’s appreciation and he/she could inherently apply the process.

• It was very important for the commander to focus on his/her subordinates’ abilities to compute at higher levels of sophistication. This assisted with developing sub-unit commanders' capacities to step up to the platform, if and when necessary, in order to put mission command into effect and to maintain the momentum of the commander’s thrust.

• The commander’s creative problem solving skill was critical to the unit’s and operation’s success. Therefore he/she needed to institute a structured approach to problem identification, analysis and resolution. Conversely he/she invested in solid personal management skills of all participants.

• Subordinate unit commanders expressed their ideas orally, understood verbal instructions, made fewer mistakes, adjusted more easily to change and more readily absorbed new ideas than those who did not.
“…problem solving skills include the ability to recognise and define problems, invent and implement solutions and track and evaluate results…” (Malan, 1996:1-2)

Virtually every informant made problem solving skills an obligatory for all leaders, irrespective of the level in the military environment. These skills were interwoven into the fabric of the unit. This would ensure that we planned as we fought and we fought as we planned. In order to do this, the commander and his/her staff needed to have a clear understanding of the context in which the military problem resided.

5.4.5 Theme 5: Placing Relevant Aspects into Context

According to the informants, the “context” could be seen as a likely framework of perspectives in a specific set of circumstances where the military problem resided.

“The review of the situation is to familiarise oneself, as the commander, to exactly what the problem is that has to be dealt with…which needs to be solved and then identify all the factors that form part of the problem…” (John Brooks)

In order to grasp where military problems dwelt, the commander made use of lessons learnt and the dependable technique of SWOT analysis. This technique placed relevant aspects into context for the commander, as a departure point or a foundation on which the next set of actions were launched. This was adequate for the tactical and higher tactical levels of war, but not for the operational level of war.

“…the aim of environmental scan was to clearly define at what level one was operating…”

(John Brooks)

Furthermore, the informants indicated that with the sophistication of modern warfare, a paradigm shift of combat participation was necessary, which resulted in the introduction of the operational level of war. The outcome of this shift revealed a need for the
commander to access additional and relevant information. This access was compounded by technology which provided endless volumes of information.

“…you needed to work through systematically and to place parameters on the vast amounts of information out there … the military perspective allowed you to look at the external areas of interest, areas of influence as the first set of parameters developed ….related to the military problem …this will overcome the overloading of the commander with irrelevant information…” (Heidi Gunter)

If the volume of information was not managed its effect would overwhelm the commander and hinder his/her decision-making cycle, rendering him/her incapacitated to act. The commander had to institute a process to define the appropriate data that needed to be gathered in order to place the problem in the right circumstances. The majority of the informants subscribed to the following insights in order to place the military problem in context:

- The commander had to develop his/her understanding and background pertaining to the military problem by compiling a data pack. The data pack was a collection of relevant information made up of facts, which needed to be analysed in order to refine his/her understanding of the circumstances in which the military problem resided. These were the source documents for the review of the situation.

- The environment was to be demarcated by the commander into an area of influence and area of interest. This would ensure that the commander could focus his/her attention on the area of influence while keeping cognisance of the impact in the area of interest.

- The commander was to provide an explanation of the circumstances that led to the military problem, in both the tangible and intangible dimensions. This in turn, would
provide the link between the political end-state and the military objectives that needed to be executed at the tactical level in order to attain the governmental strategic imperative.

- Although there was a link between the political environment and military environment, the commander’s focus would be on what effect he/she could bring to bear on the adversarial forces in the physical dimension, would disrupt his/her cohesion and “will to fight” in the psychological dimension, alluding to the use of the indirect approach to war.

The indirect approach was the brain child of Sir Basil Liddell Hart “where he proposed the opposite of a heavyweight fight. He proposed the avoidance of the most expected. The indirect approach proposes strategy and tactics which are indirect in all respects… indirect into direction, method, timing and psychology”. (Liddell Hart, 1946: xiv)

- The commander was to provide a framework in order to act as a category filter for the collecting of relevant information. In order to do this, the commander would have to identify relevant factors as the categories from which information would have to be gathered such as:
  
  - Regional determinants, governmental imperatives, economic consideration, law of armed conflict, media considerations both within the international and national spheres, non-governmental organisational activity in the both the areas of influence and interest and the involvement of paramilitary organisations.
  
  - The focus here was not on interpretation, but on collection of relevant information.
5.4.6 Theme 6: Shared Understanding of the Environment

The informants reaffirmed that “Shared Understanding” involved both people and artefacts.

“…bring one’s planning staff to a point where we’re all on the same level in terms of what the problem is …you have to deal with it so that there is no ambiguity… furthermore to ensure that everyone participating in the planning is at the same level in terms of knowledge of the problem at hand…” (John Brooks)

For this reason, commanding at the operational level of war was something of an art. The essence of the “art” centred on the commander’s ability to share his/her interpretation of the environment in a simple concise manner. This would be realised with the following insights as suggested by the informants:

According to William Hunt (Hussey 1994:185) shared understanding is: “A common sense notion is that shared understanding involves two or more people agreeing on ideas or appropriate actions.”

- The commander was to concentrate on using face to face meetings in order to foster mutual knowledge, beliefs and assumptions in the process of sharing.

- During actual work, the commander had to take note of the relevant factors involved in the shared understanding which could change - considering the scenario/contingency planning.

- The commander’s ability to prepare relevant information for use within the battle space. It was clear how referencing and clarification might have built an integrated or more abstract understanding.
The commander linked the effects of the guidance received from the military strategic authority as well as his/her awareness of the external environment in which his/her campaign/operation would be conducted.

The commander adjusted the foundation criteria to meet the current purpose, taking into account the strength of the evidence.

The commander used the information available in the common domain, both for presenting and accepting comments.

The commander provided evidence as often as possible to support the comprehension and awareness of the environment.

The commander activated official collaboration to emphasise efforts by the commander and the campaign planning team.

The commander occasionally “took the heat” for actions taken by his/her subordinates. The commander had to see this as a learning curve for both him/her and the subordinates and in the process reaffirmed the concept of mission command.

The interpretation of his/her analysis allowed the commander to determine the external environment within which he/she has to achieve his/her goals.

### 5.4.7 Theme 7: Establishing the Context of the Situation

The informants subscribed to the view that the main role player to set the context of the situation was the commander supported by his/her planning staff. The responsibility of this team in setting up the context amounted to the following:
• The gathering of relevant facts for the appraisal of the situation was to be driven by the Officer Commanding and vetted, verified and refined by the staff.

• The setting up of a process that would only register aspects of vital importance in order to minimise data overload of the team (and especially the commander) in order to establish a total awareness of the scope and nature of the military problem.

• Providing a clear understanding of the role of the military in support of the national policy in order to provide boundaries for the theatre of operations.

As an appointed commander who knew only too well that maintaining and attaining relevant information was the groundwork for any significant analysis, without the categorisation of applicable information, analysis could not be appropriately conducted, as it would not be focused. This led to the question – where did the commander/planning staff obtain their information and how was this sorted? According to the informants, while getting one’s hands on appropriate information, the following applied:

• Most of the information was formally supplied via the intelligence departments and informally through internal and personal research/liaison visits.

• On the whole the commanders/planning staff constructed a “data pack” from which to draw on, for their analysis. This data pack resided within the Intelligence Departments and was synonymous with a four-drawer cabinet in which each drawer represented a category such as ‘Own Forces’, ‘Opposition Forces’ (Adversaries), Battle Space’, filled with relevant facts pertaining to that operation.
• To ensure that the commander and the planning staff could conduct contingencies planning. Real in-time information contributions would be required in a steady stream, in any form from all participants, until the operation has been concluded.

• Relevance of information was in accordance with getting an understanding of the conflict.

It was stressed that the ultimate information would only be received in hindsight; therefore decision-making would have to take place based on the available information on hand at the time. That is why the data pack had to be kept updated and relevant with appropriate information as it would increase the decision-making cycle of the Commander (OODA).

5.4.8 Theme 8: Appropriate Contextual Parameters

The Commander was seen by the informants as a master problem solver, innovator and a team builder. In order to bring this to bear, the commander would have to display the ability to departmentalise or categorise the information. This could be seen as the establishment of the contextual parameters. The informants provided the following insights to already established contextual parameters:

• The commander had to understand when, where, what, who and what there-after, within the conflict. In order for this to take place he/she would identify relevant parameter categories.

• The commander’s skills determined the forces and factors that interfered with the organisation’s ability to overcome its problems.

• The commander was to provide the factors about which information could be collected in order to support constructive deliberation.
• Gathering of the correct and relevant information would be fundamental to the deliberations.

5.4.9 Theme 9: Deliberation Integration

According to the informants, deliberation is an art - a creative activity based on character, intellectual ability and mental power. This is the pivotal point of separation between command, at the operational or tactical levels of war.

“The conceptual analysis of the factors can be seen as the heart of the commander’s appreciation. It can be seen as the “acid test” of the commander’s understanding of the characteristics of the battlefield, for his intellectual ability to master vast amounts of information, his interpretation of the operational concepts and his mastery of operational art” (Malan, 1996: 1-2). Herein lay the art of planning at the operational level.

The focus would therefore be on the commander’s conceptual analysis in order to extract significant information for his/her interpretation in order to provide an innovative solution. The informants provided the following insights into factor deliberation:

“Conceptualising can be described as the instrument through which reality is understood … a convergent-divergent process which to a larger extent depends on creativity … provides the ability to quickly impose meaning on complex patterns…” (Malan, 1996: 2-4)

• The commander had the generic factors of strategic analysis, time and space, battle space, opposing forces, own forces and media to use for gathering facts.

“I think that you would have general factors such as enemy, weather etc [as a generic standard list] …I also think that you bring your standard list every time and then eliminate that which is obviously inappropriate … because I believe that ‘period of time’ in which the problem finds itself…will result in different [unique] general factors”. (John Brooks)
• However, the commander would have to decide if these generic factors were relevant and adequate for the current situation. If found to be inadequate he/she would have to provide additional factors for consideration.

  According to Col Franken “Conceptual factors are determined by the commander, because he first has to do his understanding of his campaign instruction that he received from his superiors by saying… ‘for me to be successful in this campaign I have to consider the following factors and I need to get answers from those factors’…”

• The commander should not see the factors for deliberation in isolation or silos but should realise the dynamic interaction between the factors.

• In order to ensure that the commander could build a holistic picture, the sequencing of the factors was essential. This sequencing needed to take place prior to his/her conceptual analysis of factors placing the rationale behind this sequencing on the added value list for the commander. The factor would answer a specific dimension and this would be demonstrated by generic factors.

  o Factor: Strategic Analysis (answers “Why/What”).

  o Factor: Time and space (answers “When”)

  o Factor: Battle-Space (answers “Where”)

  o Factor: Opposing Forces (answers “Who” identifies adversaries)

  o Factor: Own Forces (answers “With what”)

• The commander’s conceptual analysis of the factors would provide insight on the influence of the military problem within the contextual environment.
Analysis at this level by the commander amounted to selection of facts, deductions made about those facts and then conclusions drawn from the deductions. This would result in conclusions per factor, which in itself had limited client focussed/reduced meaning.

“A proper conclusion and main conclusion should contain as many of the W’s as possible ie: who, what, where, when and what thereafter. A conclusion without any W’s is simply not a conclusion, but merely a useless statement”. (Malan, 1996:2-3)

These conclusions were integrated and synthesised into a main conclusion for each particular factor.

All the main conclusions of the factors were synthesized into an integrated main conclusion.

Analysis of the factors led the commander to determine the “what” within the context of the military problem. This would provide the commander with insight into what needed to be done in order to achieve the desired end-state which the commander had defined during the initial strategic guidance.

Successful integration of the factors was a superior cognitive process requiring the ability of the commander to realise the intricate relationship between the different factors in order to blend into unity, which initially seemed to be unrelated.

The integration of the main conclusion was not a mere summary of previous main conclusions, but represented a crucially important, value-added synthesis of the total analysis up to then. It ultimately depicted the commander’s understanding of the external environment in which the
campaign would take place as well as his/her conceptual understanding of the internal environment relevant to the campaign accomplishments.

The commander had now attained the ability to see the operation unfold in his/her mind’s eye which was actually his/her hypothesis for the situation.

“Concepts are mental representations, which in this case emanate from the commander’s conceptual framework. ‘Concepts are mere abstractions’ from what is known through intuitive perception and in this case emanating from the commander’s experience, knowledge and skills…”. (John Brooks)

From this hypothesis, he/she would define a conceptual framework through which sufficient scope was allowed for subsequent planning. Since the hypothesis was not conveyed to anybody it remained in the mind of the commander for later use during the planning cycle when presentations were done by the planning staff, on options and courses of action which would be measured and validated against it.

5.4.10 Theme 10: Commander’s Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework was the commander’s expression of his/her intent, indicating “what” needed to be done in order to achieve the military strategic goal.

“The commander’s concept according to me is an expression of the commander’s will… in a nutshell the message that you convey to the people … so that they understand your intention… indicating what needs to be done to achieve the strategic military problem … and solve the primary problem as indicated by the commander during the MSA…”.

(Heidi Gunter)

In other words this was the commander’s proposed solution for the military problem. The conceptual framework according to the informants encompasses:
“A conceptual framework...is directly related to the display of superior military leadership by the commander through the fact that the concept is the instrument in his hand to convey his vision into the operation”. (Malan, 1996: 3-1)

- The commander’s ability to draw a picture with words was focused on his/her strategic vision in order to create understanding and support for what he/she intended. The conceptual framework:
  - Must include the campaign’s end-states which were broken up into intermediate end-states,
  - Had to be formulated within the realities of the battlefield and had to be in support of the higher commander’s intention,
  - Had a unique framework of desired results that would solve the specific military problem in the best possible way.

- The commander’s ability to create and provide guidelines for planning that result in implementation based on his/her strategic vision. This process would create scope, creative options to guide his/her planning staff with a confident hand and to foster the spirit of winning.

  “In finalising guidelines the commander must within the spirit of command initiative aim to define what must be achieved and not how... guidelines for implementation focusing on all staff involved with planning ... guidelines of planning to govern the planning process”. (Malan, 1996:3-4)

- The conceptual framework would become a permanent point of reference for the planning staff against which their intermediate and final planning results will have to
be measured. It needs to be analysed holistically in order to be understood. This needed to be prominently displayed throughout the planning process.

“A concept first provides a very broad framework as to how to solve a problem … you still don’t have any detail but you have a framework, on the “how” of the solution… and your key planner will have to use that as their baseline within which they have to plan …” (Pierre Franken)

5.4.11 Theme 11: Preparation for the Commander’s Briefing

The preparation of all the information in a briefing format is now at hand, although personal preferences may, to a large extent, dictate the format. It is about the information, according to the informants, as there is a limited time to present ideas. The brief has to be concise and to the point. The following suggestions were provided by the informants on how to select information for the brief:

“The fields that need to make up the briefing… commence with security orientation, salient points from the review of the situation, military strategic analysis, focusing on opposing and own forces concepts, critical success factors, mission constraints, guidelines for implementation and planning”. (Malan, 1996:4)

• The operational level of war was to be used to gauge the level at which the brief should be pitched to the staff. It would be very easy to digress to the tactical level. This was overcome by using command language.

• The operational level tests should be applied throughout the process in order to ensure that activities are directed at achieving results at the correct level.

• During the command briefing, the commander conveyed the product of his/her commander’s appreciation to his/her staff (and subordinate commanders if the
situation allowed) telling them “WHAT” needed to be done in order to solve the military problem.

- It also served the purpose of ensuring that the staff (and subordinate commanders) understood the primary problem and what needed to be achieved, thereby creating a firm basis for subsequent planning.

5.4.12 Theme 12: Conveys the Visionary Insight

Majority of the informants suggested that the commander’s briefing signified his/her ability to convey his/her visionary thinking:

“…so it is all about dialogue …I think that the crux of any plan, [concept] and strategy is dialogue and the way you dialogue it… because dialogue means communication and not necessarily understanding …so it’s having dialogue, conveying your strategy [concept] or what you think you want and having your people and team understand what that is… and then allowing them to take part in the dialogue…” (John Brooks)

To instil in his/her subordinates an inner feeling of trust and belief in what is to be achieved, the commander needs to convey aspects to satisfy the operational end-state.

“…there should only be one person to do that … and it is the commander…. That is where he actually puts his stamp on the process… his intention must be made clear so that everybody knows who is in charge… what the commander wants and that there is no uncertainty who the boss is …” (Pierre Franken)

- Communicating the commander’s intent was the most important task.

- The success of the transfer of the message would be based on what the commander says and the way in which he said it. This was of the utmost importance.
“I think the commander’s briefing is the most important part ... you can have the best possible plan [concept] and have the best analysis ... formulate the best answer ... but if it is not communicated properly to the [staff and sub-unit commander and the organisations that have to support it] ... It would not be a success...” (Chris Serfontein)

- If the commander believed in his/her planning, he/she had to radiate confidence and inspire his/her staff (and subordinate unit commanders). This would be possible if a commander had developed skills in listening, public speaking, presentation making, negotiations and resolving conflict, supported by a command of language.

- The commander’s briefing also served to give guidance to staff within the conceptual framework of the “what” that has already been defined.
  - The staff had to be told what was going to be expected from them and how their success would be measured.
  - In order for the message to be a success, the section heads and supervisors had to be told so that they can interpret it for their respective sections.

The commanders at the various levels would have to instil confidence in their people and to reassure them that they were the right calibre of people to execute this mission.

5.5 THEME BLENDING INTO CATEGORIES

The blending of abovementioned themes into categories was the next level of synthesis. These themes and categories could be seen as the foundation of the conversion of the Commander’s Appreciation into applicable concepts, in order to explore the business world in terms of the research question.
5.5.1 Category 1: The Strategist – Leader

The development of a military campaign and operation throughout the ages required the combined efforts of the commander and his staff, in a manner, achieving synergism within the team. This was intended to be an effort conducted by a high performance team, requiring visionary guidance and well coordinated planning activities within a dynamic planning process. The commander should aim at understanding the military problem at hand but also understand the environment in which the military problem arose. He/she had primarily to be a visionary in order to provide guidance. He/she would make use of a personal problem solving process in order to clarify the mission and strategic guidance received. He/she needed to avoid or embrace risk for the accomplishment of the mission. The following concepts would enable category mapping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discernment in turbulent times</th>
<th>Proactively</th>
<th>Decisiveness</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Use chain of Command</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery focus</td>
<td>Driving Change</td>
<td>Creative solutions</td>
<td>Allows decision-making</td>
<td>Events get the better of the GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM immersed in the details</td>
<td>Provide direction for Strategic Alliances</td>
<td>Gets things Done</td>
<td>Empowers subordinates</td>
<td>GM Prepares for the Strategic Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Identify problems</td>
<td>Make sense of a changing environment in simple and concise manner</td>
<td>Makes choices</td>
<td>Inspires Confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 19: Commander Appreciation Theme to Categories*
5.5.2 Category 2: Awareness – Problem Framing

Framing the problem was the ability of the commander to visualise the indispensable and its relevance; between the frivolous and inappropriate factors in order to establish a baseline for developing a mutual understanding of a problem at hand and its messy contextual situation. This would provide the commander the opportunity to structure the factors and their relationships. Awareness further seeks to establish the initial conditions from which the commander could provide insights as to how the problem might evolve.

Ultimately, the initial framing of the problem would set the conditions for learning about the problem. The commander’s understanding expanded as the problem changed over time. This expanded understanding allowed the commander to exploit emerging opportunities more rapidly and effectively in order to meet his/her objectives. The following concepts would enable category mapping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presents Analysis</th>
<th>Uses Technology to Manage Information</th>
<th>Instituted a process to ascertain all relevant data</th>
<th>Provides an explanation of the circumstances</th>
<th>All participants knowledge on the same level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared interpretation, simple concise</td>
<td>Ensure awareness provides info as often as possible</td>
<td>Activates collaboration sessions</td>
<td>Provides a process for gathering information</td>
<td>Continually scans the business landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activates the planning process</td>
<td>Interferes in the staff functions on a regular base</td>
<td>Problem solving ability improves during a crisis</td>
<td>Present his understanding of the boards given mandate</td>
<td>Purposeful during a crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify the problem</td>
<td>Confronts problems head on</td>
<td>Exploits opportunities</td>
<td>Driven towards action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 Category 3: Deliberations – Conceptual Solution Design

Analysis was a pivotal step for the commander in his/her route towards an understanding of the context of the military problem in order to offer a feasible

---

17 Problem Framing is the act of establishing the context of a situation within which a Commander must act to realize strategic aims by examining the assigned problem from multiple perspectives. USA Army TRADOC pamphlet 525-5-500. 2008. Commander Appreciation and Campaign Design pg 21; 2-3.
explanation for the existence of the problem and how it might be solved. The commander's own detailed appreciation process focused on a divergent and convergent approach of factor interpretation. This required the commander to enquire into the nature of the character and applicable contextual parameters of these factors.

Integration of factor deliberation would focus on determining what the commander needed to do in order to be successful in the light of the approved mission. This success amounted to the commander providing a description of the conditions that described the campaign and identification of the campaign objectives so that the commander's conceptual framework could create the desired conditions to realize the achievement of the strategic aims. The following concepts would enable category mapping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to departmentalise information</th>
<th>Problem Solver</th>
<th>Has an inherent problem solving process</th>
<th>Provides his/her concept for feasibility testing by the team</th>
<th>Provides innovative solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quickly offers meaning to a problem</td>
<td>Provides the planning group with factors for info collection</td>
<td>Realises the dynamic interaction between factors</td>
<td>Sequences Factors</td>
<td>Provides an hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses the mine's purpose in written format</td>
<td>Expresses his/her aim for the mine in written format</td>
<td>Understand the GM aim for the mine</td>
<td>Indicates what needs to be done</td>
<td>Provides a list of desired results to achieve the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides guidelines for planning and implementation</td>
<td>GM concept for the mine is displayed</td>
<td>Find analysis easy</td>
<td>Team presents large number of solution options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.5.4 Category 4: Communication and Dissemination**

The commander has at this stage to brief his/her planning staff and sub-unit commanders, if possible. The content of this briefing was made up of the commanders understanding of the context and what constitutes the military problem. The focus of the briefing would be to convey his/her conceptual framework and guidelines for planning and implementation, so that refining by the planning staff could take place under the
supervision of the chief of staff. The following concepts would enable category mapping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concisely convey his/her in the concept</th>
<th>Instills in you an inner feeling of trust</th>
<th>After the briefing you understand the problem</th>
<th>Realistic grasp of the vision and mission put into practice</th>
<th>Makes his/her intention clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After the brief you know what is to be achieved</td>
<td>Visionary thinking is conveyed during the briefing</td>
<td>Communicates desired end states</td>
<td>Grasps the organisational culture</td>
<td>Grasps the organisational politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays moral courage</td>
<td>Radiates confidence in his/her plan</td>
<td>Has good judgement of people’s abilities</td>
<td>Passion emits a strong sense of urgency</td>
<td>Encourages dialogue between levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an articulated vision</td>
<td>Energises the team by position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 ENSURING THE COLLECTION OF RELEVANT INFORMATION

The next step was to expand on the elements that have been extracted from the transcripts for use in an itemised worksheet. The establishment of a table (refer Appendix E) as an itemised worksheet of the Commander’s Appreciation broken down into fundamental notions. This was carried out in order to assist with the construction of the questions that would provide appropriate insight into whether the Commander’s Appreciation prevailed in the business environment. The clustering of elements emanating from the analysis of the Commander’s Appreciation in the following columns of the table led to appropriate evidence collection:

- Category (itemised category) as discussed above.

- The conversion of the category concepts into possible questions for evidence gathering and the reason why a method is regarded as appropriate. The construction of possible questions in order to support the mechanism of how the information would be extracted – interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) as well as why the method was regarded as appropriate.

- What information was needed while answering the research questions, objectives and intended contributions?
The itemised worksheet activated the synthesis of all the information in order to formalise a platform for the construction of the interview schedule (Appendix F) for the General Manager and the questionnaire (Appendix G) for his/her staff.

5.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter documented the primary narrative of the itemisation of the SA Army Commander’s Appreciation supported by the USA and UK processes. The core themes emerged according to the interviewed commanders (referred to as “the informant”).

The interpretation and analysis of interview transcripts led to twelve core themes and four categories as parameters in which the research instruments have been developed. Furthermore, these instruments would now enable the comparison of the military Commander’s Appreciation to parallels in the Business Fraternity. This comparison would be limited to three cases, and a synthesis of all the case primary narratives into a higher order narrative will be presented in Chapter 6: Making Sense of the Evidence.
6. CHAPTER 6: MAKING SENSE OF THE EVIDENCE

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter provided the research instruments for the collection of evidence. These instruments were applied to three case studies. In order to make sense of this evidence, a narrative approach was used as promulgated by Elliott (2005). The case study evidence was collected, explained and presented in a primary narrative.

This chapter is an interpretative evaluation of the primary case narratives in order to provide a synthesised, higher-order narrative for understanding the existence of key concepts of the Commander’s Appreciation in Business. Reflecting on the evidence gained in the primary narrative has led to a refined explanation. This explanation will contribute substance to the research question and to its sub-questions.

• Research Question. To assess whether the Commander’s Appreciation used in the Military context also prevails in the Business environment and if so, to focus attention on the areas of similarity (and differences) as a basis to formulate a model for strategic intent formulation.

• Sub-Questions

  o Is there a process used by the CEO to translate mandate into a competitive advantage?

  o To what degree can the CEO exploit business opportunities to gain the competitive advantage?

  o How can the Commander Appreciation contribute to the CEO’s situational awareness?
What lessons could be learnt from the Commander’s Appreciation to enable the corporate or entrepreneurial CEO?

6.2 POSTIONING THE RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

The participants for this research included personnel from the mining fraternity as well as the precious stone industry. The mines, in which these concepts will be applied, are taken from South Africa (BHP Billiton\textsuperscript{18}) and Australia (Talison Minerals\textsuperscript{19}). Both the mining fraternities are engaged in retrieving commercial commodities for practical use, as opposed to the precious stone industry. Talison Minerals and BHP Billiton are both international concerns operated from Australia making them comparable as is apparent within Table 20 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>South Africa (BHP Billiton)</th>
<th>Australia (Talison Minerals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>The BHP Billiton is an international Company.</td>
<td>Australian Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Headquarters</td>
<td>Perth, Australia.</td>
<td>Perth, Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market related</td>
<td>Both for captive client (government) as well as export market.</td>
<td>Market related, no government link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>International compliant.</td>
<td>International compliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of General Manager:</td>
<td>South African university; United Kingdom University; Post Graduate.</td>
<td>South African University; Post Graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>The mines are seen as the driving force of the town.</td>
<td>This is very important as the mine is the only industry in some towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Southern Hemisphere.</td>
<td>Southern Hemisphere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>General Manager’s Appointment has legal imperatives.</td>
<td>General Manager’s Appointment has legal imperatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>In the act, but not well implemented.</td>
<td>Very well implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of mining</td>
<td>Open-cast and shafts.</td>
<td>Open-cast and shafts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Table 20: Pertinent Case Comparability}

\textsuperscript{18} Khutala and Klipspruit Company Overview - refer appendix M and N
\textsuperscript{19} Talison Minerals Company overview – refer appendix O
6.3 MAKING SENSE OF THE COLLECTED EVIDENCE

6.3.1 Reflection of Primary Narratives

The evidence, collected per case, amounted to: an interview with the General Manager of the Mine, a self-completed questionnaire by members of the staff, and governance documentation pertaining to the mining procedures.

The establishment of the primary narrative comprised of the interpretation of the General Manager’s views, obtained from an interview transcript together with that of his staff’s views, obtained from questionnaires per case, in relation to the concept. This comparison has been used to see if the staff agree or disagree with General Manager’s views in terms of the Commander’s Appreciation concepts thereby confirming or refuting the existence of the Commander’s concepts in the mines. In order to obtain a synthesised understanding of the Commander’s concept existence, the three cases’ primary narratives require a significant of reflection about the information, in order to develop a refined higher-order narrative. To orchestrate this reflection, a mutual understanding of the boundaries needed to be formulated.

6.3.2 The Boundaries of Planning

The planning process of both mining fraternities is based on decision, delivery and ultimately better achieving outcomes for the company. This process is formalised and conducted via a participative management approach. The General Managers are part of a planning process, but there is no indication as to what the General Managers’ problem solving processes comprise of or if they indeed have a problem solving process (personal or company) in order to prepare themselves for their mine’s annual planning process. This has brought to the fore, the following questions, “Will the Commander’s Appreciation assist the General Manager in his preparation for the
mine’s strategic planning process?” “What is his participatory link to the mine’s strategic planning process?” and “How is his vision intertwined with that of the company?”

### 6.3.3 Category 1: The Strategist - Leader

The mapping of this category will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to conduct a high-performance team, within an ever-changing environment, by displaying leadership abilities. The General Managers are the company’s leaders within the mine, therefore mapping these concepts in the table below will depict how the agreement and disagreement groups experience the General Manager’s ability as a strategist and leader. In order to provide an integrated interpretation each concept will be discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Strategist Concept</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Case 1 Disagreement</th>
<th>Case 1 Agreement</th>
<th>Case 2 Disagreement</th>
<th>Case 2 Agreement</th>
<th>Case 3 Disagreement</th>
<th>Case 3 Agreement</th>
<th>Research View Disagreement</th>
<th>Research View Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discernment in turbulent times</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>77%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anticipatory insight</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
<td><strong>41%</strong></td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visibility (as the provider of leadership)</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use of chain of Command</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Delivery focus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Driving Change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Seeking creative solutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Allows decision-making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Events get the better of the GM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 GM embroiled in the details</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Provides direction for Strategic Alliances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Gets things Done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Empowers subordinates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 GM Prepares for the Strategic Planning Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- Percentages are calculated based on the total count for each category.
- "Other" category includes any additional data not specifically listed in the table.
- "Functional Managers" and "Supervisor" categories may include various subcategories not explicitly shown in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Able to identify problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Makes sense of a changing environment in a simple and concise manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Makes choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Inspires Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Case Comparative - The Strategist Concepts

- **Discernment in Turbulent Times.** The General Manager’s view promulgates perspicacity as the key to success for any leader in a state of flux. Notwithstanding this submission, not every manager has the ability to apply perspicacity in normal times, let alone in trying times. The application of perspicacity can be seen as a distinguishing factor for leadership in trying times. The General Manager’s point of view that is not supported by Case 1 as indicated by the Disagreement group upheld by a large segment of the Others and portion of the Functional Managers and Supervisors. This could lead to polarisation between the Executives and the “others” which in turn could lead to power struggles and unpleasant working environment.

However, case two and three Agreement group consists of a majority of the Executives and a portion of the Functional Managers and Supervisor group pointing to the ability of the General Manager to display judgement in turbulent times. In spite of this judgement under conditions of turmoil is not the same as in orderly times.
Therefore it could be experienced as autocratic decision-making or a lack of decision-making. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager’s discernment will provide stability to deal with unexpected circumstances.

- **Proactively.** The General Managers are of the opinion that proactive action could be seen as an opportunity for continuously improving the company’s competitive advantage within any environment. This is only possible if the General Manager displays an entrepreneurial mindset. The General Manager’s point of view is not supported by Case 1 as indicated by the Disagreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Other, Supervisors and portions of Executives and Functional Managers. As this grouping is very procedurally driven any changes that need to be implemented necessitate a change procedure as they are inherently inclined to resistance to change. Although Case two and three Agreement group consists of a majority of the Executives, Functional Managers groups point to the ability of the General Manager to provide proactive leadership which should result in action. It is evident that the General Managers have a personal problem solving process through which their analysis of the external environment increases their awareness. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers proactively meet challenges.

- **Decisiveness.** The General Managers views are unanimous on the fact that mandate resides within their legal appointments. They also stress that in order to be decisive, one needs to link planned action to decision-making. For this one requires clear thinking, experience and most of all common sense. The General Manager’s point of views is not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Others and Supervisors. That points to the inability of the General Manager to be decisive in corrective and direction giving action. Unfortunately the grouping does not directly report to the General Manager.
and their decisions could have been marginalised by an Executive, Functional Manager or Supervisor. In Case two and three, the Agreement group consists of a majority of the Executives, Functional Managers group pointing to the ability of the General Manager to be decisive. Fortunately the General Manager ‘direct reports’ in all three cases comprises of this group confirming their decisiveness. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager is decisive.

- **Visibility.** Visibility according to the General Managers is essential for the establishment of a trust relationship with the staff. This calls for a Leader to show up, keep going and their presence will inspire others to stay the course. *Take Rudy Giuliani, former mayor of New York City. Rudy showed up when it really mattered on 9/11… this was not due to any strategy well-thought-out or otherwise … but by showing his face as the embodiment of Manhattan’s indomitable spirit (Peters, 2005: 28).* The General Manager’s point of view is unanimously supported by all three cases as indicated by the Agreement groups and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Manager, Supervisors and Others. However, the Disagreement group consists of the Other group and large portion of the Supervisors, pointing to the lack of visibility by the General Manager. What is concerning is that the General Manager is not on the shop floor. This could suggest the notion to the workers that the General Manager is detached, unapproachable or is selective in attendance. The research view in fact supports the notion that the General Manager is highly visible.

- **Use of Chain of Command.** The General Managers maintain that the mines are inherently structured into levels and departments which contribute naturally to the establishment of a hierarchical chain of command. They also emphasised that in the light of their appointments and that of their executives, which has a legal obligation, this also contributes to the use of a chain of command. They added that it is a team effort through which each member will contribute in accordance with their specialty.
The General Manager’s point of view is supported by Case one and two and equally split in Case three as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. However, the Disagreement group across all three cases consists of a majority of the Others group and a portion of the supervisors pointing to the General Manager making use of various management methods in order to get staff involved and tasked. This could indicate that transformational leadership elements are present. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager uses the chain of command to get the job done.

- **Delivery Focus.** According to the General Managers the mine is a profit-driven company enabled by focus on delivery and service. They added that it is essential to translate effort into value. However, this will only be possible if the focus of main effort is to grow the business and maximise value in a responsible manner. The General Manager’s point of view is supported by all the Cases as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a majority segment of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. However, the Disagreement group across all cases consists of a large portion of the Others group pointing to the inability of the General Manager to focus on delivery. The main contributing factor here could be due to the inflexibility of the process and the fact that they have a captive client. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager focuses on delivery.

- **Driving Change.** The General Managers contend that change can be seen as unavoidable; it will be continual and will have consequences, irrespective of what the organisation put into place. Things in the mining industry are difficult to change in respective of the legislative imperatives and the due process. It is stressed further, for that reason, the General Manager is the company’s change agent and that change mitigation is interwoven into the way they do business and not a specific
line on a project. Therefore it is essential that the leadership embraces change and ensures that Change Management is an intrinsic management skill. The General Manager’s point of view is supported across all the Cases as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. However, the Disagreement group across all case consists of a majority of the Others group that points to the inability of the General Manager to achieve change within the organisation. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager drives Change.

- **Seeking Creative Solutions.** The General Managers contend that without a framed problem, originality of an answer will be limited, unless creativity in the forms of inventiveness, opportunism, entrepreneurial spirit and initiative reside within the General Manager. This should be an inherent ability of any leader and especially in these turbulent times. It is further stressed, that resourceful outcomes originate from the ability to analyse relevant information pertaining to a problem. However, this will only be possible if the General Manager has the ability to do conceptual analysis of the environment. Although there is a split in Case one, both Case two and three make up for it with large support as indicated by the Agreement group which are driven by the Executives whereas the compelling force behind the Disagreement group across all the cases is within portions of the Functional Managers and Supervisors. These staff members apparently believe that the General Manager does not provide creativity to spur solution development. This could be attributed to the Functional Managers, who see themselves as providing these solutions therefore making the General Manager’s contributions come to be viewed as meddling into their responsibility. It is supposed that the General Manager is responsible for direction which could be achieved via a concept of operations and possible guidelines. For the General Manager to comply with this they will need a
personal problem solving process which would enable them to provide creative solutions. The General Managers’ creative contribution to solutions resides within their ability to interpret high level strategic vision into attainable objectives. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers are creative with their solutions.

- **Allows Decision-Making.** The General Managers advocate that decision-making is left to the appointed specialist that is mandated for that task. Within a mine this size, there is no way that the General Manager can go and make decisions for the underground or open-cast staff. The General Manager can only visit and give advice. However, at the end of the day, they need to tell you what they are going to do, in order for them to take ownership. The General Manager’s point of view is not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Functional Manager, Supervisors and Others. This is visible due to the set procedures and the centralisation of decision-making. Members are not mandated to act in the process. It is evident that General Managers are fazed by the legal imperative of their appointments. In order to get a handle on the situation all decision-making is centralised. This type of management style presents the following challenges: it frustrates service delivery to the clients and staff; it contributes to high staff turnover and to a lack of continuity. The Company will lose opportunities that arise as they won’t be able to react quickly enough. However, Case two and three Agreement group consists of a majority of the Executives and large segments of the Functional Manager and Supervisors supporting the General Managers’ notion that they practice mission command and empowering of the staff. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager allows decision-making on all levels.
• **Events Get the Better of the GM.** The General Managers are of the opinion that, although there are trying circumstances, one's make-up as a leader is complemented by experience and training. This will provide one the ability to stand one’s ground during trying times. However this is only possible if one is well prepared, has resiliency, integrity, big-picture mindset and have the tenacity to follow through. In order for this to come to fruition the leader needs ‘gratitude as an attitude’ of thankfulness that becomes a way of life. The General Manager’s point of view is supported by the staff as indicated by Case one’s Disagreement group and upheld by segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. This is one of the few times that the disagreement group is the right approach. We don’t want the General Manager to be indecisive during trying times. It indicates that the staff has experienced the General Manager as a person of character. It is in the best interest of the mine that the events don’t get the better of the General Manager. However, Case two and three the Agreement group consists of a majority of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others groups that point to the inability of the General Manager to handle trying events. This could lead to a lack of decision-making within the company. Furthermore this will promote decision-making by means of collaboration and will side-line ownership. This could result in the company’s demise. The research view supports the notion that events get the better of the General Manager.

• **GM Embroiled in the Details.** According to the General Managers, direction formulation and dissemination is their forte. They stress that the translation of their direction into tangible objective is left to the Heads of Department and their supervisors. This will only be possible if there is structured planning process. The General Manager’s point of view is not supported by any of the cases as indicated by the Disagreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Functional
Manager and Supervisors. This is one of the times that the Agreement group has the wrong approach for the mine. The organisation cannot afford for the General Managers to engross themselves in the details as this will nullify the Executive, Functional Managers and the Superiors mandate. This could lead to the company moving nowhere fast as the ‘Captain is in the engine room instead of on the bridge’. However, across all the cases the Disagreement group consists of a majority of the Others group and large portions of Functional Managers and Superiors, that point to the ability of the General Manager to keep out of the companies’ operations. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers immerse themselves in the details.

• **Provide Direction for Strategic Alliances.** The General Managers acknowledge that direction and strategic alliance formulation for the company lies within their domain of responsibilities. However, this will only be possible if there is a willingness to enter into coalition, agreement and partnership. Furthermore, it was stressed by the General Managers that they make use of collaboration sessions to determine strategic partnerships in order to leverage resources that can benefit the mine. The General Managers’ points of view are supported by the majority of staff across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. However, the Disagreement group across the cases consists of a portion of the Others group that point to the inability of the General Managers to provide direction for strategic alliances. This could lead to the company being isolated within the market-place resulting in the loss of market share thus questioning the usefulness of the General Manager as a negotiator and direction giver. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides direction for strategic alliances.
• **Gets Things Done.** The General Managers are of the opinion that a struggle exists between the people who are trying to do something and the people who are trying to keep them from doing something wrong. To lead is to be in front, breaking new ground and moving away from the status quo. The General Managers points of view are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. However, the Disagreement group across all the cases consists of a majority of the Others group and larger portion of the Supervisors pointing to the inability of the General Managers to get things done. This often results from fear, indecision, fatigue, unpleasantness and lack of self-discipline. In addition, the General Managers use “due process” and “compliance” to gum up the works, to slow things down and stifle innovation. Risk seems dangerous to many because they are more comfortable with old problems versus what it takes to comes up with new solutions. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager gets things done correctly.

• **Empowers Subordinates.** What is evident here is that the General Managers advocate capacity development and they have all structured for it. They also acknowledge that their people are the conduits to translate strategy into success within the industry. However, this is only possible with education and training as elementary building blocks for the preservation of their competitive edge. The differentiating factor in business is people as they make a difference. The General Manager's point of view is supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement groups and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. However, the Disagreement group across all the cases, consists of a portion of the Supervisors and majority of the Others group that support the notion that General Managers do not empower their subordinates. What
is concerning is that the Disagreement grouping is driven by the Others which can be seen as the primary recipients of the skills transfer and empowerment. This could lead to a disgruntled workforce within the company and could contribute to a high turnover. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager empowers subordinates for succession.

- **GM Prepares for the Strategic Planning Process.** It was evident that the General Managers have personal (informal) processes for developing their understanding and awareness of situations. They confirmed that the process is to assist them to prepare for participation in the planning process, which is a team effort. This alludes to the notion that the General Managers prepare themselves for participation in the planning session. This is done with the employment of management techniques such as SWOT and PESTEL. The General Manager is supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group and driven by the Executive, Functional Manager and Supervisors. Although the disagreement across all cases is relatively high, it is driven by the Others grouping which in this concept is acceptable as they do not necessarily have access for first-hand observation to the General Manager as do the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers prepare themselves for the strategic planning process.

- **Can Identify Problems.** The General Managers subscribe to the belief that if one is well prepared one would be able to not just identify a problem but one will also be able to position it, comprehend its impact and provide an interpretation for consideration of a possible solution. This will also contribute to the General Managers’ skills, abilities and enablement to distinguish between causes and symptoms of problems. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group and driven by the Executives,
Functional Managers and Supervisors. This signals that the General Managers have acquired and developed the ability to frame a problem. Whereas, the Disagreement group, across all the cases, indicate and show a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups belief that the General Managers have not acquired the skills to frame problems. This indicator shows that they are not privy to General Managers' personal problem-solving processes and have not observed it in any form. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers display the ability to identify problems.

- **Make Sense of a Changing Environment in Simple and Concise Manner.** The General Managers claim that continual analysis of their surroundings have provided them comprehensive understanding of the changing environments. This has developed their abilities to translate complex concepts into straightforward language. The General Managers make use of iterative analysis processes to make sense of changing environments. This is supported across all the cases, which is encouraging, as the Agreement group is made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. What is of concern is that the Disagreement group across all cases is driven by the Others, which are the staff members who really need simple and concise language, in order for them to understand the changing environment’s impact on the companies’ visions. The General Managers have developed an ability to translate difficult complex concepts into simple, concise language for promulgation to the staff. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers can make sense of changing environments in simple and concise manner and communicate this to subordinates.

- **Makes Choices.** The General Managers promote the views that they are the driving force behind the survival and profitability of the companies. In order for this to be true the General Managers need to be able to make choices. Making choices
relates directly to option formulation, selection processes and risk-taking. Realising modification of the internal or external business environments is a matter of choice amounting to risk versus profit. The General Managers’ views are split in Case one and supported in Cases two and three as indicated by the Agreement group driven by the Executive, Functional Managers and Supervisors signalling that the General Manager has acquired the skill to take risks in lieu of profit enabled by making choices. Whereas, the Disagreement group across all the cases indicates and shows that a portion of Supervisors and Others are not of the opinion that the General Managers can make choices. There is no collaboration, negotiation, or participative management at the lower levels. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers can make choices.

- **Inspires Confidence.** The General Managers subscribe to the notion that they motivate their staff within the parameters of their appointment. As this is the boundary within which they can work, it is a stretch of that boundary to link motivation within their legitimate appointments; motivation is a character trait of the GMs and seeing that confidence in the General Manager is based on the GM’s ability to inspire. Furthermore, the General Managers through their legally appointed mandates are responsible for the mines and are seen as the mines’ representatives for labour bargaining and disputes. Although the General Managers have conceded that the people within their mines are the most value resources and that they motivate their staff, this is rejected out of hand by Case one. The majority of the Disagreement group supports the notion that the General Manager is compliant with his appointment and is mechanistic, bureaucratic and does not inspire the staff. However, Cases two and three as indicated by the Agreement group though the Functional managers and the Supervisors provide positive contributions that point to
the ability of the General Managers to inspire confidence in their staff. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers inspire confidence in their staff.

### 6.3.4 Category 2: Situational Awareness – Problem Framing

The mapping of this category will provide insight into whether the General Managers display the ability to frame a problem in terms of context, content relevance, appropriate factor identification and relationships. This is done in order to establish a baseline for developing a significant understanding of the problem within its situation and the evolution thereof. The General Manager is pivotal to the success of the mine. Mapping these concepts in Table 23, below, will depict how the staff experiences his ability to create an understanding of the problems within the environment. In order to provide an integrated interpretation, each concept will be discussed separately:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Awareness Concept</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Research view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Presents Analysis.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uses Technology to Manage Information.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instituted a process to ascertain all relevant data was collected.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides an explanation of the circumstance.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 All participants’ knowledge is on the same level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39 61 27 73 18 82 28 72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Shared interpretation, simple and concise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29 71 19 81 57 43 35 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Ensures awareness provides info as often as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36 64 23 77 61 39 40 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Activates collaboration sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43 57 31 69 18 82 31 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Provides a process for gathering information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39 61 35 65 18 82 31 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Continually scans the business landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43 57 35 65 21 79 33 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Activates the planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>54 46 42 58 21 79 39 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Interferes in the staff functions on a regular basis. (Negative is good)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39 61 42 58 29 71 37 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Problem solving ability improves during a crisis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>54 46 38 62 18 82 35 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Presents his understanding of the board’s given mandate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>54 46 38 62 18 82 35 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 22: CASE COMPARATIVE - AWARENESS CONCEPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 Purposeful during a crisis.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 Can identify the problem.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>65.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17 Confronts problems head-on.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>67.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18 Exploits opportunities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19 Driven towards action.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Present Analysis.** It is evident that the General Managers have personal problem-solving analysis processes. They acquire a grasp of the situation, prior to the formulation of their interpretation of the circumstances, through these processes. Their explanation is provided to the staff during a presentation. The General Managers are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group driven by the Executive, Functional Manager and limited number of Supervisors. Although there is a large support there is no indication if the presentation is formal or informal. This also alludes to the existence of a personal analysis process of the General Manager, unfortunately there are no indications whether it is used formally or not. The disagreement group across all cases is driven by the Supervisors and Other groupings which consist of people who did not form part of the planning.
group, who did not attend the presentations and who have not observed the General Manager’s formulation of his understanding. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager presents his SWOT analysis to his staff.

- **Uses Technology to Manage Information.** According to the General Managers’ viewpoints the mines have inherent core technologies for mining and support technologies to enable mining, such as information systems, financial and logistical systems and telecommunication systems. In enabling the core task the General Manager and staff relies on many ICT information systems and forms of technology. These systems will provide predetermined groups of information and reports. In addition, these systems provide the General Manager the ability to capture, store process and retrieve information. The General Manager’s point of view is not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is upheld by a large segment of the Others, Supervisors and portions of Executives and Functional Managers. This points to the General Manager’s inability to leverage technology in order to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the company by accessing relevant information. Furthermore, this also indicates that technology is used in a fragmented manner throughout the environment and cannot assist the General Manager with information management. This places the management team at a disadvantage during the planning session as the information at their disposal is not from one, good, integrated, congruent source. It is encouraging that Case two and three are indicated by the Agreement group to be driven by a large segment of Executives, Functional managers and Supervisors. This indication supports the General Manager’s notion that he uses technology to manage information. Information extracted from the company’s information systems will only be of value if there is a validation process of the value and accuracy inputs and outputs.

  Information management could ensure that the General Manager would have
access to a great deal of processed information. Unfortunately, this will only be relevant for internal day-to-day operations and not for an external impact analysis that he needs for his process of direction development. The General Manager synthesises relevant information by using complementary information technologies.

Without the supplementation of technologies to manage information there is a great possibility that the General Manager’s analysis will result in stagnation, downward spiral, irrelevance and a poor superficial answer. On the other side of the coin, an information overload could result where he would not be able to make any sense of the vast amount of available information, making customised information requirements very difficult and only at all possible if a technical specialist is available to assist the GM. It is very difficult to introduce any new system into play in the domain of ‘bleeding edge’ technology and can also be problematic for the mine. As for the Mine Manager, will he make use of the current systems to manage the information collation? The research view supports the notion that the General Manager uses technology to manage information effectively.

• **Instituted a Process to Validate all Relevant Data.** The General Managers stated that within the mine planning procedure there is no formal process through which to gather information or to determine its relevance. They however group the information in order to support management analysis models such as SWOT and PESTEL, which they learnt on mining management courses. Furthermore, the General Managers allude to a practice that they use to assemble and categorise relevant information. This notion is supported across all the cases by the Agreement group largely made up of a portion of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. Unfortunately there is no indication if the process is a formal or informal part of any General Manager’s awareness process. However, across all the cases the Disagreement group consists of a portion of Supervisors and majority of
the Others group. This points to the inability of the General Manager to ascertain relevant data for the problem. There is also an indication of a need to filter information in order to determine its relevancy to the problem prior to analysis. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager instituted a process to ascertain all relevant data of the problem.

- **Provide an Explanation of the Circumstance.** The General Managers conceded that they made use of management analysis techniques such SWOT and PESTEL to supplement their personal problem solving processes. They would provide their understanding of the problem to the staff by means of a formal presentation. Furthermore it is apparent that the General Managers construct their explanations of the circumstances (leading to the problems) from their personal problem-solving processes. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group driven by the Executive, Functional Manager and Supervisors. Although there is a majority support there is no indication if the explanation is formal or informal. It is encouraging that majority of the Agreement group is made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This also supports the notion of the existence of personal analysis processes of the General Managers. Unfortunately there is also no indication if this is formal or not. The disagreement group, across all the cases, indicates and shows a portion of the Supervisors and Others who do not understand the explanation of the circumstances provided by the General Manager in which the problem resides. These groups have not seen or been present at such explanation presentations or discussions. This could lead to uninformed and disgruntled workforces. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides an explanation of the circumstances that led to the problem.
• **All Participants' Knowledge on the Same Level.** The General Managers contend that information, of circumstances leading to the problem, is essential in order for their staff to conduct planning. Unfortunately once a plan is activated it has “a mind of its own”, fuelled by a changing world. It is the General Managers’ responsibility to enable sharing of additional relevant information. This would necessitate contingency planning and activation. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group driven by the Executive, Functional Manager and Supervisors. There are no indications whether this is done formally or informally or how the information is shared, captured, stored, retrieved and disseminated. The support across all the cases are of concern, as indicated in the Disagreement group of portions of Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors who felt that the General Managers have not attempted to provide adequate level of understanding of the circumstances pertaining to problems of the staff. This makes it difficult to understand the problem and could lead to uninformed staff making plans, ensuring that there is an inadequate base within the planning staff which could impede the staff in quick action, in order to exploit opportunities. On the other hand, this could be seen as a symptom of group-thinking which would lead to ratification of the General Manager’s plan. This is also not acceptable as it might not stimulate innovation and creativity. There has to be a very fine line between attaining the same level of knowledge of a problem and group-thinking. Although there is support for the informative process there is no indication if it is formal or informal. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers ensure that all participants are on the same level in terms of knowledge of the problem.

• **Shared Interpretation, Simple Concise.** The General Managers’ beliefs are that sharing the interpretation of the facts will create a collective comprehension of the
problem and its situation. In order for the promulgation of the collective comprehension to be effective it needs to be transferred to the staff effortlessly and deliberately. Technology is therefore used. The General Managers' views are not supported by Case three as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by a large portion of the Functional Manager and Supervisor groups and the majority of the Others. This points to General Manager's inability to communicate or to share their interpreted lack of understanding. However, the majority of Case one and two support the General Managers’ abilities to share their interpretation concisely as indicated by the Agreement group driven by a large segment of Executive, Functional Managers and Supervisors. Although there is a large support there is no indication if their sharing is formal or informal and what technology is used. This also alludes to the existence of personal problem-solving processes of the General Managers. An indication exists if it is formal or informal. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager shares his interpretation of the environment in a simple and concise manner.

- **Ensures Awareness Provides info as Often as Possible.** The General Managers believe that information dissemination is the key in order for business awareness to be successful. This is not a once-off task but it is a continuous flow of both inputs and outputs of information. In order to get an optimal level between a demand for information and the supply of information for the staff, processes have been instituted. Furthermore, they indicate that with the use of ICT systems, information could be captured at all levels and stored. In order to expedite awareness information retrieval will be either on request or pushed via dashboards alerts. The General Managers views are not supported by Case three as indicated by the Disagreement group driven largely by portions of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates the inability of the General Manager to
disseminate relevant information or to provide a process to enable it. This could lead to non-support of the company vision, as the staff will not be informed. The management team will not be able to react swiftly to competitors nor will they exploit opportunities. However, Case one and two as indicated by the Agreement groups supported by larger segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors, show that the General Managers have the abilities to provide information to the management team, to exploit opportunities in order to gain the initiative in a market. What is also evident is that relevant information is provided to specific, selective groups in order to reduce the effects of information overload. This becomes possible with ‘push and pull’ systems that develop information as a resource. The research view supports the notion that The General Manager provides information as often as possible to his staff.

- **Activates Collaboration Sessions.** The General Managers’ positions on collaboration amounted to the ability to align strategy through strategic thinking in order to reinforce customers’ strategic alliances. These cases are internal or international. Furthermore, the General Managers have indicated that their shareholders want their businesses to grow. They found that in some alliances an exchange of people and skills can help to build the necessary trust and understanding. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group driven by the Executive, Functional Manager and Supervisors. Although a majority support exists, there is no indication of this process either in a formal or informal format. The Disagreement group is made up of the portions of Functional Managers and Supervisors, as well as a large segment of the Others which point towards limited, negotiated strategic alliances or the fact that the staff were not part of it. Even though the General Managers activate collaboration sessions it could not accommodate all staff, only those mandated. This could
ultimately lead to problems within the staff. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager activates collaboration sessions.

- **Provides a Process for Gathering Information.** The General Managers’ viewpoints on information gathering are based on relevance and they reaffirmed that this is not just their task. It is the dual responsibility of the General Managers together with all their staff to contribute to the establishment of mutual data warehouse. This would be the foundation from which planning is done. It is therefore essential that all members are on the same page and have access to that page. In order that this could be enabled, technology has been used in the form of integrated information systems. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up by majority of Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that the existing information systems, both core and support (with their processes), are adequate for gathering information. Their effectiveness at input and output levels are not however visible. This also alludes to a very rigid information gathering process, reliant on inputs. The Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Other group. This Disagreement group contains the staff who has not contributed to the data collection, who have not formed part of the planning group or they are the operators who enter the information. They, in all respects, don’t support the info gathering process, as this could be viewed as additional work, regarded as cumbersome or boring. This could affect validity and reliability of the data input problems and result in the ‘garbage in, garbage out’ syndrome being applicable. This also indicates the inadequate processes for gathering information. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager has provided a process for gathering information.
• **Continually Scans the Business Environment.** The General Managers stated that global markets are becoming smaller as the international trade keeps growing and the demand for imported services and goods increase. Furthermore, their view indicates that in order to capitalise on this trend, the General Managers need to shape the landscape by focusing on supply and demand and key relationships within the internal and international markets. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This has been amplified by technology, with the convergence of telecommunication and Information systems, supported by the internet. This has made the world seem smaller and more accessible. This access has been supported by deregulation, privatisation and opening of markets by governments, everywhere. This could not be exploited without the existence of personal problem-solving analysis processes of the General Managers. It is conceded that this exists. Unfortunately there are no indications if this is formal or not. However, the Disagreement group although marginal across all cases is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Other groups which contain the staff that have not had the opportunity to witness the General Managers’ abilities in scanning their environments. They also do not have the opportunity to witness this within the information disseminated from the General Managers’ offices. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager scans the international landscape.

• **Activates the Planning Process.** The General Managers have acknowledged that they don’t activate the planning processes in an individual capacity. They do, however, form part of the planning processes as a team member. The team will create the company’s visions, core purpose and values during a session. Furthermore, this is seen as participative management in order to enhance team
work from the staff. The General Managers’ view is supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group driven by the large portion of the Executives, Functional Managers and Others. This indicates that according to the staff, the General Manager is part of the team and does not activate the planning process. This approach and the deduced participation can provide a sense of team but there will be no single leader. Decision-making is therefore based on perceived consensus. However, Case 2 and 3 as indicated by the Agreement groups supported by the larger segments of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors, show that the General Managers’ actions within the planning processes are perceived to be that of leading and activating the actual processes. It is not visible how this has manifested or if it is formal or not. Therefore, we need to take cognisance of the fact that the actions of the General Manager could be in line with a leader who has taken ownership of the outcomes of the planning session. This leader is creative, has a sense of purpose, a real relationship with staff, radiates confidence that his plan will work and has a bias towards action, risk taking, curiosity and courage. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager indeed activates the planning process.

- **Interferes in the Staff Functions on a Regular Basis.** The General Managers partially acknowledge that they intervene in the staff work, but refute the notion that they meddle on a regular basis. Furthermore, they offer as justification (or it could also be seen as mitigation), that their interventions are only the exception to the rule. This, they believe, is in the best interest of the company and in accordance with their legitimate mandates. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of a large segment of Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors as well as a small portion of Others. The staff sees their meddling as obstructive and holding them back from
doing their work. This has resulted in disempowering the staff to execute their mandated assignments. Furthermore, what is discouraging is that their meddling is not just limited to direct reports it is perceived throughout the company. This in turn could lead to centralised decision-making as the de facto process, affect productivity, promote a negative work force, instil abdication and blaming. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Executives, Functional Manager, Supervisors and Other groups which maintain that the General Manager does not meddle in the responsibilities of the staff. This view should be built on and promulgated throughout the company. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager meddles with the staff functions on a regular basis.

- **Problem Solving Ability Improves During a Crisis.** The General Managers claimed that decision-making resides with them, as the legally mandated individual of the mine. Although this is true, the team-based strategic planning approach is used to synthesise the available information and provide options for final decision-making by the General Manager. The General Managers’ views are not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by the small portions of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors and a large segment of the Others. This indicates that the General Managers comply with the team based strategies, in accordance with the rigid planning processes that needs to be followed within the mines, as well as due to the legitimacy of the decisions that are made by the General Managers. The staff perceives the General Managers to make use of decision-making by consensus, whereas unfortunately in a crisis they ought to be displaying decisiveness and discernment. This could contribute to the General Managers’ inabilities to exploit opportunities in order to gain the initiative. However, Case two and three as indicated by the Agreement groups are supported by larger
segments of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and the Others. It could be perceived that due to rigid systems, the decision makers do not show flexibility. This also shows the existence of a shared process through which the planning staff provides options for the General Manager to take decisions. This points towards the increased ability of the General Managers to solve problems during crises. The General Manager shows decisiveness and exercises good judgment at those stages. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers’ problem solving ability improve during a crisis.

- **Presents his Understanding of the Boards Given Mandate.** The General Managers indicate that they closely study their mandate from the board, but there is no formal presentation clarifying to their understanding given to the staff. Nevertheless, they do talk about their understanding of the mandate during the planning session. The General Managers have also alluded to negotiating the mandate with the board. The General Managers’ views are split in Case one between the Agreement and Disagreement groups. Case two and three indicate positive reaction by the Agreement groups supported by larger segments of the Executives, Functional Manager, Supervisors and Others. This shows that the General Manager’s ability to provide information of his understanding of the board’s direction to the staff. The Agreement group points out that the board’s mandate is analysed and spoken about by the General Manager, how and where, is not visible. This also alludes to the existence of a personal analysis process of the General Manager, unfortunately there is no indication whether this is formal or not. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager presents his understanding of the board’s mandate.

- **Purposeful During a Crisis.** The General Managers focus on the process and not on the resolution of the crisis in order to support the team based strategic planning.
process. This shows that actions are not dependent on individuals but groups. Continuity resides within the systems and processes. This is endorsed by Case one’s Disagreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Others. This indicates the inability of the General Manager to be purposeful during a crisis as he is compliant with the process. This leads to non-support of the company’s vision, as the staff is not given direction until sanctioned by the team. Case two and three, however, indicated by the Agreement groups supported by majority segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. This points towards a flexible environment in which the General Manager has the ability to react swiftly to competitors and exploit opportunities in order to gain the initiative in the market. This environment indicates the General Manager’s value is tested during a crisis, therefore he needs to be focused, resolute and decisive in a crisis. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager is purposeful during a crisis.

- Can Identify the Problem. The General Managers point towards their analysis process in the way in which they ascertain the parameters of the problem. Furthermore, the General Managers’ views are supported throughout all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This also alludes to the existence of a personal analysis process of the General Manager. Unfortunately there is no indication whether this is formal or not and how it will be used. The Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others groups that point to the inability of the General Managers to frame the problem. This could lead to the company moving in the wrong direction and committing resources unnecessarily. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers can identify the problem.
• **Confronts Problems Head On.** The General Managers provided the views that they will engage the problems within the parameters of the company processes. Unfortunately there is no evidence that the General Managers or CEOs would be daring enough to tackle any problem head-on or at all, if it lay outside their companies’ parameters. This notion of non-committal, this failure to personally face up to any problem is supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others. This indicates the inability of the General Manager to work outside the parameters. Case two and three are supported by the Agreement groups, complemented by large segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. This shows that the General Managers face problems head-on, which would contribute to the organisational values and generate employee’s commitment. This alludes to the General Managers’ abilities to display moral courage and inspire the staff to persevere. Furthermore, this projected leadership by example, leading to the inspiring of the right people forming groups and the appropriate processes to be activated. In addition, the use of position and power by the General Manager to deflect confrontations by delegating them to the mandated incumbents for resolving. The researcher’s views support the notion that the General Managers confront problems head-on.

• **Exploits Opportunities.** There is no evidence to support the notion that the General Managers have the capacity or inclinations to take advantage of unforeseen prospects and thus, to exploit opportunities as they arise. It is further stressed by the General Managers that is not up to an individual to decide to exploit an opportunity. Their view is that there is a team within the process that will decide, after considering the opportunities. It will then be referred to the General Manager to take the final decision. The Disagreement group, driven by a portion of the Supervisors
and Other group, supports the notion of the General Managers, although only marginally across all cases. The General Managers are not mandated to exploit opportunities and that they have to work in a compliance environment. It is evident that they are bound by the officially sanctioned mining processes taken together with personal liability. However, the General Managers views are not supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates that the General Managers take opportunities when they present these opportunities themselves. This also shows that there are General Managers who are discerning, capable, competent and sufficiently capacituated to do so. These opportunities cannot be exploited without the existence of a personal problem solving analysis process within the General Manager. It is considered that there is one, unfortunately there is no indication if it is formal or not. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager exploits opportunities.

- **Driven Towards Action.** The General Managers are perceived as driven and determined to be successful. Although their mandated focus is based on the tenets of their appointment and legal liability, it is influenced by how the General Manager responds to changes. Is it by re-activating activities that have succeeded in the past or is it by new solutions? Furthermore, the General Managers have stressed that “action” means to do something, irrespective of whether it is based on lessons learnt or on new creative solutions. They support actions based on ‘tried and tested’ solutions. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates that General Managers are prone to take executive action. However, the Disagreement group (although marginal across all cases), is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Other groups which provide insight into
the fact that they do not necessarily see implementing prescribed procedural steps as decisive driven actions. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager is driven towards actions.

6.3.5 Category 3: Deliberation

The mapping of this category will provide insight into whether the General Managers’ analytical abilities can offer feasible explanations for the existence of problems and how they might be solved. This will also help to identify if the General Managers have an inherent, personal problem-solving process. Mapping these concepts, in the table below, will depict how the staff members experience their abilities to create conceptual frameworks that provide the desired conditions to realise their companies’ strategic aims. In order to provide an integrated interpretation each concept will be discussed in some detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Deliberation Concept</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Research view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ability to departmentalise information.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As a problem solver.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Has an inherent problem-solving process.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides his/her concept for</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Provides innovative solutions.</td>
<td>3 3 5 3 1</td>
<td>3 3 5 5 2</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>5 5 2 5 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 1 4 1</td>
<td>0 8 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quickly offers meaning to a problem.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>0 8 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Provides the planning group with factors for info collection.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Realises the dynamic interaction between factors.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sequences factors.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Provide an hypothesis. (Negative is good)</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Expresses the Mine's purpose in written format.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Expresses his/her aim for the mine in written format.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Understands the GM's aim for the mine.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Indicates what needs to be done.</td>
<td>3 3 1 5 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 7 3 5 1</td>
<td>6 4 4 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39  61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Case Comparative - Deliberation concepts

- **Ability to Departmentalise Information.** The General Manager’s outlook on information is based on relevancy. Without appropriate information there is a great possibility of an information overload for the General Managers and their teams. Therefore, the General Managers have turned to Technological Systems to assist with the departmentalisation of appropriate information. The General Managers views are supported by a majority across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This has been amplified by technologies’ abilities to capture categories and store vast amounts of information. Furthermore with the convergence of telecommunication and information systems, retrieval has been enhanced and
simplified, making search as effective, quick and reliable. However, the Disagreement group (although marginal across all cases) is driven by portions of the Supervisors and Others groups. This indicates the lack of structure in information management by the General Manager, which leads to the under and over-utilisation of technology. The research view supports the notion that the General Managers utilise their abilities to perceptibly departmentalise information.

- **Problem Solver.** The General Managers believe that by referring to problems as “challenges” a more positive outlook within the environment is developed. They contend that this will impact constructively on the attitude of the staff to solve problems. The General Managers views are support by the majority of the staff across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which comprises of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. Although there is a majority, there is no indication if the General Managers are the initiators of the “challenge solving” or if it is just conforming to their structured processes and mandates. However, the Disagreement group (although marginal across all cases), is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups contend that the General Managers are not problem solvers, but just appointments who are being compliant with procedures as there is little creativity or originality of the solutions presented. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager is a problem solver.

- **Has an Inherent Problem-Solving Process.** The General Managers claim that challenge solving comes naturally to them and is based on their many years of experience within the companies. This is supported across all the cases by the Agreement group which made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. In turn, these views support the notion of the existence of a personal analysis process used by the General Manager. However, there is also a sizable contingent across all the cases of the staff which does not support the view of the
General Manager possessing an inherent problem solving process. They contend that the General Manager only relies on the structural processes of the mine. This makes compliance learnt over years not inherent but a conditioned respond, over time. This poses the question of whether experience learnt over time could contribute to an inherent process, which in this case is problem solving by an individual. If this is so, one must consider natural leadership, as well. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager has an innate problem-solving process.

- **Provides his Concept as the Basis for Feasibility Testing by the Team.** The General Managers assert their use of the team-based strategic planning process. They are part of the process and share their ideas, thoughts, impressions and understanding of the environments and their needs. They stressed that this is not done formally but is interwoven within the planning sessions. The General Managers views are not supported by Case three as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by the large portions of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others. This shows that the General Manager has taken charge of problem solving, regardless of the team-based planning process. This then alludes to the General Manager engaging in a personal problem solving process in order to prepare him for such a session or activity. Furthermore, it indicates the General Manager’s ability to formulate a hypothesis from personal deliberation of the problem and its environment. His ability as a leader is displayed with his enthused rendition of his own solution at the planning session which directs the team and is then evaluated for viability by the staff. It is still not clear if the performance of the General Manager, at the session, was planned, staged or impromptu. Case one and two as indicated by the Agreement groups supported by larger segments of the Executives, Functional Manager, Supervisors and Others confirms the team effort and
consensus decision-making or adherence to compliance of the mining process. This also shows that the General Manager’s ideas and suggestions are integrated within the team solution as they are evaluated for practical viability by the team. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides his concept for testing of its feasibility to the team.

• **Provides Innovative Solutions.** The General Managers acknowledge that groundbreaking, pioneering revelations are limited to improvement as the mine procedures are strict and structured for safety. It became apparent that there are various suggested processes for the improvement of process and technology. Although it is in a structured manner, the General Managers’ views are supported by the staff across all the cases, within the Agreement group. This indicates that creativity is only the starting point for innovation and that a favourable environment is necessary. Innovative solutions are not restricted by structure and procedures. It only needs a new paradigm to guide the process of contribution. Innovation contributes in the form of new and more effective systems, processes or improvement to a proposal. The Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Other groups which indicates the stifling of individual creativity, as there seems to be no thinking outside the box. This may just be an excuse to circumvent the rules. They also contend that continuous improvement is still within the parameters of the mine processes and therefore does not count for innovation - it is enhancement. Finally it is alluded that the mining environment promotes group thinking of the work forces and therefore there will not be innovation. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides innovative solutions to the problems.

• **Quickly Offers Meaning to a Problem.** The General Managers stressed that it is important for them to understand rapidly the gist and consequences of any problem.
as it surfaces. In order for this to take place the General Manager has to have access to a personal problem-solving process and thus not be obliged to be reliant on a procedure driven process. This would enable the GMs to react speedily or to exploit an opportunity. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates that the General Managers have exercised personal problem solving processes. It is not visible if these are formal or informal processes. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups showing that there are no swift interpretations of problems. This is a consequence of the structured procedures of the mines. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager quickly imposes meaning on a problem.

- Provides the Planning Group with Factors for Information Collection. The General Managers acknowledge that they do not formally provide factors for deliberation or for information categorisation prior to the planning sessions with the planning staff. However, they stressed that they offer up their suggestions of information areas and also categorise information on which the planning teams can concentrate during the planning sessions in order for them to focus. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates that the General Managers have identified relevant factors that have impacted on situations. This contributes to focusing of the analysis of relevant facts which leads to appropriate conclusions in the endeavour to solve problems. Furthermore, the factors should not be seen in isolation. The dynamic interaction of these factors should be foreseen and kept in mind all the time. This would not be possible without the existence of personal problem solving analysis processes of the General Managers. It can be
deduced that this exists. Unfortunately there is no indication if these are formal or informal. However, the Disagreement group (although marginal across all cases) is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups which is made up of the staff that has not had the opportunity to witness the General Managers’ abilities in providing factors for consideration. This could also support the notion that factors were not provided prior to, but rather were only provided during the planning sessions. This is supported by the Others grouping who, in all likelihood, did not form part of the team sessions. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides the planning group with factors for information collection.

- **Realises the Dynamic Interaction Between Factors.** The General Managers have reaffirmed that they only indicate areas for information collection and categorisation during team sessions. Furthermore, they stressed that the linking of relevant information areas with each other, is done during the planning sessions in order to picture holistic “pictures”. This will also ensure that awareness of the environment is synthesised into manageable groupings. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates that categorisation and grouping of information is done and the feasibility thereof is questioned during the planning session. All the planning staff has realised that the interaction between groupings provided a higher order synthesis of understanding of the information pertaining to the environment. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups which contain the staff that as not have the opportunity to witness the General Manager’s ability or that of the planning staff, to link the information groups. This also points to the planning team’s ability not to recognise the value of doing so. The research
view supports the notion that the General Manager realises the dynamic interaction between factors.

- **Sequences Factors.** The General Managers acknowledged that the sequencing of information areas and categorising of information takes place during the planning session. This would enable the structuring of information for analysis and deliberation in order to develop an holistic understanding of the problem and provide possible solutions. The General Manager’s view is not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven largely by portions of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates the inability of the General Manager and the planning staff to sequence the grouping of information to come prior to deliberation. This could lead to unrelated analysis or replicated analysis being done, without any contribution towards the resolution of the problem. This will probably put the company on another path and contribute to its irrelevance in a particular market. To compound the problem, the General Manager or the management team will not be able to react swiftly to competitors (or to exploit opportunities) in order to gain initiative within the market. They would not have attained a valid, holistic version of the situation in which the problem resides.

However, Case two and three as indicated by the Agreement groups are supported by large segments of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that the General Managers and the planning staff have displayed abilities to provide sequencing of factors. In this case, these are used as building blocks to enhance the deliberation process. This strengthens the synthesis of each category and group in order to bring about a higher order understanding. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager sequences the consideration of the factors.
• **Provides a Hypothesis.** There is no evidence to support the notion that the General Managers provide provisional solutions to the team or to anyone else for that matter. However, they have admitted to having provisional solutions that they have prepared for use as evaluating tools for the solution options formulated during the planning sessions by the staff. Furthermore, it is stressed that their solutions are not shown or presented to anyone – they are their proprietary (personal) solutions. Guidelines (based on these hypotheses) are given to the staff during the planning sessions. These guidelines are not formally provided. The reality that the General Managers have assumptions, demonstrates that they have personal problem solving processes. The General Manager’s view is supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by large portions of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. Unusually, the Disagreement group is the right approach. We do not want the General Manager to provide solutions to the planning team as this would stifle the planning team’s creativity, ingenuity and innovative thinking in developing resolutions. However, Case two and three as indicated by the Agreement groups are supported by large segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. This indicates that either the General Managers’ suggestions are perceived solutions or they raised points that came across as instructions. This indicator has provided a red light in terms of an authoritarian leadership style or one of extreme compliance. Irrespective of which red light is dominant, this is hampering the full potential realisation of the staff. This will manifest in high staff turnover. The General Manager is the only one with solutions, limiting ownership of the vision and mission of the company’s, goal attainment and finally the company profitability and survival. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides a hypothesis for the problem.
• **Expresses the Mine’s Purpose in Written Format.** The General Managers claim that the mines’ purposes are formulated by the strategic planning team of which they are a member. It is not the GMs task to articulate the mines’ purposes, but to contribute to its formulation during the team collaboration sessions. The General Manager will disseminate and communicate the purposes throughout the companies via the media, written format, communiqué, instructions, briefing sessions, e-mails, company websites and through company bulletins. The General Managers emphasised that the purpose was attain collaborative management decisions. The General Manager’s view is not supported by Case 1 as indicated by the Disagreement group which is made up of the large portions of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. The staff supports the notion that the General Manager formulates the purpose of the mine and the staff is the team which is expected to provide options on how that given purpose is to be achieved. They place leadership consensus higher than as an attribute and want to see the General Manager leading from the front. This indicates the opportunity of the General Manager to take ownership of the mine’s purpose. It demonstrates the need for decisiveness and decision-making on his part. The purpose of the company is fundamental as it directly addresses the primary problem and is the foundation of company’s vision and mission. This could lead to linking the General Manager’s passion and company performance as well as inspiring leadership. However, Case two and three are indicated by the Agreement groups (as supported by large segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors). The staff supports the General Managers’ views as depicted. This shows that the General Managers comply with the processes in the mines. They rely on the staff and have no personal involvement in the purpose formulation processes only in the dissemination thereof. The concern here is the ability of the General Manager to
internalise the purpose that has been developed by the staff. This is a large contributing factor for a plan to be simple, free of risk and executed without any passion. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager expresses the mine’s purpose in written format.

- **Expresses his Aim for the Mine in Written Format.** The General Managers’ views are that the mines’ aims are formulated by the strategic planning teams of which they are members. They acknowledged their contributions to the planning sessions in this regard. They asserted that it is not their tasks to articulate the mines’ aims but to contribute to the formulation during the team collaboration sessions. The General Managers’ views are not supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which is made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates that the General Manager formulates and expresses his aim for the mine. It is not known where it is expressed, if it is formal or informal and to which forum. The GMs aim for the mine would not be possible without the existence of a personal problem solving analysis process of the General Manager. It is inferred that there is one, unfortunately there is no indication whether it is formal or informal. The Disagreement group supported across all cases by the General Manager’s view, although marginally, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups which contains the staff that have had the opportunity to witness the General Managers participate within the planning sessions in order to formulate the aims for the mines which will then be disseminated in written format. This indicates the compliance of the General Manager and staff to the planning process of the mine. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager expresses the mines’ aims formally in written format.

- **Understands the General Manager’s Aim for the Mine.** The General Managers draw attention to the formulation of the aims that they express. They claim that the aim is
not their personal view but a result of a collaborative process of formulation. It was sanctioned by the strategic planning group for dissemination and conveyance. The General Manager’s view is not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by the large portions of Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. This shows that the staff does not seem to understand the aim, to the degree that it is a direct reflection of the strategic planning team’s formulation. However Cases two and three are in Agreement as supported by large segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. They claim to understand the General Managers’ aims. This could be as a result of the members being part of the process of formulation of the mines’ aims. The research view supports the notion that the staff understands the General Manager’s aim for the mine.

- **Indicates What Needs to be Done.** There is no evidence to support the notion that General Managers indicate what needs to be done in order to achieve the mines’ strategic goals. However, they have admitted to, providing guidance for solution development in order to address the company’s purpose and aims. There is evidence to support the provision of guidelines, but it is not evident whether this is personal or process driven. Furthermore, they stressed that it is their task to keep the planning teams on their toes. This is in order to avoid a repetitive planning process where the same things are rehashed year in and year out. The General Manager’s view is supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by large portions of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. In this case, the Disagreement group is the right approach. The General Manager should not provide tasking as this nullifies the planning process, renders the Executives and Functional Managers redundant, increases their span of control, moves from macro management to micro management and promotes
centralised decision-making and control. They need to comply with the processes and if they cannot do so, they need to rectify the process. However, Case two and three are indicated by the Agreement groups supported by large segments of the Executives, Functional Manager, Supervisors and Others. The staff reveals that the General Managers task anywhere in the Company. This indicates that either the General Managers suggestions are perceived solutions or tasking, otherwise their discussions with the workers come across as instructions. There is evidence showing the General Manager circumventing the command channel by tasking staff that are not in line appointments. What is not visible however, is the frequency with which this happens, whether it is intentional or accidental and what processes activate to inform the chain of Command of their decisions. The justification offered by the General Managers for these actions, in time, is of the essence as they are legally accountable for these actions. This then places a question mark on the validity of the process that is supposed to be the mandate for the personnel (and for accountability). The research view supports the notion that the General Manager indicates what needs to be done in order to solve the mine’s strategic objectives.

• **Provides a List of Desired Results to Achieve the Problem.** The General Managers’ positions are that they provide specific desired end-states to be achieved during the planning sessions. The format is however not visible, nor whether it is formal or informal. Furthermore, they claim that these desired results are to be established in order to satisfy the strategic goals. The General Manager’s view is not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group (which is under the influence of a large portion of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors). This indicates that the General Manager does not provide desired results. It is not evident whether this is due to his inability or compliance with the process. This places the onus on the planning team to develop and achieve his desired results. Could this be seen as
the convergence of strategic planning and governance? However, Cases two and three as indicated by the Agreement groups are supported by large segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. This shows that the General Managers’ abilities provide desired results in order to structure the planning sessions. They possess the abilities to link the strategic imperative to actions causing the desired result to become perceptible, thus making problem solving a vehicle for success. In order for this to be possible, the General Manager has to have a personal problem solving process. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides a list of desired results that will solve a specific problem.

• **Provides Guidelines for Planning and Implementation.** There is no evidence to support the notion that the General Managers provide planning or implementation guidelines. It is reiterated by the General Managers that they form the part of the strategic planning team. They also acknowledge that they do not personally provide guidelines for planning or the implementation thereof. This is the function of the planning team. The General Managers claim only to provide suggestions. This marginal view is supported by the staff across all the cases within the Disagreement group. This indicates that the General Managers participate in the formulation of the plan during the planning sessions and provide suggestions which are not seen by the staff as guidelines. However, the General Managers views are not supported by the majority across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others. They stated that the General Managers should provide guidelines for planning and implementation thereof in order to structure the team’s planning sessions and the outcomes. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager provides guidelines for planning and implementation of their intention.
• **GM’s Concept for the Mine is Evident.** There is no evidence from the General Managers to support whether their concepts or those of the planning teams are evident. It is apparent that the General Managers have concepts on how to solve companies’ problems, but they are not formally part of the companies’ planning processes. According to the General Managers the respective corporate visions are displayed - this is deemed to suffice. The General Manager’s view is supported by Case 1 as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by the Executives, Functional Manager, large segments of the Supervisors and Others. This indicates conformance to the planning process and the role the General Manager is supposed to play in that process. Furthermore it shows that the General Manager’s concept for the mine is not displayed but his corporate vision is made visible. However, majority of Cases two and three do not support the General Managers’ views as indicated by the Agreement groups supported by portions of the Executives, Functional Manager, Supervisors and Others. This indicates that the staff believe that the General Managers have concepts. This would, however only be possible if the General Managers had progressed through personal problem solving processes. This also shows that the use of displaying a concept would contribute positively to the development and attainment of the company’s plans. This would also encourage local buy-in within the management team and foster team cohesion throughout the company. By linking this to the corporate vision, it would provide support and achievement. This confirms the existence of the General Manager’s concept but does not indicate whether the format is consciously or subconsciously used. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager’s concept for the mine is displayed.

• **Finds Analysis Easy.** The General Managers believe that they have natural abilities to investigate, probe, evaluate, compare and consider information in order to
compile hypotheses. They also contend that their vast experiences within mining and the various positions they have held over time have contributed to their abilities to examine problems in detail. The General Manager’s view is not supported by Case one as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by the portions of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. This perception leaves no doubt as to the existence of the General Manager’s personal problem solving process. Unfortunately there is no indication whether this is a formal process or not. This poses the question: “What would it take to make this formal and would this assist the General Manager in his deliberation?” However, Cases two and three as indicated by the Agreement groups, are supported by large segments of the Executives, Functional Manager and Supervisors. There is evidence to support the notion that the General Manager finds analysis easy. In order for this to be possible, the General Managers should propound some approach to analysis. Personal problem solving processes, compliance to organisational mining processes and lengthy experience are discernible as qualities the GMs share. The mining processes are in fact compliance actions thus addressing problems resolutions in the process. If previous experience was the driving factor for analysis by the General Managers, their solutions would be based on successful past responses. This leads to the promulgation of a possible ‘one solution fits all’ or forcing the present situation (problem) into a cast from the past (pervasive successful solution). This would seem to make the personal problem solving process a feasible option to support the General Manager’s ability to find an easy analysis. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager finds analysis easy.

- **Team Presents Large Number of Solution Options.** The General Managers confirm the use of the mines’ planning process as the foundation for problem solving in the companies. This contributes to embedding good planning practices throughout all
the levels of the company. In order for this to be institutionalised the introduction of 
team-based strategic planning approaches was essential, made up of the various 
groups of planning staff. The staff’s participation in the planning process amounts 
to the continual development of options for decision-making by the General 
Managers. The General Managers confirm that the processes make continual 
provision for group collaboration on developing solutions. The General Managers 
views are supported by the majority of the staff across all the cases as indicated by 
the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers, 
Supervisors and Others. This indicates that the planning process provides the forum 
for team involvement on solution development. Nevertheless, it must be understood 
that planning is supposed to be seamless. In this case, there is no specific point 
where the planning ceases and the execution starts. It is proposed that planning on 
this level requires a uninterrupted development and is regarded as seamless. This is 
where the staff continuously and iteratively prepares options for evaluation, 
especially in a turbulent environment. This also indicates that the options are all 
evaluated for practical viability prior to implementation; and so too should corrective 
actions, be evaluated during and after implementation. This exercises the planning 
staff in deliberation and problem solving processes. The Disagreement group 
although marginal across all cases, is given impetus by a portion of the Supervisors 
and Others groups. This shows that there are no continuous options prepared by 
the staff. Such staff work would most probably hamper the General Manager’s 
ability to act proactively in order to exploit an opportunity or to react to competitors. 
This would lead to a stop-start planning process, which would be impractical. It also 
contains the staff that has not had the opportunity to participate in the planning 
process. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager allows his 
team to present a large number of solutions to the problem.
### 6.3.6 Category 4: Communication

The mapping of this category will provide insight into whether the General Managers display the ability to communicate their understanding of the context (and of what constitutes the problem) in order to convey their conceptual framework, guidelines for planning and the implementation thereof to the recipients of that communication. As the General Managers are the companies’ leaders and are obliged to instil confidence and belief in their staff, mapping these concepts in the table below will depict how the staff experience their abilities to create an informed staff, as well as esprit d’ corps. In order to provide an integrated interpretation each concept will be discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Communication Concept</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Research View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Concisely convey his/her concept of what must be done.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Imbues with inner feeling of trust.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>After briefing the problem was understood.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Realistic grasp of putting into practice the vision and mission.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Makes the GM’s intention clear.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>After the brief what is to be achieved is clear.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Visionary thinking is conveyed during the briefing.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communicates desired end-state.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grasps the organisational culture.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grasps the organisational politics.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Displays moral courage.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Radiates confidence in the company’s plan.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Exhibits good judgement of peoples’ abilities.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Passionately projects a strong sense of urgency.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Encourages dialogue between levels of management.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: Case Comparative - Communication Concepts

- **Concisely Conveys the Concept of What Must be Done.** The General Managers acknowledge their responsibilities to inform their staff. One very important way to achieve this is with the use of short succinct messages. Furthermore, they also recognize that English is not necessarily the staff’s home language, even though it is the main language of education. Language is therefore a critical success factor in the company. According to General Managers there are three fundamental concepts that need to be addressed in messages. One must be able to link the
  - “what must be done” with the
  - “why it must be done” with a compelling reason indicating benefits to staff.

The General Managers views are supported by the majority across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and (portions of) the Others. This indicates that the General Managers make use of straightforward, plain language to communicate their messages across all levels within the company. This approach by the General Manager is to be extended to the international environment of the company in support of their global presence. Furthermore this contributes to General Managers establishing a culture of appropriate engagements with staff and customers. Good communication will help ensure loyalty of both the staff and the customers. This
could contribute to the competitive advantage of the company and additionally complement the efforts to gain the initiative within the particular market segment. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisor and Other groups. They subscribe to the notion that the General Manager could not convey the message to the staff. It is unclear whether this is attributed to their use of language or if this is due to multi-levels of the company, or whether it is lost in translation by the staff or if it is a combination of two or more possibilities. Furthermore it is suggested that the reason for not grasping the General Managers’ messages is the fact that they have not developed the message themselves and therefore cannot establish the emotional link with the staff. A communicator needs passion and belief in what he/she says. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager concisely and adequately communicates his concepts for the mine to his receivers.

- **Imbues With an Inner Feeling of Trust.** The General Managers are of the opinion that a trusting environment will promote cohesion within the team and will engender trust. They stressed that to inculcate a feeling of trust one must be able to align body language and verbal language. It is reiterated by the General Managers that their messages resonate within the emotional level of the receiver and this is where their focus will be for trust development. The General Managers views are supported by a majority of the staff across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that the General Managers have identified fundamental attributes to be satisfied to ensure trust will be instilled within the company in both the tangible and intangible dimensions. To be successful in creating a favourable and trusting environment, the staff needs to see action, belief, passion, enthusiasm and moral courage emanating from the General Manager. However, the
Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Other groups. This indicates that there is a number of the staff that has no trust in the General Manager or in his ability to establish an environment conducive for trust development. This will also have a direct impact on the maturity level of the company, to accommodate change such as new directions enabled by technology. This contributes to negative small groups forming within the company which can turn into a “cancer” within the company. This is to be eradicated with due diligence as it will otherwise over time spread throughout the company. In business terms this is a red light as this could lead to inefficiency and fruitless endeavours pertaining to survival of the company. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager imbues the staff with an inner feeling of trust.

- **After the GM’s Briefing the Problem was Understood.** The General Managers project their understanding of the primary problem as part of their briefing to the staff. This is only possible after they have applied their minds to the circumstances in order to frame the problem. Furthermore, the General Managers have conceded that in order to apply one’s mind in a structured and controlled manner, requires processes. The outcome of that analysis will be needed to focus the problem solving process of the company. They acknowledge that the primary problem is the key to unlocking relevant solutions. The General Managers views are supported by staff across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others. This illustrated the General Managers ability to frame the primary problem within its context and translate the understanding into simple, concise language for dissemination in the GM’s brief. This would only be possible if the General Managers indeed applied their minds to the situations and circumstances of the problems. This would be feasible if the General Managers have personal problem solving processes on which to draw
during such times. It is not visible whether it is in a controlled and structured fashion or whether it was done on a whim; unfortunately there is also no indication if it is formal or informal. However, there is a substantive number of staff that do not support the notion that the problem is understood after the General Managers briefing as indicated by the Disagreement group across all cases driven by segments of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others groups. This indicates that the problem is not framed and there is a lack of understanding. This alludes to the inability of the General Managers to analyse circumstances, identify problems and to translate their understandings accuracy and concisely to the staff. This could also derail the problem solving processes during the planning sessions. The GMs often allow their contraction to shift onto a personal tangent which could cause a focus on irrelevant aspects, which could result in a waste of resources and would limit business value. The research view supports the notion that the staff understands the primary problem after the General Manager’s briefing.

- **Realistic Grasp of Putting into Practice the Vision and the Mission.** The General Managers views are pragmatic about the permeation of the companies’ visions and missions within the companies. They stress that it is not “their” vision and mission but is “ours”. It therefore “belongs” to all the members of the company. In addition they also reassure the staff that this shared vision is what the successful company hinges on therefore all actions in the company is to be evaluated against the vision and the mission to ensure business value. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. The General Manager translates the vision and mission into attainable objectives in order for it to become useful and attainable. Furthermore, the General Managers constructed these objectives into strategic plans for implementation as opposed to “wonder
plans” that end up unimplemented in the drawers of the staff. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a section of the Supervisors and Others groups who do not understand the practicalities of the vision and the mission; neither do they understand its implementation nor its realisation. Unfortunately, a developed plan will not contribute to substantial changes by using the same systems, processes and managed by people with the same competencies which they employed twenty years back. This will not work. This alludes to the existence of a grouping that will not be able to link their daily task contributions to the company’s vision and mission which could result in fruitless expenditure and would therefore hamper the company’s survival. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager displays a realistic understanding of the implementation of his mission and vision.

- **Makes the GM’s Intention Clear.** The General Managers maintain that during their planning sessions the company’s strategic intent is formulated and consists of a vision, mission, goals and objectives. Furthermore, it is stressed by the General Managers that the company intent was promulgated by them on numerous occasions both verbally and in written format. In addition they highlighted that their intents were incorporated within the company intent during the planning sessions. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This in turn points to the existence of a General Manager’s intent. It could thus be inferred that they (GMs) are the originators of that intent. How it is formulated is not presently apparent and whether it is done formally or informally is also lacking. Nevertheless, the staff in attendance of the planning session ought to have witnessed the General Managers’ presentations of their respective intents. It is not obvious when, how and in what format this was done. Furthermore, it reveals
that there is a difference between the company intent and the General Manager’s intent. What is not visible is to what extent they are aligned; how they contribute to each other; whether they are effective sequentially or concurrently. However the Disagreement group, although marginally spread across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and majority by the Others group which supports the notion that there are elements contributing to the establishment of the company strategic intent. This is formulated during the formalised, rigid planning process of the mine. These staff comments could be due to their attendance of the sessions, not observing the General Manager or they did not participate in the session. They therefore base their inputs on their working understanding of the mining processes. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager makes his intention clear to everybody.

- **After the Briefing What is to be Achieved Becomes Apparent.** According to the General Managers one must continually track and measure one’s messages. Furthermore one needs to know the answer to the question “Do people understand where we are going and why”? This will only be possible if the staff is provided the opportunity to critique the messages in order to internalise their understanding. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others. This shows that the General Managers have collaborative feedback collaboration processes to ensure that the messages are understood by the staff. What is not shown is the make-up of this feedback loop, its benefits as a validation tool. This in turn highlights the ability of the General Manager to communicate concisely. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others group which contains the staff that do not understand the messages of the General Managers.
They have not had the opportunity to attend the presentations of the General Manager and are basing their views on the second hand opinions of staff who did attend. This group could lead to a negative element within the company that will place the company’s survival in jeopardy. The research view supports the notion that the staff understands what needs to be achieved after the General Manager’s briefing.

- **Visionary Thinking is Conveyed During the Briefing.** The General Managers share the view that in order for a company’s vision to be successful it has to be futuristic, imaginative and inventive. However, this alone will not suffice. It has to be conveyed with passion and feeling in order to inspire the staff. In order for passion and feeling to be projected by and during the General Manager’s briefing use must be made of story-telling as a technique of delivery. This has become very apt in the current business environment as stories connect people with their meaning and associated fervour. What is a matter of some concern is that there happens to be an equal split in Case one between the Agreement group and the Disagreement group of the General Manager’s view. This shows that half of the staff believes that the General Managers can convey visionary thinking while the other half contends that they cannot. Although it would be simple to attempt to say that these two views “cancel each other out” in true mathematical analysis, the crux of the matter is what this split really means. By itself, it outlines a predicament therefore the impact of the staff’s opinion (within the bigger scheme of things) cannot be simply dismissed. This view needs to be placed in context with Case two and three. The General Manager’s view is not supported by Case three as indicated by the Disagreement group which is driven by the large portions of the Executives, Functional Manager, Supervisors and Others. This indicates the supposed inability of the General Manager to convey visionary thinking during his briefing. Regrettably, the Disagreement group maintains
that there are indications that no visionary thinking transfer took place during the General Manager’s briefing. This alludes to the partial existence of visionary thinking with or without the communication ability of the General Manager. The General Manager’s views are supported by Case two as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This has been amplified by the introduction of story-telling. This is not a gift - it is a skill which could be learnt or taught. Therefore telling stories from one’s own experiences could make people connect with you as a person, not just as the GM. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager’s briefing signifies his ability to convey his visionary thinking.

- **Communicates Desired End-States.** The General Managers contend that feasible outcomes are based on “what” and to “whom” they are verbalised. However, the following two options were offered by the General Managers in order to link the “what” with the “whom”. Firstly, one needs to provide a set of specific effects that must be interwoven during the planning session. Secondly, one needs to provide achievable outcomes for the staff. In order for this to be possible, the General Manager is to be conversant with the application of business language. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This has amplified the notion that the General Managers have desired results which need to be communicated to create a specific effect. Furthermore it is inferred that the formulation of the desired result is a product of the personal problem solving processes conducted by the General Managers. It is however not visible if this is formal or informal. The General Manager therefore plays a leading rolling in the planning session. A formal planning session would contribute to the General Manager's ability to use and improve his fluency in “business command”
(management) language. The Disagreement group, although marginal across all
cases, is driven by a portion of the Functional Managers, Supervisors and large
segment of the Others group. The staff that subscribe to this notion is made up of
those that did not participate in the planning session and a few who did participate.
Those that did not participate attribute their comments to what they picked up from
those who did participate together with forthcoming documents. This indicates that
is has not been recorded as desired end-states. Those who have been participants
within the planning processes indicate that all the outcomes are attributed to the
formal planning process of the mine and not the General Manager. Although they
acknowledge that the GM is part of the planning team (and in this capacity he has
contributed to the mine’s end-state). The research view confirms the notion that the
General Manager communicates his desired end-state for the mine.

- **Grasps the Organisational Culture.** The General Managers put forward the view
  that culture affects the “what”, “why” and “how” things are done in a company. This
  establishes a link between the culture of the company, its strategy formulation and
  implementation. Furthermore, it is very important for the General Manager to be
  responsive to this link. The conflict between company culture and strategy send
  mixed signals to company staff resulting in less than ideal choices by all. For that
  reason the company’s organisational culture, if approached correctly, becomes a
  valuable supporting factor in strategy formulation and implementation processes or,
  if not approached correctly, could become a major stumbling block. The General
  Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement
  group made up largely of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and
  Others. This indicates that the General Manager has comprehended and taken
  cognisance of the impact of culture on the formulation and implementation of
  strategy. This also highlights that the common denominator for culture, strategy
formulation and implementation is the individual member of the company. This also
indicates that the General Manager’s responsiveness brings together his ability of
analysis and synthesize within the tangible and intangible spheres. The company
needs to focus on the effects of individual participation and attitudes within the
company. It is not visible how the focus is achieved or assimilated and whether it is
formal or not. This alludes to the General Managers having analyses processes
which assists with coming to terms with the impact of company culture in both
spheres. This makes company culture another dimension for consideration within
the personal problem solving process of the General Manager. This will enable the
General Manager to focus on the company’s direction, performance and targets, in
order to overcome company culture and to allow them to execute successful
strategy formulation and implementation. The Disagreement group (although
marginal across all cases), is driven by a portion of the Functional Managers,
Supervisors and a large segment of the Others group. There is no indication
whether the General Manager linked strategy formulation to company culture for
implementation and if he took this into consideration during his preparation for the
planning session. This is a cause for concern as it could erode certain difficult to
define values and commitments of the staff towards the formulation and
implementation of the strategy. It is not visible if the General Manager is people
focused; risk tolerance provides reward criteria and seems tolerant of conflict as this
creates an understanding of organisational culture. The research view supports the
notion that the General Manager grasps the organisational culture.

- **Grasps the Organisational Politics.** The General Managers contend that ownership,
power structures and culture are all contributing factors to organisational politics.
They also stress that one ignores this fact at one’s own peril. The individual
company member is the focal point and there is a link between power, the leader
and getting things done. Leaders perceive that to achieve goals and power is the means of facilitating this achievement. This makes politics real and if it is not attended to, it could incapacitate the company and inevitably result in the company’s demise. This might be acceptable in times of stability, but in periods of flux, which are far more common, it could prove to be the GM’s undoing. It is safer to rely on almost inevitable change, to keep options open and to restrict alliances to only those based on needs, not on loyalty or shared values. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group which are made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that politics resides within all companies and that everything has political overtones. The General Managers’ have comprehended the political situation and its impact within their companies. It is emphasised that in order to get the better of politics, one needs to stick with valuing trust and with established relationships. Trust and relationships can be built on by quickly moving into a position of strength by “leaping” from one alliance to another. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Other group. This indicates that the General Manager has not fully grasped the impact of politics within the organisation. This could lead to the demise of the company, the formulation of splinter groups and non-support of the company’s vision. This could be attributed to the power structure and the individuals within that structure. These types of General Managers have a desire for power or intend to ensure their own survival by using a mixture of individual influences and institutional rules in order to enable control. They could be seen as childlike, overly mature, inflexible and overly serious, making them highly vulnerable in politics. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager grasps the mine’s organisational politics.
• **Displays Moral Courage.** According to the General Managers there are either those who are stubbornly resistant to change (and progress) or those who have a vision for the best possible outcome. The dilemma is that these individuals are to be found throughout the companies’ structures thus locating them in managerial posts or subordinate posts causing their interaction to be truly unique. Furthermore it is stressed by the General Managers that subordinates might fear how superiors will respond to their advances. Every person should carry responsibility to do what he can when it would make a positive difference to the company. He/she should tell a superior what the superior ought to hear. The General Managers emphasised that many strategies and many companies have failed when the subordinates could see the problems but were hesitant to inform leadership. This takes courage and many subordinates come across as being negative, but truth is the only value on which to build success. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that there are two dimensions. Firstly, doing the right thing on an individual level, based on the ethical convictions of the General Manager. Secondly, standing up to one’s superiors. An acid test for this is if the General Manager is prepared to look bad in the eyes of his superiors on behalf of his subordinates. This will only be possible for the leader if he has a firm base, built on integrity and morality. One can leverage strength for moral integrity by interrogating the status quo and being willing to risk obliterating comfort zones to achieve things that are more meaningful. This will also be endorsed by GM’s going the extra mile. A common element among successful individuals is a driving urge to make things happen and an unflinching willingness to take charge when not fully in command. Commitment is lost at the grass-roots level by leaders without moral courage. What is not shown is if moral courage can exist from top down within
management and, if it does, how would this manifest itself. The Disagreement
group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors
and Others group which contains the staff who purport that the General Manager
does not display courageous decision-making. In these cases there is no reason to
support courage and the staff is reluctant to find it, because they do not want the
hassle of having to substantiate it. They are satisfied by “ruling their own world” and
they feel comfortable controlling their own environment despite intrusions from
leadership. They would not stand up to the leadership because they feel the
possible risk is not worth the reward. The research view supports the notion that the
General Manager displays moral courage.

- **Radiates Confidence in his/her Plan.** The General Managers maintain that the
  success of the plan is coupled to their abilities to project confidence in the plan
during its communication to the staff. This will only be possible if the General
Managers have actually compiled the plan, are passionate about it and can talk
about it. This will contribute to their abilities in communicating resulting in inspired
staff. The General Managers views are supported across all the cases as indicated
by the Agreement groups which are made up of the Executives, Functional
Managers and Supervisors. Motivating and inspiring staff to perform with excellence
is a job for the boss who in this case, is the General Manager. This will only be
possible if the GM communicates well. It is vitally important for the General Manager
to be able to inspire staff, from his ability to radiate confidence in the company plan
during presentation. The Disagreement group (although marginal across all cases),
is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups. This raises the question
of the inability of the General Managers to convince their staff of their belief in the
company plan. This is underwritten by the possibility that the product was prepared
for the General Manager not by the General Manager. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager radiates confidence in his plan.

- **Exhibits Good Judgement of People’s Abilities.** The General Managers point out that in any company it is the people (human resources) who are the critical success factors - the glue that holds everything together. Those closest to the leader will determine success level of that leader. The General Managers also stress that their assessment of people is based on capacity, competency and capability. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers, Supervisors and Others. This indicates that the General Manager has criteria for appointment, other than those of the Human Resources department especially for senior appointments. This approach could contribute to the intangible dimension of the General Manager’s personal problem solving process of allocation of skills sets. However, the Disagreement group although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others group. This raises the concern of the General Manager’s ability to consider staff abilities. Unfortunately, if the people are the glue that holds the company together, then this view is an area of great concern for the General Manager and the company. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager has good judgement of people’s abilities and character.

- **Passion Emits a Strong Sense of Urgency.** The General Managers point out that enthusiasm, firmness and commitment to them forms the foundation on which passionate commitment can be built. However, this will contribute to the debate on the concept of urgency versus importance in order to affect the General Manager’s decision-making ability. What is of concern is that there is an equal split in Case one between the Agreement group and the Disagreement group of the General Manager’s view. This shows that half the staff believes that the General Manager
emits passion and a strong sense of urgency while the other half contends that he cannot. The General Managers’ views are supported by Cases two and three as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that the General Manager is involved in the development of the plan. The General Managers exhibit the ability to discern and prioritise in terms of what is important and what is urgent. They can also convey this message with passion that inspires action. The Disagreement group, although marginal in Cases two and three, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others group. This raises the question of the ability of the General Manager to be passionate about his plan and his ability to distinguish between what is urgent and what is important. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager’s passion emits a strong sense of urgency.

- Encourage Dialogue Between Levels. The General Managers believe that in order for any company to succeed, especially a mine, it is essential that the liaison and co-ordination between the levels of management allows seamless interaction as it is essential for survival. This is only possible if the leadership is progressive, and there is a high level of maturity within the company to enable this type of collaboration. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This indicates that wide open channels of communication and transparency are vital to fast-moving companies. The seamless transfer of information between levels will only be possible with a high level communication process which is essential to building trust. What is not evident is how bad news is disseminated and whether this will hamper or impede the dialogue between levels. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others group. This raises the question of the
company’s maturity level and the leadership of the General Manager. This will give rise to politics, small group formulation, power plays and turf wars. This view subscribed to by the Others group could lead to the establishment of inappropriate culture within the company. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager encourages dialogue between all the levels of the organisation.

- **Has an Articulated Vision.** The General Managers reaffirm that they have no personal disparate vision for the company. What is referred to here is the company’s vision established during the planning session. The General Managers also stressed that they internalised the companies’ visions for accurate distribution. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. The visions for the companies are not merely words. They should emanate from the General Managers’ creativity and experiences. However, the Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others group that point to the inability of the General Manager to internalise the companies’ visions. This could lead to a company moving in the wrong direction. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager has an articulated vision.

- **Energises the Team by Position.** The General Managers indicate that their positions and appointments are legally mandated. They also stress that their appointments include legislative accountability and that their company puts individuals in situations based on their competencies and capabilities. It is unique that the General Managers, although employees of the companies themselves, also have to represent their company as the employer’s representative during labour discussions. This places them in a quandary on leadership in the fullest sense. The General Managers’ views are supported across all the cases as indicated by the
Agreement group made up of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. Overcoming the quandary depends on factors such as degree of confidence, trust and respect that subordinates have in their General Manager. Furthermore, the General Manager’s positional power can be either strong or weak depending on the rewards he is able to muster. The Disagreement group, although marginal across all cases, is driven by a portion of the Supervisors and Others groups. This raises the question whether the leadership style of the General Manager can be anything other than autocratic. This also points toward the feasibility of transformational leadership within the corporate sphere. The research view supports the notion that the General Manager energises the team by position.

6.4 SYNTHESISED VIEW

The successful integration of the categories will provide insight into the extent that the concepts of the Military Commander’s Appreciation exist within the mining fraternity and in the process indicate its prevalence in business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Research view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The strategist</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Awareness-Problem Framing</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Managers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 25: Case Comparative - Synthesised View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Functional Managers</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication Executive | 26        | 42                  | 17         | 68    |
| Functional Managers     | 28        | 74                  | 71         | 76    |
| Supervisor              | 28        | 108                 | 94         | 35    |
| Other                   | 118       | 53                  | 33         | 86    |

| Total                   | 200       | 277                 | 122        | 319   |
| Percentage              | 42        | 58                  | 28         | 72    |
|                         | 27       | 73                  | 73         | 32    |
|                         | 73        | 68                  | 32         | 66    |

4 Communication

The Strategist. The General Managers are of the opinion that leaders have fundamental attributes such as judgment, entrepreneurial spirit and visibility seen to be within the main focus of service delivery. This will only be possible if the General Manager’s drives change, provides creative solutions and allows decision-making by the staff at all levels so that things can get done. In this process there is empowering of subordinates. It is also stated that due to legal obligations of their appointments the General Managers are inclined to immerse themselves in details. The General Managers’ points of view are supported by the staff as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that concepts of the Commander’s Appreciation pertaining to the strategist are present within the mines. The Disagreement group consists of a majority of the Others group supported by portions of the Functional Manager and Supervisors indicating that some of the Commander’s concepts are not present or they are limited. This indication is supported by the Others group where they did not experience these concepts or they were not visible to them. This raises the question as to how these concepts should be packaged for use within the company by the General Manager. The
General Manager makes use of the Commander's Appreciation concepts in his role as the strategist of the mine.

- **Awareness - Problem Framing.** The General Managers indicate that framing problems is fundamental to company survival/profit and necessitates their personal understandings of the environment. The General Managers are required to focus on their abilities to develop and provide information gathering processes. In order to deliver appropriate information for the development of their personal understanding. They then need to communicate and so, explain their interpretation/analysis of relevant information, and circumstances/context within which the problem exists in order to be able to exploit opportunities. The use of collaborative sessions, technology and processes will assist the General Managers with the identifying and the framing of problems forming a threat to their companies. This process is used for preparation of the General Managers’ participation in their planning processes as well as to satisfy the need to exploit opportunities. This keeps the General Managers “on top of their games” which alludes to the existence of the General Managers’ personal problem solving processes. The General Managers’ points of view are supported by the staff as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that concepts of the Commander’s Appreciation pertaining to awareness and problem framing is present within the mines and used by the General Managers. The Disagreement group, consisting of a majority of the Others group, supported by portions of the Functional Managers and Supervisors indicate that some of the Commander's concepts are prevalent to a limited extent. This raises the question on how the General Managers prepare themselves for the planning session, providing leadership, leading within crises and for exploiting opportunities to enable growth of revenue. This alludes to the possibility that there is an Executive or a Functional
Manager that is actually driving the planning process. This research made it clear that the General Manager makes use of the Commander’s Appreciation concepts for awareness and problem framing.

- **Deliberation.** The General Managers contend that they need to be problem solvers with inherent abilities to quickly give meaning to data. In order for this to be true they need to be able to departmentalise relevant information, to facilitate the creation of innovative solutions. Furthermore, these solutions are the General Manager’s personal parameters in which he develops desired end-states with guidelines for planning and implementation. This is given to his teams to develop various options for approval. The General Managers’ points of view are supported by large portions of the staff as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by segments of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that concepts of the Commander’s Appreciation pertaining to deliberation is present within the mine and used by the General Managers. It is however not known to what extent and in what format this is used. However, the Disagreement group consists of a majority of the Others group supported by portions of the Functional Manager and Supervisor indicates that some of commander’s concepts are not used by the General Managers. This raises the question on how the General Managers deliberate information indicating that the General Managers may have another way in which they prepare themselves for planning sessions. This alludes to the possibility that there is an Executive or a Functional Manager that is the actual driver of the company’s vision formulation. The research confirmed that the General Managers make use of the Commander’s Appreciation concepts for deliberation.

- **Communication.** The General Managers maintain that in order for any message to permeate throughout the company it is dependent on how the company’s culture and politics is used for dissemination of information. For the delivery of the message
the General Managers need to radiate confidence, be concise and instil a feeling of trust within the staff. This will contribute to how successful the company will be in implementing the vision and mission. The General Manager’s point of view is supported by the staff as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by a large segment of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that concepts of the Commander’s Appreciation pertaining to communication is present within the mines and used by the General Managers. However, the Disagreement group consisting of a majority of the Others group supported by portions of the Functional Managers and Supervisors indicate that some of Commander’s concepts are not visible to the staff. This raises the question on the ability of the General Managers to convey a concise message in order to inspire the implementation of the company’s intent. This alludes to the possibility that the General Managers have no role in the communication of the company intent. The research confirmed that the General Manager makes use of the Commander’s Appreciation concepts for communicating messages.

6.5 CONCLUSION: THE HOLISTIC VIEW

The General Managers claim that leadership attributes of judgement and entrepreneurial spirit are fundamental in creating awareness for problem framing. This would be possible if one is an inherent problem solver with the ability to quickly impose meaning on a set of data as this is fundamental to company survival and therefore necessitates a personal understanding of the environment in order to be able to develop a vision. This is however; also dependent on how the company’s culture and politics are used. The General Manager’s point of view is supported by the staff as indicated by the Agreement group and upheld by segments of the Executives, Functional Managers and Supervisors. This shows that concepts of the Commander’s
Appreciation pertaining to all the categories are present within the mines and used by the General Managers.

- To formulate his understanding of the situation and the environment that enables him to exploit opportunities.

- To provide the board with his understanding of the demands, place them into perspective as well as obtaining consensus to his performance.

- To provide decisive direction for his staff.

However, the Disagreement group consists of a majority of the Others group supported by portions of the Functional Managers and Supervisors indicating that some of Commander’s concepts are not used by the General Managers or may not have been observed by these respondents.

Further interpretation and reflection on this narrative is needed in order to identify relationships between the issues and determine the key research findings. This will be found in Chapter seven.
7. CHAPTER 7: FINDINGS AND THEORECTICAL CONJECTURE

7.1 INTRODUCTION

A narrative technique was used in the preceding chapter to make sense of the evidence collected. Further explanation is now required in order to gain a deeper understanding of the research. The narrative needed to be refined, once again, in order to extract fundamental synthesised issues. As this research is qualitative in nature and understood in terms of an interpretative approach, further investigation can be carried out by means of reflection.

A number of key findings have become apparent. These findings have led to the capturing of essential similarities and differences which present a crystallized understanding of the prevalence of the Commander's Appreciation concepts within the mining fraternity. In addition, it will be shown how the research findings can be made relevant and built upon for use within the (Generalised) business environment.

7.2 CONTEXTUALISATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

From the comprehensive literature review the researcher suggested that strategic intent was two dimensional, namely a union the CEO's intent and the Company's intent (section 2.5.3). This led to an investigation of the application and format of the CEO's intent and Company's intent formulation. The only environment that made use of something similar to the CEO's intent formulation was the military environment. The Military Commander's Appreciation is a formal military process that provides a mechanism to the Commander for the analysis of relevant factors, the synthesis of understanding by creating his/her concept of operations; and communication to his/her staff in order to activate the campaign planning process. Hence the research question:
Research Question. To assess whether the Commander’s Appreciation used in the Military context also prevails in the Business environment and if so to focus on the areas of similarity (and difference) as a basis to formulate a model for intent formulation.

It was necessary to identify a suitable industry to ensure that the comparison between the Military and Business environments would be feasible. The industry selection process was based on comparable, similar planning processes, larger corporate organisations, a larger organisational hierarchy and large individual business units. The mining fraternity was found to be suitable and the research instruments, a product of chapter five, were administered to three cases. The case study primary narratives were synthesized into higher order narratives as depicted in Chapter Six. The reflections about Chapter Five and Chapter Six crystallised into findings. Each finding provides an integrated view and additional insights to the prevalence of the Commander’s Appreciation concepts and its application by the CEO.

7.2.1 Finding 1: The Need for a Manoeuverist Mindset

The military believes that conceptual thinking by the Commander is fundamental in deciphering strategic level direction, visualising change and addressing unexpected circumstances. Conceptual thinking is used by the Commander to facilitate his/her cognitive process, during the Commander’s Appreciation. In order to overcome turbulence and uncertainty the Military Commander has traded in his/her ‘attritional’ mindset for a ‘manoeuverist’ state of mind. This is supported by the tenets of mission command and the requirement for a new type of Commander.

The General Manager entertains similar creative notions in the form of inventiveness, opportunism and initiative requiring an entrepreneurial spirit. Although they promote a manoeuverist mindset, in reality it is quite the opposite. Mines are subjected to governance based on a rigid planning process which indicates the likelihood of a stifling
of individual creativity, as there is no “thinking outside the box”. Compliance with the process is the sole order of the day. When there is “thinking outside the box” it is seen as an excuse used by the mavericks in the company to circumvent the rules. This also means that the role of the General Manager in the mine’s planning process is static and rote by nature. This rigid compliancy approach will hamper his/her ability to deliver on service and to react flexibly to opportunity. It could therefore be useful to counterbalance this approach with the introduction of a complementary formal conceptual analysis process for the General Manager.

The Commander makes use of the Commander’s Appreciation to conceptualise what needs to be done. The General Manager is confined to the mining planning process which has no process for conceptualisation of the task. Both the Commander and the General Manager contend that proactive and innovative solutions are not restricted by structure and procedures. It is all in the mind of the leader as part of a conceptual thinking process. This concurs with Mintzberg’s (Thompson & Martin, 2010:16) view on a visionary strategic leader who sees strategy as a mental representation of the successful position or competitive paradigm inside his/her head. In order to enable reactive and proactive action to the market demands and to be in the position to exploit opportunity, the CEO needs to have the ability to hold disparate ideas in his/her mind at the same time and still be able to function as put forward by F Scott Fitzgerald (Mintzberg, 2009:20). Further insights:

- The manoeuvrist approach provides insight into the necessity for a formal conceptual analysis process for the CEO. This will enable him/her to establish a “big picture” mindset. This will enhance his/her ability to create a conceptual framework that will provide the desired conditions to realise their company’s strategic imperatives.
• The CEO needs to clarify the Board’s expectations. The sign-off from the Board of his/her interpretation of their expectations is seen as the mandate of the CEO to proceed with the company plan.

• The CEO needs to create an understanding of what would be the optimal combination of compliance and service delivery in order to exploit opportunities to increase the company’s revenue and “footprint”.

• The CEO needs to gain insight into the Board’s strengths and powerbases.

7.2.2 Finding 2: The Handling of Complexity in Framing the Problem

The military also concede that conceptual thinking alone will not deliver on complex problem identification or the solution thereof. It is recognised that complexity\textsuperscript{20} in the military context resides within the structuring and the understanding of the problem’s context/environment. Complexity stretches from self-evident problems\textsuperscript{21}, structurally complex problems\textsuperscript{22} to wicked problems\textsuperscript{23}. Military problems reside within the “fog of war” therefore making problem solving a high-order cognitive process for the Commander to identify to allow him to shape the problem. For the Commander, complexity is addressed by his/her ability to blend conceptual thinking, common sense and cognitive understanding of systems during his/her Commander’s Appreciation.

The General Manager, on the other hand, makes use of due process and policies to ensure that problems are structured making it a bureaucratic process. The General

\textsuperscript{20} Tradoc pam 525-5-500. Complexity is based on two types: that of structural complexity - based on the number of parts and Interactive complexity - based upon the behaviour of the parts and the resulting interactions between them. It is the number of parts and the ways in which they interact that define the complexity of a given problem. Cambridge Dictionary defines complexity - when something has many parts and may be difficult to understand or find an answer to.

\textsuperscript{21} Tradac Pam 525-5-500. The problem is self-evident therefore structuring is trivial.

\textsuperscript{22} Tradac Pam 525-5-500. Professionals easily agree on the problem structure.

\textsuperscript{23} Weber R and Horn R. (2007: 1). Wicked problems are seemingly intractable problems. They are composed of inter-related dilemmas, issues and other problems at multiple levels society, economy and governance. These interconnections- (systems of systems) make wicked problems so resistant to analysis and to resolution.
Managers also accept that they make use of management analysis techniques such as SWOT and PESTEL to structure problems. Unfortunately there is no evidence that the General Managers would be daring enough to tackle any problem straight-on or by going outside of the company's parameters. There is no confirmation that the present mine processes could accommodate complexity in any dimension.

The Commander made use of the Commander’s Appreciation process to shape and categorise complex problems. The General Manager is confined to the mine's planning process in order to determine complexity without a conceptual problem solving process. Both environments are prone to uncertainty which promotes the necessity for the leader to have a continually updated understanding of the direct and indirect environment of the problems. This understanding will attract vast amounts of information which could easily overwhelm the leader. Both leaders’ ability to extract only the relevant information in the process of shaping and structuring problems is essential. The leader could succumb to past experience and due process because they are more comfortable with the “old” problems versus what it would take to come up with new solutions. The issue is how the CEO would contend with complexity and uncertainty in order to display courageous decision-making ability. Further insights:

- The CEO is to approach problems from a holistic view in order to overcome complex problems by distinguishing between causes and symptoms. The problems are then prioritised in accordance with the discussion on urgency versus importance.

- The CEO needs to first analyse the board’s expectations. This is the foundation of the problem to come and will provide his/her mandate for further consideration. On sign-off of the expectations, the CEO needs to acquire an understanding of the environment in which the expectation resides.
• The CEO’s environmental understanding amounts to his/her ability to determine the structure of problems and their independent parts within the environment. This is enabled by technology such as enterprise architecture modelling software, and the review of the capabilities of all legacy systems capabilities. This will show the amount of freedom of action each part of the problem exhibits and its interdependences making things easier, in order to finalise the scope of work and to achieve its implementation in a sequenced but piece-meal approach.

7.2.3 Finding 3: Appointment Suitability for a Position of Leadership

The military has made it clear that the person that matters is the appointed Commander. This appointment amounts to a directive by the General Staff based on fixed Commander’s criteria. Commanders at all levels must have qualities qualifying them for leadership. What constitutes attributes of worthy leadership amounts to attitude, initiative, getting things done, character, inspiring confidence and most of all displaying moral courage, resolution and determination.

The General Manager’s appointments and that of their executives, (which also has a legal liability) contribute to the establishment of a chain of command similar to that found the military environment. There are criteria for senior appointments, based on competency, capability and task-fit. This will lead to appropriate grouping of the staff with the company’s activities and process ensuring efficiency and effectiveness. On the other hand, their rigid appointment criteria could already have cost the company dearly as the subordinates see problems but are hesitant to inform leadership.

This indicates an authoritarian leadership style or at least one of extreme compliance within both environments. Irrespective of domain, this approach is hampering the full potential realisation of the staff and the leader. What are the key issues that will
contribute, or not, to the establishment of a worthy leadership environment? Further insights:

- An authoritarian leadership style or one of extreme compliance will hamper the full potential realisation of the staff. This will contribute to high staff turnover. The CEO is then the only one with solutions, limited ownership of the vision and the mission of the company, a drive to goal attainment and finally concern for the company’s profitability and survival.

- The individual is the focal point and there is a link between power, the leader and getting things done. Ownership, power structures and culture are contributing factors to the organisational politics. If not attended to these will incapacitate the company and could inevitably result in its demise.

- The CEO in one situation is not necessarily suitable for leadership in another situation. Therefore, suitability is seen as the pivotal focus in determining worthy leadership attributes.

- The following individual attributes were found to be pivotal for the CEO: cognitive ability, social skills capacity, ethical outlook, problem solving, intuition and the ability to exercise sound judgment. These attributes should contribute to the CEO’s predisposition towards action. In order for action to be embedded, the CEO needs to blend his/her experience and leadership attributes. Early identification of these attributes could assist with the appointment of a CEO and will support succession planning within the company.

- The lack of an inherent grouping of leadership attributes within the potential candidates at all levels in the company can result in promotion of individuals beyond their competency and capacity.
• Authoritarian appointments have led to centralisation of decision-making and the return to acceleration of activities that have succeeded in the past without entertaining any new solutions. This type of management style frustrates service delivery to the clients and staff, causing an increase in staff turnover and a lack of continuity.

• The rigid selection process is inappropriate for the identification of the new types of leaders. The new type of leader has to be able to apply his conceptual and cognitive ability in a free-flowing environment.

• Cognisance should be taken of the candidate’s “technology generation”\(^\text{24}\) when appointments are made as one could lead the company out of the market or reinvent oneself unknowingly.

• To enable the company to react quickly enough in the identification and exploitation of opportunities. Suitability for strategic conceptualisation should be evident in the CEO’s ability to realise the trade-off between compliance and service delivery.

• It is a bit of a stretch to link motivation within the legal appointment which is seen as mechanistic and bureaucratic. Motivation is more a character trait of the individual and it is seen that confidence in the CEO is based on his/her ability to inspire supporting noteworthy leadership.

\(^{24}\) Prensky, M. 2001. Technology generation. A digital native is a person for whom digital technologies already existed when they were born and hence has grown up with digital technology such as computer, the internet, mobile phones sms, internet, blogging, gaming, Artificial Intelligence and MP3s. See computers disappearing becoming like air. They are native speakers of technology, fluent in the digital language of computers, video games and the internet. A digital immigrant is a person born in a world without computers, Over time learned how to use digital environment. Grew up with typewriters, later word processors and finally the internet when operating in the digital world in distinctly pre-digital ways, for instance, S/he might “dial” someone on the telephone to ask if his email was received.
7.2.4 Finding 4: Packaging Effects to Achieve Specific Outcomes

The Military commander needs to influence internal groupings of staff towards a specific result or an effect that leads and contributes to specific outcomes. The Commander’s success is determined by his/her ability to construct and package effects for delivery on the identified objectives. This packaging of effects will only be accomplished if the Commander has conducted his/her Commander’s Appreciation.

The Commander’s Appreciation is carried out in order to attain an understanding of the environment, the mandate, the capabilities at his/her disposal and the effects he/she can bring to bear on a specific objective. This understanding will become a concept of operation in general terms. The staff will then be given guidelines for the planning of all the important details.

The General Manager has also to achieve the board’s imperatives as part of the team based mine planning process. The General Manager makes use of various management models to assist the packaging of effects. As part of the mine’s planning process, the identification and grouping of the mine’s effects will be determined by the internal team. Details are then worked out by the functional experts, which will then be adapted into an implementation schedule. These effects will be designed in a collaborative approach.

This shows that in both environments leaders are inclined to group internal resources to achieve an effect in addressing strategic outcomes. However, there is disparity between the mechanisms used to achieve packaging of effects for specific outcomes. The military makes use of the Commander’s Appreciation and the General Manager makes use of various management models. The CEO needs to focus on the development of the effects. What is not visible is how the focus is conducted, assimilated and whether it is formal or not. Further insight:
• The establishing of a personal analysis process for the CEO is deemed critical. In order to be able to determine their company’s capabilities while establishing appropriate effects.

• The CEO needs to provide the planning group with a set of specific desired effects that must be interwoven during the planning session in order to attain the desired end-states and the sign-off of the Board.

• The CEO has to sequence resources in order to release effects incrementally for the achievements of specific outcomes. This will be expedited with the leveraging of technology to improve accessing of appropriate information on resources.

• The company culture will hamper the realisation of the effects due to the “what”, “why” and “how” things are done in the company. The CEO as the company’s change agent will therefore orchestrate events into the way the company does business.

• Existing information systems (both core and support) with their processes are adequate for gathering information. It is not visible if their effectiveness at input and output levels and contribution to the effect are sufficiently developed.

• Innovation contributes in the form of new and more effective systems, processes or an improvement to provide an offering.

7.2.5 Finding 5: The Leader is too concerned with the Details

A Commander whose daily life is taken up considering details has no time for the comprehensive reflection of the holistic picture thus cannot impact strategically only tactically. The military contends that the planning staff has to concern themselves with the details of plan development and the implementation thereof. The Commander, on the other hand, will ensure that his/her intent and guidelines have been developed into
a feasible course of action and ultimately into a plan. The Commander will not interfere with the staff in the development of options, his/her function during the planning session and the plan implementation is clear: to take decisions.

The General Manager stresses that he/she is part of the planning team that translates the board’s strategic imperatives into tangible objectives. This is done in accordance with the mine’s planning process. They admit to intervening in the preparatory staff work, but refute the notion that they meddle on a regular basis. Furthermore, they offer the idea that their interventions are the exception to the rule, in the best interests of the company and in accordance with their legal mandate, thus should be seen as immersing themselves in the details.

Both environments have their plans developed by the staff. The Commander provides his/her intent to direct the planning staff, making his/her role directive. The General Manager is part of the process and his/her direction is an input during the process making his/her role inclusive. This could be the reason for the General Manager meddling in the details as if he/she was part of the team’s development process. What is discouraging is that their meddling is not just limited to direct reports, it is perceived throughout the company. The staff sees their meddling as obstruction and holding them back from doing their work. This could lead to the company “moving nowhere fast” as the “Captain is in the engine room instead of on the bridge” is what is seen to be happening (naval analogy).

- The CEO has no mechanism to develop his/her conceptual insight of the situation. He/she is feeling left out or either, sucked in so deep in the tactical day-to-day issues that it is making his/her view tactical and not strategic.
- The company can’t afford that the CEO engrosses him/herself in the details as this will nullify and disempower the staff to execute their mandated positions. This in turn
could also lead to centralised decision-making as the de facto process, which would affect productivity, promote a negative work force and instil a form of abdication and encourage a blaming environment.

- The CEO needs to function on the strategic level and not on the tactical level. It is absolutely vital that a CEO should keep him/herself from becoming immersed in the details. He/she should be spending many hours in quiet contemplation and reflection about the challenges of the external environment leaving the handling of the internal environment to the staff.

- The CEO is to focus on how to attain the Board’s strategic imperatives by conceptual analysis of the holistic picture, thereby ensuring that he/she is not sidetracked. The CEO should dominate the events which surround him/her. Once he/she lets events get the better of him/her, they will lose the confidence of their people and when that happens he/she ceases to be of value as a CEO.

7.2.6 Finding 6: Limited Ownership for Action

It is pointed out that the commander can be seen as the architect for the development of military strategy. Military strategy at any level consists of achieving ends or objectives, with ways and means or resources. The commander’s ability to blend these ends, ways and means into an appropriate, feasible and applicable military intent will dictate effectiveness. Military strategy tries to limit the onset of chaos by making subordinate commanders self-sufficient within the parameters set by the intention of the Commander. The Commander’s intellectual flexibility is seen as operational art, of trading time and space, of distributing and applying military means to fulfil governmental imperatives.

The General Manager’s compliance to the team bases strategy formulation in relationship to the mine planning process. They also acknowledge that strategy sets the
direction and leads to action, to build consensus and commitment to the vision, the
mission and the strategic imperatives. Although, strategy formulation amounts to
strategic thinking and their people are the conduit to translate strategy into tangible
objectives. The General Manager has no formal mechanism for strategic thinking. This
would contribute to their inability to exploit opportunities in order to gain the initiative
within the market.

Both environments show that the respective leader drives the formulation of strategy -
the Military by direction-giving and the General Manager by acting as part of the team. It
is also confirmed that the staff will convert the strategy into plans for implementation.
The military and the businessmen agree, that “if you want to win you’d better get your
strategy right”. For this reason, strategy can be seen in its simplest form as “the way to
win”. Further insights into creating ownership for action amount to:

- Strategy actually embraces all the critical activities of the firm and provides a sense
  of unity, direction and purpose.

- The plan is not the strategy, but merely the method for its implementation.

- The CEO is to articulate the company’s purpose as intent, for development into a
  plan by the staff, during the team collaboration session. There is a need for a
  mechanism to develop the CEO’s intent.

- Strategy is the logical means by which individuals manoeuvre in order to achieve
  his/her goals which would contribute to the organisation’s knowledge and skills
  base. This also contributes to the establishment of a link between the culture of the
  company and its strategy formulation and implementation.

- Strategy puts knowledge, insight and experience to the best practical use.
• Action is to do something, irrespective if it is based on lessons learnt or a new 
creative solution. This will only be possible if the CEO drives changes, provides 
creative solutions and allows decision-making by the staff at all levels so that things 
can get done.

• There is conflict between culture and strategy sending mixed signals to company 
staff resulting in detrimental choices by all. For that reason, organisational culture, if 
approached correctly becomes a valuable ally in strategy formulation and 
implementation process or a stumbling block if not approached right.

• The CEO is to focus on the company direction, performance, targets, to overcome 
culture and execute successful strategy formulation, implementation and execution.

7.2.7 Finding 7: Grasping the Environment of the Problem

In order to grasp the environment in which the military problem resides, the 
Commander makes use of various management models to create his/her awareness of 
the environment. The prominent models in use are lessons learnt and SWOT analysis 
which are acceptable for the tactical level, but not the operational level of war. The 
Commander’s Appreciation becomes the model for the operational level of war, 
supplemented by the various management models. Awareness had to be lifted to an 
environmental scan, which in the military amounts to a review of the situations. This 
review provides the contextual statements showing what has to be taken into account in 
order to enable the Commander’s subsequent analysis. This makes relevant 
information the key issue for the Commander, hence if the volume of information is not 
managed its effect will overwhelm the Commander and hinder decision-making thus 
rendering him/her incapacitated. In order to overcome the overloading of the 
Commander with irrelevant information, he/she, as the first set of parameters, provides 
the area of interest and area of influence, giving factors upon which to focus the
collection of relevant information and its analysis. In order to attain a situational awareness based on a scan of the environment both nationally and internationally.

Within the mine planning process, there is no formal procedure to gather information or to determine its relevance. The planning team uses management analysis models such as SWOT and PESTEL to group and categorise information. The mapping of these categories will provide insight into the team’s ability to frame a problem in terms of context, content relevance, appropriate factor identification and their relationships. This is done in order to establish a baseline for developing a mutual understanding of the problem within its situation and how it might evolve. This is only possible if the General Managers apply their minds to the situation and contextual circumstances of the problem. Applying his/her mind will only be feasible if the General Manager has a personal problem solving process.

Both environments have identified that enough correct information is the key to acquiring an appropriate awareness of the circumstances pertaining to the problem. The gathering of the information is done in both environments as a team effort. They also make use of similar management models. The military introduced the Commander’s Appreciation as their mechanism of acquiring an understanding of the environment. The General Manager acquires his/her understanding of the situation in conjunction with his/her team as they compile a mutual understanding. Further insights:

- The CEO needs to institute a process in order to ascertain specific relevant data. This will be accomplished by indication of areas of influence and areas of interest.
- The CEO is to determine a suitable set of categories/factors to structure and focus the collection of relevant information per area.
• The establishment of a personal problem solving process for the CEO to facilitate developing their understanding and awareness of the situation. This will also assist the CEO to identify relevant factors that have impacted on the situation.

• The management team will not be able to react swiftly enough to competitor’s moves or to exploit impromptu opportunities to gain the initiative in a market. They would not have been able to attain a valid, holistic version of the situation in which the problem resided.

• The identification of appropriate technology to enable the management of information and their networks. Mapping one’s information requirement to the legacy information systems will provide a realistically efficient view which is translatable into business value.

• The increased awareness of the CEO due to access to useful, accurate information indicates a flexible environment and improves the ability to react swiftly to competitors and exploit impromptu opportunities in order to gain the initiative in the market.

• The relevant information will indicate that in order to capitalise on this trend, the CEO needed to shape the business landscape by focusing on supply and demand and key relationships within the internal and external markets.

7.2.8 Finding 8: Connecting the Staff to your Intent

The development of a military campaign requires the combined efforts of the Commander and his/her planning staff. The Commander’s efforts in connecting with the staff commence with giving them his visionary guidance that project the confidence of his/her intention. This visionary guidance is the product of his/her Commander’s Appreciation process which amounts to a clear understanding of the role of the military
in support of the national policy and to provide limits/boundaries for the theatre of operations. In order to motivate and inspire the staff, one needs to map each team member’s gifts and talents and motivate them with “personal benefits” for aligning to the intent. This approach will empower and energise the team to exceed beyond their potential in order to ensure delivery. The Commander thus creates an environment which promotes taking of risks and of assuming an entrepreneurial mindset for his/her staff. In so doing he/she encourages dialogue and promotes creativity of the staff during the planning process.

The General Manager’s appointment contributes to the planning process structure and its compliance making it very mechanistic and bureaucratic. This does not provide him/her much movement outside the Managers’ guidelines for the planning manual. The General Manager nonetheless acknowledges that his/her people are the most valuable resource. This approach promotes participative planning where the team establishes a total awareness of the scope of the board’s expectations in order to formulate the company’s vision, mission, core purpose and values. The General Manager maintains that in order for a vision to be successful it has to be futurist, imaginative and inventive. This alone will not suffice as it has to be conveyed with passion and feeling in order to inspire the staff.

Both environments are reliant on their staff. The difference is that in the Military, staff is guided by the Commander’s intent during planning which is a product of the Commanders Appreciation, whereas the General Manager is part of the planning process and has no Commander’s Appreciation process. The motivation and inspiration of the staff emanates from individual passion of the leader. This supports Bates (2009: 3) view on business leaders who place considerable value on visionary leadership “…connecting people with purpose and passion towards a common goal…” This will
only be possible if the General Manager has actually compiled the message, is passionate about it and can articulate it, which would enhance his/her ability to communicate resulting in an inspired staff. Visionary leadership implies a strategic leader with a personal vision for the future of the organisation or at least a broad idea of the strategies for pursuing the vision (Mintzberg et al. 2009:141). The General Manager is more prone to meddling in the staff’s planning as this is the only “safe” planning mechanism available to him/her with which to attain an understanding of the environment. The key to any planning process is that the staff has accepted the leader and his/her intent for the company. Further insights:

- The leader needs to energise his/her team in order to achieve success by example and not position. One needs to be aware of what drives one and then to share that purpose with others - the result can be very powerful.

- To provide a clear role of the company in support of the board’s strategic imperative. The team has to set up processes with the aid of technology to register information of importance in an accumulative and enlightening manner.

- In both environments the leader needs to be seen as a master problem solver, innovator and a team builder in order to be able to connect the staff with his/her intent. The combination of the leader’s passion, company performance and inspiring leadership will contribute to a successful company, as easily it will contribute to a successful military operation.

- The members of staff are not mind readers, therefore it is important for the leader to connect them to his/her intent by telling them at every possible opportunity what his/her intent is and what it comprises.

- Leaders who motivate others have a unique ability to see a larger picture.
• Understanding what motivates other people is not the same as understanding what motivates you. The staff members will take ownership if they are able to understand what is expected of them and what they will be getting out of the successful company.

• You must continually track and measure how the company is doing so that the staff can be informed and enabled to experience success. The staff needs to know that the efforts they contribute are on target, appreciated and make a difference.

• To overcome meddling in the staff’s work, the leader will have to demonstrate restraint, trust, courage, persistence, tenacity, determination and synergistic communication skills, as this will bring out the same qualities in the group.

7.2.9 Finding 9: Allocation of Authority, Accountability and Responsibility

The Military Commander evaluates the mission that was issued by his/her superior in order to attain awareness and understanding of what has to be done, what is important and where it fits into the larger plan. This evaluation is done during the Commander’s Appreciation. He/she will then determine the effects required for attaining the mission. The appointed Commander has the right to demand and enforce obedience by virtue of the position’s authority. The position’s authority is mandated by an assigned command affiliation that will provide specific responsibilities and accountabilities to the Commander. Acceptance of the Commander’s authority will be determined by the staff and on his/her ability to influence and persuade others.

The General Manager negotiated the mandate with the board in accordance with the Manager’s guide to planning manual. There is no formal conceptual problem-solving process for the General Manager to attain an understanding of the environment in which the problem resides. The General Manager has no formal presentation to the
staff of his/her understanding of the environment. Nevertheless, they do talk about their understanding of the mandate during the planning session. The General Manager’s legitimate appointment promotes the use of position and power to circumvent delegated mandated staff. The staff sees the meddling of the GMs as obstructive and holding them back from doing their work. This has resulted in disempowering the staff in order to execute the mandated position. The General Manager advocates that decision-making is left to the appointed specialist that is mandated for that task. It is also stressed by the General Manager that his/her appointment is one of accountability and the company puts individuals into situations that fit their competency and capability. However, in order for the staff to accept ownership of the company’s vision and mission and to support/enable the GM, they need to participate in the solution development.

Both environments evaluated and negotiated their respect tasks received from their boards. The military has a process to prepare the Commander for those negotiations called the Commander’s Appreciation. The General Manager’s process is one of discussion and does not provide him with a model or an opportunity to prepare. The Commander’s and General Manager’s appointments are legally authorised. This authorisation comprises of being held responsible\textsuperscript{25} and accountable.\textsuperscript{26} Within the military, the Commander has been given a directive based on the command affiliations whereas the General Manager has to comply with the Manager’s guide for planning. The King Report on governance has provided the commercial industry with guidance on accountability and responsibilities for senior management. Further insights:

\textsuperscript{25} Kakabadse et al. (2005: 222) only being held responsible is and opportunity where new initiatives can be pursued or different approaches can be tried out, but with no real repercussions if all goes wrong.

\textsuperscript{26} Kakabadse et al. (2005: 222) being held accountable is demanding, especially if the individual has not direct responsibilities as the person is being judged without necessary having control activities, projects or project members.
• Governance is to be mandatory for all management and integrated into senior management’s performance directives. For this, one requires, clear thinking, experience and most of all common sense.

• Even though the focus of the mandate is based on appointment and legal liability, it is still based on how the CEO will respond to change. A question arises whether this response will be by accelerating activities that have succeeded in the past or by engaging in new solutions.

7.2.10 Finding 10: Alignment of Business Potential\textsuperscript{27} to Shareholder Value

The Military Commander determines during his/her Commander’s Appreciation, the required amount of combat power\textsuperscript{28} by linking areas\textsuperscript{29} and missions with own force capabilities. This ensures that the grouping of forces is done in accordance with tested combat ratios and focus of main effort tactics. The Military Commander assigns areas where the concentration of capabilities will support the Commander’s core functions\textsuperscript{30} and “unlocks” opponent’s Centre of Gravity\textsuperscript{31}. These assigned areas will also support the ability of the Commander to employ operational concepts (as well as the principles of war) to expedite success. The Military Commander will sequence actions in terms of effects based on the availability of resources.

The General Manager is faced with the same limited resource challenges due to the linking of investments, order book and skill set requirements. If not done properly, the company could be moving in the wrong direction and committing resources unnecessarily. The General Manager makes use of collaborative sessions in order to

\textsuperscript{27} According to the researcher Business Potential are those capabilities of the company use to achieve their strategic imperatives.
\textsuperscript{28} USA Army FM 3-46 defines “Combat Power” as the inherent capabilities of a military organisation.
\textsuperscript{29} Areas refer to here are the areas of Interest and Influence.
\textsuperscript{30} Commander’s Core Functions amount to finding, fixing and envelop the opponent.
\textsuperscript{31} USA Army FM 3-24. The Military considers a “CoG” as that element, characteristic, capability, or locality that enables one’s own or allied forces to accomplish their objectives.
determine strategic partnerships for leverage and resources that could benefit the mine. They also acknowledged that people are the conduit to success therefore focusing on capacity, competence and capability of their manpower resources.

In both environments there are scarce resources which need to be linked to strategic imperatives in order to gain the initiative either on the battlefield or in the business market. This initiative amounts to the Commander focusing on governmental imperative whereas the General Manager focuses on a balance between profit, cost and survival in order to achieve the stake-holders imperatives. The Commander and the General Manager map their internal capability and capacity to the strategic imperatives in order to prioritise the scope of work. The Commander makes use of the “centre of gravity” and “focus of main effort” tactics to group and sequence resources during his/her Commander’s Appreciation. The General Manager uses various management tools in order to combine resources and capabilities to attain competitive advantage. This concurs with Pearce and Robinson (2007: 164) that companies differ in fundamental ways because each company possesses a unique bundle of resources made up of an organisation’s distinct combination of assets, skills capabilities and intangibles. Further insights:

- There is a need for a unique process to determine business potential and to group tailor-made groupings of resources in order to deny the competitors market share. The CEO has no ability to allocate areas as he/she is focused on delivering the order book.

- There is no indication that any actions by the CEO will either prevent or slow down competitors. It is therefore essential that the CEO protects his/her company’s Centre of Gravity (CoG).
• Linking the external analysis to the internal ability of a company will provide the CEO with insight to areas for survival and exploitation. This will focus the company’s capabilities in a prioritised manner in order to exploit opportunity for increasing short term revenue versus long-term scheduling.

• The inability of the CEO to analyse circumstances, identify problems and to translate their understanding accurately and concisely into actions could lead to disaster. This could also derail the attainment of the strategic imperatives as they will concentrate on things that are irrelevant, waste resources and limit business value.

• The differentiating factor in business is our people. Therefore capacity development is only possible with education and training as elementary building blocks for the preservation of the competitive edge of the human resources.

7.2.11 Finding 11: Limited Grasp of What the Competitor is up to

A battle is in effect a contest between two wills, the Own Force Commander and the Opposing Commander. The Own Forces Commander will focus either directly or indirectly on what his/her opponent is doing. In battle, the Commander is continually thinking on how to defeat the opponent in both the tangible and intangible spheres. Both spheres will contribute to establishing the holistic picture and in the process ensure that the Commander is not sidetracked. What is meant by sidetracking is that the Commander is obliged to leave the implementation of his/her intent to the Unit Commanders who focus on the holistic picture development. The holistic picture determines the opponent’s capability and fighting power, which will indicate their intent as well as their most probable and possible course of action. The Commander is now in a position to respond appropriately as he/she has a coherent understanding of the events which surround and affect them within the area of interest and influence. Once
the events get the better of the Commander he/she will lose the confidence of their people and cease to be of value as a Commander.

The General Manager is more inclined to be focused on the bottom line. The bottom line leads to who is going to buy the products. This approach will hamper the attainment of the big picture by the General Manager as he/she is inclined to be focused on day to day operations. In order to attain the big picture, his/her evaluation of customers must become a vital indicator of what the global market demand is for the product/s in both the internal and external environments. It is a race to identify the market before one’s competitors, to equip internally and to be able to respond first within those markets. Technology has “made the world smaller” and access to the right operational information is much easier. This access has been supported by deregulation, privatisation and opening of markets by governments everywhere. The General Manager makes use of various management models in order to analyse the external environment.

The mining fraternity is focused on production and distribution as opposed to what the Military calls ‘the battle between two wills’. Therefore the environment is made up of two dimensions, firstly the tangible product dimension and secondly the intangible psychological dimension of the leader. These disparate ideas can be seen as two sides of the same coin where tangible actions impact on the intangible dimensions. In the military environment this is when the commander attacks the opposing Commander on various fronts (tangible-product dimension) making it difficult for the opposing Commander to assimilate all the information (intangible dimensions). One has therefore disrupted the opposing Commander OODA$^{32}$ cycle and his/her will to fight. It takes a fine leader to synthesise and synchronise actions within the tangible dimension in order

---

$^{32}$ USA Army FM 3-19. Decision-making cycle OODA = Observe Orientate Decide Action
to bring to fruition in the intangible dimension. These effects then need to be translated into intent that will result in the difference between winning and losing. This requires conceptual and strategic thinking on the strategic level. The Commander makes use of the Commander’s Appreciation process in order to formulate his/her intent (that will provide him/her the ability of linking tangible effects to intangible actions). This keeps the Commander thinking and his/her head in the game. The General Manager makes use of various management models with the aid of his/her management team to formulate the reaction to the competitors and to ascertain an on-going understanding of the environment in the tangible dimension. Both environments support the view of strategy as a ploy to outwit a competitor, held by Mintzberg et al. (2009:15) - this is in line with the viewpoint that many believe strategy to be a business chess game where one needs to think several moves ahead in order to win the game. Further insights:

- The CEO’s ability to grasp how the competitors will make use of the neutral factors in the mutual surroundings in order to expedite and increase their market share. This could lead to contingencies, alignment strategies and strategic alliances being developed.

- The CEO would benefit from a mechanism enabling him to analyse the external environment in order to position and create his/her awareness of the business landscape. To provide the Board with his/her understanding of their expectations, demands, to place them into perspective and to encourage them when obtaining their mandate and sign-off.

- The CEO needs to shape the business landscape by focusing on supply and demand and key relationships within the international and domestic markets. This approach will extend to the company’s global presence and the establishment of a culture of appropriate engagement with staff and customers.
• The CEO’s holistic awareness value is tested during a crisis, therefore he/she needs to be focused, resolute and decisive in a crisis. If not, this could lead to the company being isolated within the market place resulting in the loss of market share. This could place in jeopardy the usefulness of the CEO as a negotiator and direction giver.

• The CEO’s lack of holistic understanding to link tangible actions to intangible effects will impact on the company survival. This could lead to unrelated analysis or replicate analysis being done, without any contribution towards increased business value. This could put the company on another path or contribute to its irrelevance in a particular market. The CEO or the management team will not be able to react swiftly to competitors or exploit opportunities in order to gain the initiative in a market.

• The CEO’s business awareness for successful information dissemination is the key and it is not a once-off task. In order to obtain an optimal level of information for the staff between demand for and supply of info, processes have been instituted. Furthermore, with the use of ICT systems, information can be captured and stored at all levels. In order to expedite awareness information retrieval will be either on request or pushed via dashboards alerts.

7.2.12 Finding 12: Enabling Freedom of Action by Comprehending Risk

The Commander faces risking life and uncertainty with every battle in order to attain the strategic objectives. Commanders are trained from early stages to make decisions within a state of flux supported by limited information. This underwrites choice and encourages the use of intuition. The Commander’s application of mission command must realise freedom of action for the subordinates to enable their rapid decision-making. Unfortunately, the commander who centralizes all the decision-making, in order
to project his/her strength, is in fact strong nowhere. This approach takes away the opportunity of the junior leader to develop responsibility and initiative. Furthermore, the Commanders who are risk-averse will not make many mistakes, but they will however not achieve much of anything either. This will result in loss of confidence in the unit and their leadership by their subordinates.

The General Managers risk with each decision their shareholders’ livelihood and assets. Where risk seems dangerous, they are inclined to be more comfortable with old problems versus what it takes to come up with new solutions. The General Manager will not move until there is predicable certainty of the outcome of their decision in accordance with the processes. In order to assist with taking the choice, the General Manager will commission various risk assessments as pragmatic processes in order to take into account all the relevant factors. The mining fraternity culture is risk averse. Certain strategic options will be deemed note worthy of consideration out of hand. The General Manager does not make choices, as he/she is part of the team collaboration during the planning session. The General Manager is satisfied by ruling is/her own world and he/she feels comfortable controlling the environment even with intrusions from the board and stakeholders. He/she will not stand up to the leadership because they do not feel the risk is worth the reward. To realise modification of the internal or external business environment, is a matter of choice which amounts to risk versus profit within a compliant environment.

Both the Commander and General Manager have to take risks into account during the formulation of their company intent. The Commander has the savage burden of lives of the men and women under his/her Command (and the political cadres will not tolerate a high casualty rate). The General Manager is accountable to the stakeholders not to gamble with their livelihoods or assets, and is also responsible for the health and safety
of the workers. Both the Commander and the General Manager are inclined to agree that risk should be commensurate with expected returns. The Commander is trained to take risks when there is a real prospect of winning. The General Manager only accepts a high risk of failure if the likely profit is very high. Risk is ever-present and the leader with an entrepreneurial mindset is more likely to take risks. Further insights:

- The combinations of pragmatism, analytical skill and common sense are valuable attributes for the CEO to be able to position risk.

- The comparison between service delivery and compliance will provide an indication on acceptable risk. This construct will provide a perspective from a bureaucratic and entrepreneurial approach.

- The CEO’s continual updated awareness of events in the area of interest and the area influence will enable a rapid response. This will be possible with a personal analysis process for the CEO.

### 7.3 THEORETICAL CONJECTURE THE STUDY CONCEPT

The findings discussed in the section above have been synthesised through a process of reflection into a theoretical conjecture. The reflection process involves interactively reflecting separately on each finding as well as on the findings as a whole in order to produce an explanation of the interrelationships between them. The outcome of the exercise was the derivation of this study’s contribution. It provides an understanding on the shortcomings of a CEO’s intent formulation model and represents what has been learnt during the research. This expresses an integrated main conclusion of the elements that would make up the CEO’s intent formulation model which could also be used for a company’s CEO. The key elements in the theoretical conjecture are presented in order of importance and may be directly traced back to the evidence supplied by the case. The theoretical conjecture is as follows:
Strategic planning with the emphasis on turbulent times and the CEO’s role in attaining the stakeholders’ directives based on the appropriate awareness of the situation. It has become evident that the CEO has no personal mechanism to maintain and formulate relevant awareness. This boosts their inability to translate directives into tangible objectives or to exploit opportunities which relates to the CEO’s involvement in the strategy formulation process, addressing the misalignment that exists between the CEO and his/her staff. This mismatch has manifested as the CEO’s intent formulation (CEO) and the Company’s intent formulation (staff). The CEO’s intent formulation results from the inability of the board to hold the CEO accountable, as well as the CEO to show how he/she has integrated the board’s direction.

Through use of the CEO’s intent, the Board’s strategic imperatives are analysed in order to ascertain their expectations resulting in a principal expectation. Subsequently, this principal expectation has been mapped to the external environment in order to determine the impact on all current market participation and identify new market participation. The analysis of the company’s internal environment to attain a comprehensive understanding of the company’s capability, capacity and competency provides insight into market share, affordability of current endeavours, cost of expansions and the ability to prioritise actions. The provision of a prioritised scheduled scope of work mapped against the available resources determines the optimal solution between compliance and service delivery. This requires the compilation of the most opportunistic and most probable option in order to address the principal expectation of the board. This results in the CEO’s hypothesis. The conversion of the hypothesis into the CEO’s conceptual strategic intent addresses the board’s strategic imperatives and the formal promulgation to their planning staff signifying his/her visionary thinking.
which instils a feeling of trust, also thus providing room for the staff to develop a number of options. These aspects contribute to the tailored CEO Intent Formulation Model which could become an integral part of any company CEO.

7.4 POSITIONING OF THE CEO’S INTENT FORMULATION MODEL

Based on the findings and theoretical conjecture, a model and set of guidelines were developed to address the lack of a CEO’s intent formulation process. A model is a succinct representation of an artefact, concept or series of concepts processed together in order to contribute to the improved understanding of a phenomenon (business dictionary). The theoretical conjecture or framework supports the notion that the CEO’s intent formulation process is not visible. This model will suggest a process, its content and context supported by a set of guidelines as an instrument for the CEO to formulate his/her strategic intent. Prior to providing a model for the formulation of the CEO’s intent, as suggested above, it is necessary to provide a link between the CEO’s intent and the Company’s intent. Figure 28 below provides insight into the concepts that have been realigned as a result of the research.

Figure 28: Linking CEO Intent with Company Intent Concepts
7.4.1 Where in the Process

The CEO’s intent has been proposed as the activation of the planning process. Pearce and Robinson (2007: 36) state that “…leaders help their organisations embrace change by setting forth their intent – a clear sense of where they want to lead the organisation and what results they can expect to achieve.”

It is therefore necessary to position the CEO’s intent within a strategic development process. In order for the CEO’s intent to be practical and useful it has been placed within the Strategic Management Process Model (Louw & Venter, 2006: 2) as the first step in answering the question “What is the Target” as shown in Figure 29 below.

![Research Focus within the Strategic Management Process Model](image)

**Figure 29: Placing the CEO intent**

7.4.2 The Strategist Approach to Strategic Intent Formulation

We have now linked the CEO’s intent concepts to the Company’s intent concepts and placed the CEO’s intent formulation process into a Strategic Management Process Model. It is important to position the strategist with useful approach concepts. As this
model is focused on the strategist it is suggested that the CEO’s transition be enabled from an attritional state of mind to a manoeuverist state of mind. Cognisance needs to be taken by the CEO of the following constructs as a possible bridging approach. The term ‘bridging’ has been used in order to show that the CEO can move back and forth as the situation demands. This ensures that there is an acceptable trade-off within the mind of the strategist based on these concepts.

7.4.2.1 The Construct of Compliance versus Service Delivery

It has become evident that the CEO needs to understand the trade-off between compliance and service delivery. This will ultimately indicate the CEO’s willingness and will mark his/her threshold for taking risks. The visualisation of this trade-off could be simplified with the aid of a continuum. Therefore, to enable the CEO to position him/herself with an acceptable level of risk, an optimal zone needs to be established between these concepts. This optimal zone is used to illustrate the trade-off between the compliance and service delivery concepts. The continuum (Figure 30) has been established between compliance (on top) on the one side (1) and service delivery (on the bottom) on the other side (2).

![Figure 30: Continuum Compliance vs Service Delivery](image-url)
Figure 30 shows a continuum made up of compliance and service delivery concepts. This continuum shows the predicament in which the CEO finds him/herself. In order to explain this continuum it is necessary to look at it from the perspectives of the CEO as depicted in (A) made up of the Bureaucratic Company within its inflexible and attritional mindset of the CEO as opposed to the (B) Entrepreneurial company with its flexible and manoeuverist mindset.

The (A) perspective, indicator 1, shows 90% compliance actions that will yield a 10% service delivery. This approach is commonly found within the non-profit orientated companies such as government departments. The approach is extreme and stifles service delivery and the flexibility of the CEO.

The (B) perspective, indicator 2, shows on the other extreme where there is 10% compliance and 90% service delivery. This approach is normally found in the highly entrepreneurial environment with start-up companies and is inclined to promote flexibility and involves more risk.

Now that we have set the extremes of the continuum (A) – (B) it is necessary to find an optimal environment from which the CEO can operate. The optimal environment has been demarcated within (3) and (4) and the demarcation is visualised by the hashed area. The first indicator (3) shows a 60% compliance provides a 40% return; indicator (4) shows a 40% compliance provides a 60% return. This construct shows that in order for the CEO to be effective he/she can move between 3 and 4. The risk factor becomes extreme anywhere outside this optimal environment - stifling on the one hand and verging on total recklessness on the other. With this optimal mindset assisting the CEO, what would be the involvement of the staff in strategy formulation?
7.4.2.2 CEO and Staff Participation in Strategy Formulation

The compliance and service delivery construct has offered insight into an optimal mindset for the CEO in order to formulate his/her strategic intent. We need to firm up the role between:

- The CEO and his/her staff,
- The CEO’s intent and Company’s intent within the Strategic Management Process Model, and
- The contributions between the CEO and his/her staff in order to formulate and exploit the optimal position between compliance and service delivery.

![Linking CEO and Staff Roles in Strategy Development](image)

**Figure 31: Continuum CEO - Staff Roles in Strategy Development**

Figure 31 depicts a continuum existing between the CEO role (top left) and the staff’s role (lower right) separated by the line segment 4 - 5. This is supported by two banners. The top banner indicates the result while the lower banner indicates the mechanism. Viewing the continuum from position A creates an understanding of the interaction between the CEO’s role and staff’s role in strategy formulation. Position A will be discussed within three Columns indicated by the numbers 1, 2 and 3.
• **Column 1.** This Column is made up of the CEO’s intent formulation process with its tool the Strategic Intent Formulation Model. The focus is on the CEO as the major participant, establishing a conceptual understanding of the situation. This understanding will frame the problem and provide direction for its solution. The staff’s participation will be limited to clarification and provisioning of information. The staff’s continual collaborative involvement will move from supportive (position 4) to participant (position 6) culminating in the CEO’s conveyance of his/her intent. The end-state for Column 1 (position 6) is that the CEO will convey his/her intent with guidelines to the staff. This will trigger Column 2.

• **Column 2.** Column 2 focuses on the formulation of the Company’s Strategic Intent within the Strategic Management Process Model by making use of column 1 which outputs the CEO’s intent and guidelines (position 6). The CEO’s input to this column is his/her intent and guidance for planning and implementation. Once this is done the CEO’s role is one of guidance and decision-making. Furthermore, the staff has an increased role in developing the company’s business plan. In this column, the lead role is given to the planning team, which increases the staff role from position 6 to position 7. The focus of the staff will be to formulate options for the development of the company’s intent made up of vision, mission, priorities, goals, objectives, strategic initiatives and strategies. The end state of column 2 is the conversion of the CEO’s intent into company’s intent which has been realised into a business plan ready for implementation (position 7).

• **Column 3.** This column contains the implementation of the formulated business plan. The vision and the mission have been translated into plans for
implementation. The CEO’s intent has now been integrated into the plans of the company. The plans have been approved and resourced. Tasking of staff at all levels has been activated in order to drive the implementation of the business plans and the monitoring thereof. The relationship between the CEO and staff amounts to control by the CEO and implementation by the staff. The end-state of this column shows the achievement, or not, of the board’s strategic imperatives by the company’s staff (position 7-5) making use of the business plans. This has now placed the CEO’s intent formulation as the activation process for a strategic planning process.

These columns show the flow of the boards’ strategic imperatives internalised by the CEO (Column 1 position 4-6), translated by the planning staff into tangible initiatives and objectives (Column 2 position 6-7) and implemented for achievement by the company staff (Column 3 position 7-5). The focus returns to the makeup of Column 1’s mechanism - the Strategic Intent Formulation Model.

7.5 CONCEPTUAL STRATEGIC INTENT FORMULATION MODEL (CSIFM)

There is no set recipe for strategic intent formulation. This model provides the CEO with a conceptual analysis mechanism to obtain an appropriate awareness of the business environment. This awareness offers the CEO the flexibility to be decisive and proactive in his/her quest for service delivery and increased market share. Furthermore, flexibility enables the CEO to act in order to stabilise the situation, gain the initiative within the situation or exploit opportunities that present themselves within the situation. These actions culminate as the result of the Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model (CSIFM). This model is made up of the following four steps (Figure 32):
• **Step 1: Mandate.** The mandate centres around the CEO’s interpretation of the strategic imperatives received from the board. The result of this step is the correct identification and formulation of a principal expectation\(^{33}\).

• **Step 2: External.** The CEO will commence his/her conceptual awareness analysis by mapping his/her principal expectation to the external environment. This mapping will provide insight into the relevancy of all current market participation and identify new market participation. The result of this step is a corrective/alignment of current endeavours and identification of new opportunities setting the parameters within which the CEO achieves the board’s strategic imperative.

• **Step 3: Internal.** This step commences with the CEO’s analysis of the company’s internal capabilities. He/she then maps the output of step 2, corrective/alignment of current endeavours and opportunities, in order to prioritise resources. The result of this step is the CEO’s hypothesis of addressing the boards’ strategic imperatives. This is not for dissemination but only for the CEO’s personal use as a foundation from which to construct his/her strategic intent.

• **Step 4: Strategic Intent.** The CEO commences this step by converting his/her hypothesis into a conceptual strategic intent. This strategic intent comprises of the “What” needs to be done and not the “How”. The CEO will convey his/her strategic intent formally to the planning staff, focusing on “What needs to be done”. The result of this step is the synthesis of the CEO’s hypothesis into the CEO’s conceptual strategic intent and the conveyance thereof to the staff.

\(^{33}\) The link between the board expectations for the company and the CEO’s understanding thereof needs to be clearly defined and agreed upon.
The CSIFM should be continually revisited by the CEO in order to ensure that implications of a turbulent environment are properly considered. The steps of the CSIFM are now described in greater detail.

![Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model](image)

**Figure 32: Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model**

### 7.5.1 Step 1: Mandate (Determining the What and When)

The aim of this step is to determine “What” is to be achieved by analysis of the strategic imperatives received from the board and the parameters of those strategic imperatives. This begins with collaborative sessions between the CEO and the board in order to determine the precise detail of their expectations, as to what is to be achieved by the CEO. This will ascertain what has to be done which should include preconditions of the shareholders, political and legal imperatives, as well as their impact on timeframes. This analysis should consider how the other instruments of power, culture, diplomacies and economics will be used in order to support the strategic imperatives. When considering the step ‘mandate’ in context and relevant content, the CEO should consider the following questions:

- What is the history of the company?
- What is the relationship track record of the board with its CEOs?
• What are the policy limitations in order to attain the strategic imperatives?

• What is the power, culture, politics and legality issues within the company?

• Who is the driving force of the board?

• What does the board want to achieve with their strategic imperatives? This is very important in order to capture the intangible expectations so that it can be coupled to the tangible achievements (how it is said and not what is said).

• Who is the driving force on the board?

• What is the impact of all the questions within a timeframe? This will baseline the available time in order to achieve the strategic imperatives. This will enable prioritising of activities simultaneously as well as sequencing of actions. Ensure the timely acquisition of business intelligence in order to enable the gaining of the initiative. Critical decision-making needs to take place for timing of customers and competitors which will activate and provide the schematic timeframe.

With the accomplishment of “Step 1: Mandate”, the CEO has established a firm foundation for the rest of the strategic planning process. Hence the product of this step will comprise of a principal expectation and schematic schedule.

• **The Principal Expectation.** The link between the board’s expectations for the company and the CEO’s understanding thereof needs to be clearly defined and agreed upon prior to any analysis. The CEO needs to correctly identify the make-up of that expectation prior to any further analysis and planning. Any mistakes in identifying the principal expectation would steer the strategic planning process into the wrong direction. It is imperative to get the board to sign off on the principal expectation prior to any further analysis. Without this, one has no mandate and can therefore not continue.
• **Schedule.** The establishment of a time schedule with expected deliverables which could be seen as the framework. This will be built upon with progress through the process.

• **Closure of Step 1.** The final task in determining the mandate resides within the approval of the principal expectation by the board. This approval is a pivotal point for the continuation of the CSIFM.

The principal expectation can be seen as imperative for the CEO’s intent formulation process as the Principal Expectation is the most significant and decisive aspect standing between the CEO and the achievement of the board’s strategic imperatives. Furthermore, this will be utilised as a reference point by the staff throughout the intent formulation process as well as during the Strategic Management Planning process.

### 7.5.2 Step 2: External

The aim of this step is to determine the “Where – the business space of the company” by gaining an understanding of the external environment and the company’s current commitments. This amounts to an industry’s geo-spatial environmental analysis, including international interest for possible strategic alliances and joint ventures. Furthermore, political influences should be considered including public will, environment, cultures, competing demand for resources and economic and legal constraints. This will indicate the areas in which the strategic imperatives would best achieve and be supported. These areas are called “area of interest and area of influence” and together make up the business space.

The positions of international competing organisations should lead to the identification of likely adversaries. Furthermore, it is to be understood that such adversaries are

---

34 Business Space comprises the geographical statistics, infrastructure, political and economical
subjected to the same factors, constraints and freedoms and will also try to gain the
initiative in the market. It would be beneficial to develop an adversary’s perspective in
the CEO’s strategic intent as this would focus on countering action which could assist in
focusing the staff’s effort during the planning process in order to exploit gaps and
weaknesses. When considering the external step in context, the CEO should consider
the following questions in order to attain relevant content:

- What is the company’s global footprint? This will provide the present area of interest
  and influence.

- What industry is the company in and what does it want to be in? This will provide
  insight on possible diversification, expansion and determine the impact of Global,
  Regional and Country Strategies.

- What areas are available and what is not? This will provide the confirmation of
  continuation and new environments which could support the principal expectation.

- What does the impact of competitors, suppliers, media and customers have on the
  principal expectation?

- What are the influences and implications of social responsibility?

- How can time and space be traded within all the questions? This will provide insight
  into when a market place should be entered and left. This will also provide market
  release.

The CEO can then determine the impact and positioning of the principal expectation
within the external environment and current scope of work. This in turn should identify
gaps for possible opportunity exploitation and correction realignment. The product of
this step will involve the following:
• Compilation of a graphical representation of the area of influence and the area of interest showing where the company is, where it wants to be and the potential areas for opportunities.

• The development of an adversary expectation in order to show the adversary Centre of Gravity (CoG), Focus of Main Effort (FME) and its capabilities.

• Register of corrective actions of current commitments.

• List of possible strategic alliances and joint ventures.

• Inventory of possible opportunities.

• Areas of influence (indicating the strategic imperatives) and areas of interest (indicating possible opportunities).

7.5.3 Step 3: Internal

The CEO has now placed the mandate (step 1) into the external environment (step 2). The purpose of step 3 is to determine the “Who – Company Potential” which will be gained with the CEO’s analysis of the company’s internal environment. This will be done in order to attain a comprehensive understanding of the company’s capability, capacity and competency. It would be astute for the CEO to have an intimate knowledge and understanding of the company’s capabilities and competencies as well as its shortcomings. When considering the step “Internal” in context, the CEO should consider the following questions in order to attain relevant content:

• Where is the company deployed?

• What is the present market share of the company?

• What joint venture, alliance and their value have been contracted?

---

35 Company Potential is expressing possibility of inherent capacity for action by the company.
• What is the company’s composition? The CEO should have a clear holistic picture of the capabilities of each of the components within the company. He/she may be required to attain inputs from regional, countries and divisional staff.

• What are the critical resources that support or create the company’s strategic advantage? (The evaluation of the Human Resources, Logistical, Operation, Financial and Management).

• What is the company’s CoG and FME? This will provide the CEO with the option to identify his/her shortcomings and how to protect it. Additionally this will enable the CEO to group resources into a main effort in order to attain his/her principle expectation.

• To what extent will one allow the use of initiative by subordinates?

• How can one trade time and space within all the questions? This will provide insight into when to commit and release resources.

The CEO can therefore gain insight into market share, affordability of current endeavours, cost of expansions and the ability to prioritise actions. This prioritisation will assist the CEO in compiling his/her hypothesis which will address the principle expectation of the board. Hypothesis\(^{36}\) creation will only be possible once the CEO has formed a clear picture in his/her mind of the complete situation by synthesising\(^{37}\) all of the conclusions into very important conclusions that point to the solution of the principal expectation in a narrative format. The product of this step will comprise of the following:

\(^{36}\) Hypothesis in this context means the CEO integration and synthesis of conclusions.

\(^{37}\) This synthesizing is not a mere summary of previous conclusions but represents a critically important, value added synthesis of the total analysis thus far. It ultimately portrays the CEO understanding of the external environment, mapped to the internal environment in order to accomplish the principal expectation of the board.
Prioritised Scope of Work. Most probable and possible versions of the prioritised list will only be possible once the resources have been allocated. This will show what the company can afford, what they should be able to do as well as the unfeasible aspects of the principal expectation.

Hypothesis. This will be the CEO’s view of the most advantageous solution that will be found in the optimal segment of the service delivery and the compliance concept. From this hypothesis the CEO will define his/her Strategic Intent providing scope for subsequent planning. The CEO will not convey his/her hypothesis to anybody as it is his/her personal solution and resides in his/her mind. This will however remain the CEO’s measuring and validation tool of options presented by the staff during the planning session.

7.5.4 Step 4: CEO Strategic Intent

This step is the culmination of all the steps and is a superior cognitive process through which the CEO synthesises his/her hypothesis in order to create a Conceptual Strategic Intent. The Conceptual Strategic Intent underwrites the “What” needs to be done and not the “How” it is to be done. It comprises of the CEO’s vision and guidelines. The Conceptual Strategic Intent comprises of the CEO’s ability:

- To convert the hypothesis into a Conceptual Strategic Intent, representative of his/her visionary thinking.
- To create understanding and support for what he/she intends.
- To create scope for creative options.
- To confidently convey his/her guidance to the planning staff and to foster the sprit of winning.
• To convey the CEO’s strategic intent to the staff and to inspire and instil a feeling of trust.

The conceptual strategic intent is directly related to the display of superior leadership by the CEO. As already mentioned, under no circumstance is the CEO’s hypothesis to be presented, as this would deprive the staff of contributing or it could negate them totally thus providing room for the staff to develop a number of options. This step will comprise of the following:

• The Establishment of a Competitor’s Strategic Intent. This will provide the CEO with the insight into how competitors would approach the environment. This is a possible parameter in order to focus action and will assist with the activation of contingencies. This would also provide inputs into the establishment of gaining the initiative within the market space.

• The CEO’s Conceptual Strategic Intent. This is where the CEO will spell out what needs to be achieved, the sequencing of events and the allocation of resources in order to achieve the principal expectation of the board. The CEO’s strategic intent should focus on the overall effect which the company is to have within the market. It should be a concise and precise statement of how the CEO intends to achieve the strategic imperative of the board. This is the driving logic behind the planning process in order to enable the staff to produce the best reasoned solution.

• Conveyance of the CEO’s Strategic Intent. The purpose of the CEO’s conveyance of his/her strategic intent and guidelines to his/her staff is to initiate the planning process. The presentation is to give the staff guidance within the framework of the CEO’s intent. The CEO’s body language should radiate confidence and belief in his/her intent. The CEO’s ability to convey this signifies his/her visionary thinking and instils a feel of trust. This is where the CEO’s Intent (Figure 31, Column 1) is
converted by the staff into the Company Intent (refer Figure 31, Column 2) for implementation (Figure 31, Column 3).

7.5.5 CEO CSIFM Application Guidelines

In order for the full value of the model to be useful and practical it is necessary to place its application into context by suggesting guidelines for the CEO.

7.5.5.1 Focus of the CEO

The CEO’s focus is based on interpreting strategic guidance from the board, identification of objectives, orchestration of tactics; resource allocation and sustainability of momentum for the company’s profitability, survival and longevity.

7.5.5.2 Iterative Approach

In order to gain a holistic comprehension of the situation, the model should not be implemented in a checklist fashion. The CEO will need to re-examine aspects in an iterative manner, until he/she is satisfied that sufficient understanding of the problem has been gained in order to develop a strategic intent.

7.5.5.3 Format – Tailor Made by the CEO

The model is made up of four sequenced categories (step1-4) with questions that will elicit appropriate information in order to enable the CEO in his/her quest to attain a holistic understanding of the situation. This will place a high premium on the CEO’s cognitive processes. In assisting the CEO, the model’s flexibility will provide him/her the ability to select only appropriate questions in order to extract applicable information for creating solutions. Subsequently the configuration of the model is fluid and situational making the model applicable to CEO’s within the Entrepreneurial and Corporate Sectors.
7.5.5.4 Shared Understanding

To gain the initiative within turbulent times there will be a great deal of realignment, planning and the use of contingency planning in order to achieve pro-activity and exploit opportunities at all levels. There must therefore be a unity of effort through unified action. This is only possible if it is based upon a shared awareness of the principal expectation and a common approach to problem solving (refer Figure 4).

7.5.5.5 Assumptions

In the absence of a complete understanding of the situation, assumptions are used to fill the gaps. The CEO will have to make assumptions that bridge the gap between "what the CEO knows" and "what the CEO does not know". These assumptions are based on informed professional judgements that allow the strategic intent formulation process of the CEO to continue. However, assumptions are to be validated or rejected as the strategic intent develops.

7.5.5.6 Problem Solving

The CSIFM is a logical problem solving process which is applied in uncertain and dynamic environments. This will manage the trade-off between competing goals and time pressured. The CSIFM is iterative by nature since no situation ever remains static.

7.5.5.7 CEO Model Application

The CEO mentally conducts this model for simpler problems. The written format will be considered as more appropriate for complex strategic situations. It is human nature to formulate conclusions as progress is made through a problem solving process. For that reason it is vital that temptation is limited, when drawing final conclusions prior to the completion of all steps. In order to overcome this temptation, the model has been sequenced in its design before the relevant factors have been considered and
evaluated in order to prevent consideration of later problems. Conclusions are made on each question, which then escalates to the main conclusion which will be integrated in the CEO’s hypothesis in step 3. This seeks to prevent reaching conclusions that are neither based on fact nor on logic.

7.5.5.8 CEO Strategic Intent Ownership and Production

Although the CEO might use his/her staff to counsel him/her, the CEO’s strategic intent is the personification of his/her awareness of the relevant business environment and the ability to apply business techniques. The CEO’s strategic intent visualises staff grouping, allocation of resources to those groupings and the sustainment thereof.

7.5.6 The Stretch of the CSIFM

The focus is to shed light on the range of the CSIFM as a tool for the CEO and its usefulness within the various business environments.

There is a definite link between the leader and the life-cycle of the company. Rothschild (1996) proposes that an organisation in start up needs a risk taker as a leader. Risk-takers are highly intuitive, aggressive visionaries with an entrepreneurial leadership style. When the organisation moves into the growth phase it needs a caretaker who builds on strengths and implements change gradually. As the organisation matures it will need cut backs and therefore a skilled surgeon is the need.”

In order to best illustrate the business environments where the CSIF model will be practically applied by different CEO’s, a continuum will be used. The continuum (Figure 33) has been established between the Entrepreneur (Side A) and Corporate (Side B), separated with line segment (1-2) in order to depict the range of the CEO’s CSIFM model indicator (7, 8, 9).
In order to explain the continuum (Figure 33) it is necessary to look at it from both the CEO’s perspective as depicted by (A) made up of the Entrepreneurial Company CEO with his/her flexible and manoeuvrister mindset as opposed to the Corporate CEO (B) with his/her inflexible and attritional mindset.

- The (A) perspective shows that the majority (3) focus will be on flexibility mindset and minority (4) bureaucracy compliance. This approach is normally found in the entrepreneurial environment and within start-up companies promoting flexibility.

- The (B) perspective showing the majority (6) focus will be bureaucracy compliant while the minority (5) will be on flexibility. This approach is commonly found within large corporate and government departments.

Now that we have set the extremes of the continuum (A) – (B) it is necessary to find the range of the CSIF model within this continuum with the aid of indicators (7, 8, and 9). The CSIFM practical utilisation perceptive will be discussed per indicator.

- **Figure 6 Indicator (7).** The CEO’s practical use of the CSIFM within the entrepreneurial domain will amount to:
o **Environment.** The environment in which the CEO will find him/herself will be from the ‘launch to growth phases’ of the company’s life-cycle. The CEO’s role will be as the driver with limited staff. To make matters worse, the company is normally a new entrant experiencing turbulent times. The model will provide insight into the external and internal environments and will provide focus.

o **Action.** The need for rapid decision-making will require a more mental process of problem solving for the CEO. Following the models category steps, a mandate will be provided to the CEO, a market and his/her own capability and solutions.

o **Planning Process.** The planning process is fluid and flexible. Focus is on Column 1. The results will directly manifest in Column 3 (Figure 31). The planning process is a mental one driven by the CEO as there is limited staff. This planning will be carried out by the CEO and instructions given to the few staff members for implementation thereof. Staff involvement will be limited. There will be limited administration with emphasis on the legal minimum. The CEO’s intent, the company’s intent and the business plan is similar as there has been no further development by the limited staff.

o **Gaining the Initiative to be Competitive.** To be able to respond to the market demands necessitates that the CEO has an awareness of the environment. The model will provide the CEO’s information - the relevancy and appropriateness will be determined by the CEO’s ability to filter, analyse and synthesise the provided information and quality of the decision-making.

- **Figure 6 Indicator 8.** The CEO’s practical use of the CSIFM within the corporate domain will amount to:
o **Environment.** This is the corporate side which is inclined to be predominantly bureaucratic by nature. The company will have layers of management and will be on the mature decline side of the life-cycle.

o **Action.** The formulised and approved measured decisions authorised in accordance with a planning process.

o **Planning Process.** The planning is formal and rigid. The CEO’s role and the staff are depicted within Figure 4 based on Columns 1-3. The CEO formulates his/her intent which will be formally presented to the staff in order to develop the company’s intent converted into business plans for implementation. The CSIFM product is in an administrative format.

o **Gaining the Initiative to be Competitive.** Responding to the market demands necessitates that the CEO has an awareness of the environment. This environment within the corporate fraternity amounts to formal planning, scenario planning and contingency planning. The model will provide the CEO with the mechanism to process information, reach appropriate conclusions, to exploit opportunity, activate scenarios and align formulated plans.

- **Figure 6 Indicator 9.** This is a floating indicator that will enable the CEO to position his/her utilisation of the CSIFM in both entrepreneur and corporate domains.

The above indicators have provided a snapshot of how it is suggested the CSIFM could assist the CEO in formulating his/her intent within the entrepreneurial and corporate dimensions. Furthermore, it is suggested that there is an intertwining of the two dimensions as one moves along the continuum from indicator 7 to 8. The CEO’s intent and the company’s intent at indicator 7 is synonymous. As one progresses to indicator 8 however, the corporate process increases, introducing the planning staff. Therefore the CEO starts to relinquish his/her involvement and the corporate planning process
begins to develop. The split as shown in Figure 31, Columns 1-3, require that the CEO’s intent be formulated and communicated to the staff as an initiator for the planning team to develop the company’s intent.

7.6 CONCLUSION

The research findings presented in the chapter provides an in-depth insight into strategic intent formulation resulting in the CSIFM. There is support for the existence of two intent types namely the CEO’s intent and the company’s intent. Focus in this study was on the CEO’s intent formulation.

Iterative reflection on the findings explains key relationships leading to the development of a theoretical conjecture. In addition, a model and set of guidelines outline how this theoretical conjecture could be operationalised. The reflective process involved in deriving the theoretical contributions are in line with Remenyi (1998:76) where theory development largely relies on a researcher’s “creative ability” as there is no structured methodology for developing theory which,

“...can be regarded as an art that relies almost entirely on the imagination and creative abilities of the researcher... It is precisely here that science and thus research becomes truly creative...” Remenyi (1998:76).

The study contributions broaden the understanding of strategic intent formulation knowledge. Through acquiring an understanding, the difficulties involved in the CEO’s awareness and relevancy has led to the development of a new model for the CEO’s intent formulation that can be used by CEO’s in both the entrepreneurial and corporate environments. The importance of this theoretical contribution as well as the study limitations and possible avenues of further research are considered in Chapter 8.
8. CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter draws the research to a conclusion by reflecting on the theoretical contribution made in chapter seven. The components of the theoretical contribution are theory plus a model which offers new insights into Strategic Intent Formulation. The importance of this theoretical contribution is assessed in section 8.2. In addition, research audit trails (section 8.3) are used to ensure that the theoretical contribution is grounded within empirical evidence. This in turn provides an appropriate foundation for suggestions on further research (section 8.4).

8.2 IMPORTANCE OF THE THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

The usefulness of this study’s theoretical contribution and model can be measured on various levels:

- Firstly, it contributed to the discussion pertaining to strategy formulation with the focus on the utilisation of strategic intent. Strategic intent plays an important role in strategy formulation. There is paucity of literature on the strategic intent utilisation within all stages of a commercial entity’s growth. The use of strategic intent in the corporate business is of no less importance than in the entrepreneurial environment. The theory and model address the formulation of strategic intent. The model may be regarded as an alternative approach to iteratively improve alignment between the CEO and Strategic Intent Formulation in entrepreneurial and corporate environments. This study adds to the understanding of literature on the utilisation of strategic intent.

- Secondly, it indicated where strategic intent resides. It has become evident that intent is a concept associated with a specific individual and not a company concept.
as it is only an individual that can engender intent. Furthermore, the typical
commercial company is made up of people who negotiate what transpires in the
company. It became evident during this study that individuals’ agendas are often as
important as their joint or shared intent. It is not uncommon for committees to make
decisions that compromise the principles of certain individual committee members.
The company will benefit from the intent of individuals (in this case the CEO), as this
intent provides direction. This view is not seen as being in contradiction of that of
the Andrews - Hamel and Prahalad’s views, but is regarded as an expansion of it.

- Thirdly, this study suggested that the expansion of strategic intent in two dimensions
  - namely that of an individual and that of a company. These dimensions have been
  referred to in this study the “CEO intent” and the “Company intent” (section 7.4) -
two sides of the same coin. It is therefore necessary to position the CEO’s intent
within the Strategic Management Process Model. In order for the CEO’s intent to be
practical and useful it was placed within the Strategic Management Process Model
(Louw & Venter, 2006:2) as the first step in answering the question “What is the
Target?” (section 7.4.1).

- Fourthly, this study highlighted that the company’s intent is deeply embedded in its
culture. Within this view the CEO is likely to have little impact on the embedded
intent. Real change in intent can only occur after a change in culture has taken
place, such a change may take time. The CEO’s role in the formulation of strategic
intent will provide a mechanism for the formulation of formal awareness by the CEO.
This will also show how the CEO should approach service delivery, compliance and
risk, where the staff participates within the strategic management process model.
The usefulness of this lies in that it provides the CEO with a mechanism through
which to attain situational awareness. This in turn will contribute to the relationship
between the chairman of the board and the CEO, as well as to defining the CEO’s boundaries and responsibilities.

8.3 THE RESEARCH LOGIC – AUDIT TRAIL

The accounting fraternity is known for its auditing trails. These concepts have been introduced in research by Seal’s guidelines (1999:158) where “reflexive methodological accounting” is used in order to demonstrate that a study was carried out with considerable care. This enables the researcher to reflect on how the study progressed and helps a reader to follow each stage as the researcher outlines his/her research logic. There are two types of research audit trails that are relevant to this study – firstly, an intellectual audit trail (Table 25) and secondly, the physical audit trail (Table 26). These audit trails will be discussed in the two tables below. According to Rice and Ezzy (2000:36)

“…maintaining and reporting an audit trail of methodological and analytic decisions allow others to assess the significance of the research”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual Audit trail</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited understanding of a positivist</td>
<td>During my MBL degree it became evident that the positivist approach attempts to simplify the real world and to produce physical law-like generalisations. This was seen as restrictive in addressing the research directive to develop new theory from an in-depth understanding of complex social issues. Evidence would have been not effectively captured and understood with quantitative data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical stance review</td>
<td>After various courses on research methodology, I concluded that that an interpretivist position was more appropriate for this study. This was in order to capture contextual depth and social context. The details of applicability were recorded in chapter three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence collection</td>
<td>I found that to make use of interviews only would not have provided sufficient depth in the collection of evidence within the cases. I therefore decided on a mixed-method collection (section 3.3.4), which was predominately qualitative for the sake of analysis and interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence analysis and interpretation</td>
<td>As this was a qualitative research it was found that the grounded theory would be appropriate for inductive theory development. In order to overcome the strict format and micro-coding, an adapted grounded theory method was selected (section 4.2.1-3). I had difficulty in deciding on a qualitative software programme for the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interpretation. I concluded that in order to really understand the iterative process, the coding needed to be carried out manually (section 4.2.4). This also assisted me during my reflections of the collected body of evidence.

**Reporting of theory development**

The narrative approach was selected as an appropriate approach for reporting qualitative evidence. This assisted the interpretivist position in order to be able to report complex situations in a story format. Furthermore it enables creativity in developing a coherent story and exploring the key relationships. The evidence evolved from interview transcripts, categories, concepts, primary narratives, to higher order narratives and then to a new theory and model with guidelines (section 7.5).

Table 26: Intellectual Audit Trail

In order to provide insight into the researcher’s key methodological decisions, the use of the physical audit trail was found to be appropriate in order to document each of the research stages and idea formulation: – from the research problem to the development of a new theory and model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Audit Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading list assignment</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Identification of a research problem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea formulation – proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicability of the research design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong>&lt;br&gt;The analysing of empirical evidence was based on a grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converting the Commander's Appreciation into a research instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the instruments within Business and formulating a model for the CEO's strategic intent formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model suitability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administered to knowledgeable informants. Their transcripts were analysed via a grounded theory approach and contributed to the refinement of the model and to the positioning of the CEO’s intent formulation (Section 7.4). These contributions added to the existing body of strategic intent formulation theoretical knowledge.

Table 27: Physical Audit Trail

8.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has taken a number of small steps towards addressing strategic intent formulation. There are however, some opportunities for further research within this environment.

- The research findings and theoretical conjecture may be examined in a wider context. This could be extended to incorporate other military Commander’s Appreciation processes which would provide further density to the research instruments. This would also provide further comparative data and in so doing, would confirm or extend this study theory. This would also establish whether the findings were transferable to an even broader environment.

- The CSIF model could be applied within various business environments. The continuous participative evaluation approach would provide for greater involvement by stakeholders. This project could comfortably include a longitudinal study which would determine the model’s usefulness in linking the CEO’s strategic intent to the Company’s survival for both the typical enterprise and corporate environments in general.

- It would be interesting to see if the model could be applied within the higher education and executive training environments. It is suggested that the model could be synthesised as part of the administration of MBA programmes. This would show how the MBA student had internalised his/her programme material and would also show its relevance to the industry’s needs.
• The involvement of the Chairman and Board of Directors, with the CEO’s Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model could be pursued. This would show if the Board and the Chairman’s expectations were aligned. It could be interesting to see if the Board members and compliance with the Chairman’s King 3 would be improved if they made use of this model.

• To investigate the role of the Chair of the Board would play on intent development; and, include the introduction of the role played by a Military Chief of Staff into a business planning environment. This would provide the CEO with the opportunity to stay alert and to remain at a remove from the detailed development of the strategy.

• Finally, the research for this thesis was confined to the mining fraternity. Comparative research in other large industries could be beneficial. This could allow researchers to determine whether issues similar to those experienced in the mining were applicable to the formulation of strategic intent in other fields of business. In this respect it might also be of value to conduct comparative research and to compare research results in the UK, USA, India, China and Brazil.

8.5 STUDY CONCLUDING REMARKS

Strategy formulation concerns itself with the company’s existence, growth and shareholder value. The role-players entrusted with this responsibility include the members of the Board, the Chairman of the board and the CEO. For this reason, the synchronisation of these role-players’ expectations with the CEO is pivotal in order to ensure the company’s survival and increased profit levels. In order for this alignment to be beneficial to all, a shared strategic intent is regarded as imperative for company direction.
The Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model provides the CEO with a mechanism to establish his/her understanding of the Board’s expectations, to match it with the external environment, to couple it to the internal company capacity, to formulate his/her strategic intent and to convey it to the planning team. This activates the translation process of the CEO’s intent into Company intent via the strategic management process model. This has now aligned the board’s expectations with the implementation plan. Furthermore, the model will increase his/her awareness through an iterative process which would enable the CEO to react proactively in order to exploit opportunities as they arose. This would contribute to gaining the initiative in the industry and would realise the competitive advantage. This would all be carried out as a consequence of the CEO’s endeavours to create shareholder value.
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## 10. APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY

### 10.1 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt Col</td>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov Tech</td>
<td>Government technology seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS-SA</td>
<td>Military Information Communication Symposium South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>Department of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSBL</td>
<td>Graduate School of Business Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIFM</td>
<td>Conceptual Strategic Intent Formulation Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Strategic Management Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP</td>
<td>Strategic Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQM</td>
<td>Total Quality Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDF</td>
<td>South African National Defence Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Masters of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMPM</td>
<td>Strategic Management Process Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADOC</td>
<td>USA Military Training Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OODA</td>
<td>Observe Orientate Decision Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoG</td>
<td>Centre of gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME</td>
<td>Focus of main effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.2 DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate</td>
<td>To make easy, ease, make possible, help, smooth the progress of, help, aid, assist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>A process in which a neutral person helps a group work together more effectively (Schuman, 2005: 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>An individual whose job is to help to manage a process of information exchange. By providing non-directive leadership, the facilitator helps the group arrive at the decisions that are at task. (Schuman, 2005: 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>The primary purpose of leadership is to influence the feelings and emotions of those associated with the organisation (Weymes, 2003: 321)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>One who possesses amongst others the attributes of integrity, honesty, loyalty, selflessness, compassion, competency, respectfulness, fairness, responsibility, self-discipline, decisiveness, spiritual appreciation and cooperativeness (Weymes, 2003: 568)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management</td>
<td>Refers to the managerial process of forming a strategic vision, setting objectives, crafting a strategy, implementing and executing the strategy (Thomson &amp; Strickland, 2003: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic intent</td>
<td>A company exhibits strategic intent when it relentlessly pursues an ambitious strategic objective and concentrates its competitive actions and energies on achieving that objective (Thomson &amp; Strickland, 2003: 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management principle</td>
<td>Building a stronger long-term competitive position benefits shareholders more lasting than improving short term profitability (Thomson &amp; Strickland, 2003: 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management process</td>
<td>The process of reconciling the organisations’ resources (internal environment) with threats and opportunities (external environment) (Thomson &amp; Strickland, 2003: 140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy execution</td>
<td>Is fundamentally an action orientated make it happen process. The key tasks are developing competencies and capabilities, budgeting, policy making, motivating, culture building and leadership (Thomson &amp; Strickland, 2003: 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan</td>
<td>Consists of an organisation’s mission and future direction, near term and long-term performance, targets and strategy (Thomson &amp; Strickland, 2003: 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3 TERMINOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>A variation of the summated rating scale. This scale asks a rater to agree or disagree with statements that express either favourable or unfavourable attitudes towards the object. The strength of attitude is reflected in the assigned score and individual scores may be totalled for an overall attitude measure (Cooper &amp; Schindler, 2003: 253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview schedule</td>
<td>An alternative term for the questionnaire used in an interview, phone or in-person communication approaches to collecting data (Cooper &amp; Schindler, 2003: 361)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area sampling</td>
<td>A type of cluster sampling usually applied to a population with well-defined political or natural boundaries but without a detailed sample frame; population is divided into homogeneous clusters from which a single-stage or multistage sample is drawn (Cooper &amp; Schindler, 2003: 179)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. APPENDIX B: RESEARCH INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

This interview schedule assist with the interviewing of the relevant member as an instrument for the obtaining evidence for the qualitative a review. The following interview schedules have been used.

11.1 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR COMMANDER

1. Explain the role of the campaign planning process?

2. What is the role of the review of the situation?

3. What was your understanding of the role of the military strategic analysis?

4. What are the core elements of the military strategic analysis?

5. What is your understanding of conceptual factor analysis?

6. Are general factors unique?

7. How are conceptual factors determined and by whom?

8. What is your understanding of the formulation of a concept?

9. What is the role of the operational concept?

10. What is the role of the commander’s briefing?

11. Who communicates the commander’s brief?

12. What is communicated during the commander’s brief and to whom?
11.2 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE MINE: GENERAL MANAGER

1. Provide a short synopsis of your career in the mining industry that led to your present appointment.

2. Explain the structure of the mine in order to indicate your communication/reporting lines both upwards and downwards.

3. What is your mandate, as received from the Board?

4. Describe your understanding of the strategic planning process used within the mine.

5. Describe your mine’s strategic planning process?

6. What is your role in your mine’s strategic planning process?

7. What is your understanding of strategic intent?

8. How would you align the intent of your superiors with your intent?

9. Explain how you will perform your environmental analysis for the mine?

10. What are the factors that you would conceptually analyse in the internal and external environments in order to acquire a comprehensive situational awareness?

11. How do you prepare yourself for participation in the mine planning cycle?

12. Who from your staff participates and what are their roles within the planning process?

13. How and when do you provide guidance to your staff for planning?

14. To what extent does gut/intuition feeling play a role in establishing a holistic picture of your environmental analysis?

15. How will you synthesise all the relevant environmental analysis information?

16. What are the most difficult aspects of implementing your strategic intent?
11.3 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE MINE STRATEGIST

1. Provide a short synopsis of your career, within the mining industry, that led to your present appointment.

2. Explain the structure of the SA BHP Billiton\textsuperscript{38} /BECSA.

3. Describe your understanding of the documented strategic planning process used within SA BHP Billiton (BECSA).

4. Would it be possible to get access to the documented planning process, indicating any references to intent?

5. What is your understanding of strategic intent?

6. What would you do to communicate BECSA intent?

7. Explain how you will perform your environmental analysis for BECSA?

8. What are the factors that you would use to conceptually analyse the internal and external situations impacting on BECSA in order to acquire a comprehensive situational awareness?

9. How and when do you provide guidance to the Khutala and Klipspruit mine managers for planning?

10. What are the most difficult aspects of implementing BECSA strategic intent?

11.4 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: ENTREPRENEURSHIP

1. Provide a short synopsis of what prompted you to becoming an entrepreneur.

2. What is your understanding of the concept ‘entrepreneurship’?

3. What are the attributes of an entrepreneur?

4. Is an entrepreneur an opportunist or a strategist?

5. Explain strategy formulation within your organisation?

\textsuperscript{38} BHP Billiton is the world’s largest mining company. It was created in 2001 by the merger of Australia’s broken hill proprietary Company (BHP) and the UK’s Billiton, which had a Dutch and South African background. The result is a dual listed company with head offices in Melbourne and London.
6. Explain how you handled the growth of your organisation?

7. How do you access and distribute information within your organisation?

8. How do you consider environmental factors (access to capital, competition, etc) ?

9. Explain your understanding of the following four types of entrepreneurs and indicate where you position yourself

   a. The calculating inventor or The inspirational innovator

   b. The optimist promoter or The builder of strong enterprise

10. How do you capitalize on an opportunity?

11. Explain the organisational structure within your organisation and why it was chosen.

12. Explain the use of a business plan within your organisation.

13. How do you pick up signals in the environment that allow you to trigger major shifts in strategic perspectives to position your organisation?

14. Who makes key decisions concerning strategy and operations within your organisation?

15. What are the most difficult aspects of implementing your vision?

11.5 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: CORPORATE

1. Provide a synopsis of your career, highlighting contributions to corporate strategy development.

2. What is your understanding of the concept “Strategy and its development”?

3. Expand on the concepts of “Corporate and Business strategy”.

4. Describe your understanding of what makes up “Strategy Development”.

5. Explain the role of the CEO, in the “Strategy Development” process.

6. What is your understanding of the strategic planners role in “Strategy Development”?
7. Explain your understanding of “Intended strategy and Realised strategy”.

8. How would the development of strategy accommodate “turbulence in the environment”?

9. Explain the role of the board, in the “Strategy Development”.

10. What is your understanding of the concept “Strategic Intent”?

11. Can corporate strategy development be associated with entrepreneurship?

12. What role will the ‘life cycle of organisation’ play, within the strategy development?

13. Is strategy development a reactive or a proactive process?

14. How is a personalised vision of the CEO integrated into the company strategic development process?

15. Explain the structure required for strategy development.

16. Which documented planning process would you prescribe for use within corporate?

17. How did you communicate your vision within the company?

18. What are the most difficult aspects of implementing the CEO’s strategic intent?

11.6 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE MODEL SUITABILITY

1. Provide a synopsis of your career, in the military and civilian sector.

2. What is your understanding of the concept ‘Strategy and its development’?

3. Explain your understanding of “Intended strategy and Realised strategy”.

4. What is your understanding of the concept “Strategic Intent”?

5. Explain the role of the CEO, in the “Strategy Development” process.

6. What is your opinion on the researcher view:
   a. That strategic Intent is made up of CEO Intent and Company Intent.
   b. The construct of Compliance versus Service delivery
c. The Construct of CEO and Staff Participation in Strategy

d. Model Step 1: Mandate

e. Model Step 2: External

f. Model Step 3: Internal

g. Model Step 4: CEO Strategic Intent

h. Application Guidelines

i. The stretch–range of the CSIF Model
**12. APPENDIX C: MAPPING THE COMMANDER’S APPRECIATION: INFORMATION REQUIREMENT**

**Mapping Categories into Research Instruments for Evidence Collection.** Chapter 5 “The Commander’s comment” is a primary narrative that provides a synthesis of my dissection of the Commander’s Appreciation. This narrative led to the identification of 12 themes and 4 categories. The next step is to identify relevant information that will provide appropriate insight to access whether the “Commander’s Appreciation prevails in business.” In order to do this the following step is to construct possible questions and indicate their plausible contribution in answering the research question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate)</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Context • The commander appreciation has been analysed and primary narrative has been compiled in Chapter 5. This narrative will be converted into research instruments that will focus on assessing whether the commander’s appreciation prevails in business. Process • This is the expansion of the identified categories into questions that will extract relevant information from the case for analysis Content • The interview schedule is made up of questions that will be used to extract information from the source • The questionnaire is to confirm the information from the staff</td>
<td>The Contribution • Interview will provide direct access to information • The questionnaire will provide information to draw a parallel between the planning staff and the General Manager on how they experienced his/her understanding of the situation • This will also contribute to my belief that there are two types of intent formulation that of the CEO and that of the company. • Are there two cognitive distinct processes and what is the link?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Strategist – Leader</td>
<td>• How do you solve problems (I– this will provide insight on how the General Manger uses this to formulate his/her understanding of the situation, handling of change, incorporation of turbulence and providing direction) • Explain the structure of the mine (I– as this will provide insight directly from the General Manger on how the communicating, reporting , mandating and structuring of his/her departments of the mine) • The General Manager’s discernment will provide stability to deal with unexpected circumstances (Q– as this will provide insight on how the staff experience the process</td>
<td>• Provide information to confirm or not that the General Manager formulates his own intention • To obtain information on how the General Manager simplifies and integrates turbulent activities. • This will provide information into the judgement, acumen of the General Manager and his ability to grasp and integrate the unexpected emergent actions. • To obtain information to determine if the General Manager is proactive or not • This will provide information whether or not to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser No</td>
<td>Category (itemised Category)</td>
<td>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate</td>
<td>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |                             | that the General Manager uses to integrate change and turbulence). • The General Manager proactively meets challenges (Q– this will provide insight directly if the General Manager has a process that keeps him informed to be able to join the don't and be prepared). • The General Manager is decisive (Q– as this will provide insight directly to a cognitive process that the General Manager uses to make decisions and if he is clear in his thinking and resolute). • The General Manager is highly visible (Q– as this will provide insight directly to the General Manager's credibility within the group. This also indicates his well-being to not lose touch with the front line). • The General Manager uses the chain of command to get the job done (Q– as this will confirm the General Manager’s flexibility in both the physical and the cognitive scenes). • The General Manager focuses on delivery (Q– as this will confirm the General Manager’s flexibility). • The General Manager drives change (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager is proactive and has awareness of his surroundings). • The General Manager is creative in his solutions (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a problem solving process that he uses to personally develop solutions). • The General Manager allows decision-making on all levels (Q– as this will confirm the General Manager’s trust in his subordinates and that they all have bought into the plan. This will also provide insight into the General Manager’s mandating of his/her staff. This will also indicate the ability to exploit opportunities as they arise). • Events get the better of the General Manager (Q– as this will confirm how the General Manager reacts under support the General Manager’s entrepreneurial ability and risk threshold. • This will provide information to expose or not the General Manager’s ability to make critical and vital decisions • To obtain information that will show whether or not the General Manager is clear thinking, decisive resolute and strong minded • To provide information if he/she drives change • To show if his/her leadership will convince members to participate • To see if the General Manager is rigid and bureaucratic or not, alluding to his/her flexibility and entrepreneurship. • To obtain information on how the General Manager simplifies complexity for the planning staff and the internal members. • Information to determine if the leader/ General Manager has installed a problem solving process within the company • The General Manager’s grasp of the problem will indicate his ability to, launch proactive action and in the process gain the initiative • This will indicate the role of the General Manager in the planning process. • This will show that the General Manager is constantly improving him/herself. • This will show that the commander has identified areas for continuous improvement of his/her staff skill set • This will provide info on the General Manager’s involvement in the planning process • This will also provide the insight to how the General Manager has internalised the problem, structured it and taken ownership of it. • This will provide an indication to what factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate)</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        |                             | pressure; this is not a favourable situation if he/she is affected as he could lose his credibility and standing within his staff).  
• The General Manager immerses him/herself in the details (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to work at the strategic level, provide his staff ability to contribute, stifle staff innovation. This will not be a favourable situation).  
• The General Manager provides direction for strategic alliances (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to focus on profit. This will indicate his/her ability to access competence).  
• The General Manager gets things done correctly (Q–this will confirm if the General Manager conducts ethical business).  
• The General Manager empowers subordinates for succession (Q–this will confirm that the General Manager coaches, skills and invests in his staff to improve themselves and their flexibility).  
• The General Manager prepares him/herself to contribute to the strategic planning process. (Q–this will confirm if the General Manager has a personal problem solving process).  
• The General Manager displays the ability to identify problems (Q–this will confirm if the General Manager has a personal problem solving process).  
• The General Manager can make sense of a changing environment in a simple, concise manner (Q–this will confirm the General Manager’s ability to temperate the external environment and translate his analysis).  
• The General Manager makes choices (Q–this will confirm that the General Manager has the ability to make decisions and has an understanding of the environment to be able to make choices).  
• The General Manager inspires confidence in you (Q–this will confirm the General Manager’s ability to get people he/she uses to get an understanding of the environment.  
• This will assist with the identification of knowledge Gaps of the General Manager and his/her staff  
• Information to show that there is a General Manager’s vision which will support the notion of a General Manager’s intent  
• This is to provide information on how the General Manager intertwined the change management principles as the way of doing business. The interpersonal relationship of the senior executive displays these attributes.  
• The ability to inspire and build teams  
• The information will indicate via interview and verified by questionnaire the entrepreneurial ability of the General Manager.  
• This will then show that the entrepreneurial environment can be accommodated within the tangible and intangible dimension.  
• This will also show that the General Manager can be held accountable for the delivery of the strategic aims.  
• This will provide inputs into the leadership trait’s of the General Manager  
• This will also indicate if the General Manager has the ability to provide strategic direction, which he has interoperated.  
• The information will indicate a process that will prepare and offer options for consideration for the General Manager to consider and to decide upon. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (Itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q)) and why method is appropriate</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3     | Awareness – Problem Framing  | • What is your mandate, as received from the Board? (I– as this will provide insight directly to the process the General Manager uses to formulate his understanding and the parameter of the mission received. This will also provide the link between the board and their expectations)  
• Describe your understanding of the strategic planning process used within the mine. (I–this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on how the strategic planning is constituted, conducted and what the process is,)  
• What is your role in your mine's strategic planning process? (I–this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on his/her role in the strategic planning process)  
• What is your understanding of strategic intent? (I – as this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on his/ her understanding on intent and its formulations. This will also indicate whether strategic intent is used or not, visible or not within the organisation)  
• How would you align the intent of your superiors with your intent (I– as this will provide insight directly to a process that the General Manager users to break down the superior intentions- alluding to a process, cognitive and conceptual thinking)  
• Explain how you will perform your environmental analysis for the mine? (I– as this will provide insight directly to the General Manager’s conceptual analysis of his/her environment and his/her ability or not to contextualise the environment and provide boundaries with relevant factors)  
• The General Manager presented his/her SWOT analysis to his/her staff (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a personal analysis process in order to | • This will provide information to support or not, if the General Manager has the ability to formulise his/her understanding of the relevant situation formally or informally  
• Provide information to support the notion that the General Manager offers factors for understanding of the environment  
• Provide information that will assist the General Manager to show how he/she internalises the strategic objectives into attainable tactical objectives  
• This will enlighten the role of the board and the mandate and parameters that are given to the General Manager.  
• This will elicit information of the market into which the General Manager would like to steer or exploit the company and in the process gain the initiative in the space  
• It would provide information of the General Manager’s explanation, interpretation and understanding of the parameters of his/her mandate. This will support the presence of a CEO’s intent formulation process, which in turn should lead to certain factors that were considered by the General Manager.  
• This will provide insight into how the General Manager will prioritise information to ensure that there is an understanding of the environment  
• This information will provide the General Manager’s ability to overcome analysis by paralysis.  
• The more relevant information here will determine how effective the General Manager will be in order to gain the initiative  
• The information will provide an indication to what |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7      | 1                           | formulate his/her understanding of the external and internal environment and has the ability to identify opportunities. • The General Manager uses technology to manage information (Q–this will confirm that the General Manager has the ability to enable his/her process with technology. This also provides insight into his/her technology innovation). • The General Manager instituted a process to ascertain all relevant data of the problem (Q– as this provides insight that the General Manager has the ability to structure problems. This also indicates his/her ability to understand complexity). • The General Manager provides an explanation of the circumstances that led to the problem (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a personal problem solving process. This will also indicate his/her ability to synthesise the environment in which the problem resides). • The General Manager ensures that all participants are on the same level in terms of knowledge of the problem (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has the ability to extract the fundamental elements of the environment and has the ability to communicate them in such away that he/she has developed a solid footing). • The General Manager shares his/her interpretation of the environment in a simple, concise manner (Q– as this will confirm the General Manager’s ability to translate his/her interpretation for local consumption. This alludes to the General Manager having a personal problem solving process). • The General Manager provides information as often as possible to ensure awareness of the environment (Q– as these will give insight into the General Manager’s ability to package relevant information. This will also indicate his/her inability to communicate and disseminate extent the General Manager will have a grasp of the situation • This will link up with what factors that are required to be analysed. • This will provide information of continuous improvement initiatives that the General Manager has implemented to ensure flexibility. This will also indicate his/her ability to handle a state of flux. • What will be the factors and the process the General Manager will use to gain an understanding of his/her mandate • What analysis process was used by the General Manager • Information that will provide the boundaries within which the planning for the organisation will be conducted • This will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to identify and exploit opportunities • With the change of direction this will indicate the General Manager’s ability to internalise and implement new action to exploit opportunity. • The down side here could be seen that there is no understanding of the environment by the General Manager • The General Manager’s ability to internalise the expectation of the board’s mandate. • This will show how the General Manager has linked the expectation of the board to the identified problems, and its resolution construction • This will show how the General Manager has interpreted the expectation of the board into tangible objectives • This will provide a process and elements that the General Manager uses to interpret the mandate • Information will indicate what conceptual factors...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (Itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q)) and why method is appropriate</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       |                             | The General Manager activates collaboration sessions. (Q – as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to extract information from a group. This also provides an indication to his/her ability to foster team work, activate partnerships and promotes building of alliances).  
The General Manager provides a process for gathering information pertaining to the situation (Q – as this will confirm the General Manager’s understanding of the situation as this will be focus and filtering process).  
The General Manager continually scans the international landscape (Q – as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s personal process that he/she will use to stay informed of the international business environment).  
The General Manager activates the planning process (Q – for the General Manager to activate anything he/she needs to understand the situation, which alludes towards a personal awareness process leading to the framing of the problem. This also indicates that there is a planning process within the business).  
The General Manager butts into the staff functions on a regular base (Q – as this will confirm that the General Manager can’t delegate or his/her ability to mandate his/her subordinates to act).  
The General Manager’s problem solving ability improves during a crisis (Q – as this will confirm that the General Manager is focused, has moral courage and conviction of his/her abilities. This will also indicate that he/she is well informed and will act).  
The General Manager presents his/her understanding of the mandate from the board (Q – as this will confirm that the General Manager has the ability to translate strategic objectives and intentions into tactical attainable
|       |                             | The General Manager has identified and used to analyse his/her mandate in order to establish the boundaries of the situation and how the staff experienced them.  
Linking his/her action to that of the national interests and that of the shareholders.  
How would the General Manager link the national strategic aims to that of the higher order mandate (received by the board)?  
The General Manager has taken ownership or not of the mandate given him/her by the Board.  
This will show the General Manager’s understanding and to what level he/she questions the status quo.  
How the policies are amended, updated to accommodate the freedom of action of the General Manager and in the process promote flexibility  
This will enlighten the role of the board and the mandate and parameters that is given to the General Manager  
This will elicit information of the market that the General Manager would like to steer the company into.  
The information would provide the General Manager’s explanation, interpretation and understanding of the parameters of his/her mandate. This will support presence of the CEO's intent formulation which in turn should lead to certain factors that were considered by the General Manager.  
This will provide insight into how the General Manager will prioritise information to ensure that there is an understanding of the environment in order to provide the General Manager with a platform for solution development.
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q)) and why method is appropriate</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager is purposeful during a crisis (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager becomes more focused during a crisis).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager can identify the problem (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s personal analysis process to identify and frame the boundaries of a problem).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager confronts problems head on (Q– as this will confirm the General Manager’s conviction).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager exploits opportunities (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a risk taking or entrepreneurial approach to conducting business).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager is driven towards action (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a tendency towards action. This also shows that there is a structured project planning process and that he/she is delivery orientated).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>• What are the factors that you would conceptually analyse in the internal and external environments in order to acquire a comprehensive situational awareness? (I– as this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on what framework and factors or the lack thereof will be analysed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How do you prepare yourself for participation in the mine’s planning cycle? (I– as this will provide insight directly to a process that the General Manager uses to grasp the environment; it facets as well as alluding to elements and their sequencing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Who from your staff participates and what are their roles within the planning process? (I– as this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on how the strategic planning is conducted and who are the role players)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent does gut/intuition feeling play a role in establishing a holistic picture of your environmental...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To obtain information in order to understand the “General Manager’s concept formulation” he/she has used for problem solving. This will also allude to the existence of a personal problem solving process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The information obtained will show what factors the General Manager needs to analyse prior to the formulation of his/her concept of operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will show how the General Manager articulates his/her understanding of the environment in which the primary problem resides.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will provide insight into what type of information needs to be analysed by the General Manager in order to formulate his/her concept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will indicate the General Manager’s ability to conceptually analyse the situation and present a logical argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager’s ability to converge or...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser No</td>
<td>Category (itemised Category)</td>
<td>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q)) and why method is appropriate</td>
<td>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>analysis? (I– as this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on how experience is used or how it will show that the General Manager works on a hit and miss.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How will you synthesise all the relevant environmental analysis information? (I– as this will provide insight directly from the General Manager’s process of problem solving)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the most difficult aspects of implementing your strategic intent? (I– as this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on the lesson learnt from the past and how he/she adjusted his/her vision and management style to achieve the goal or did he/she just concede the failure. For the General Manager to be able to do this he/she will have to have a problem solving process that is constantly scanning and evaluating the environment for opportunities with practice of this problem solving process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager displays his/her ability to departmentalise information (Q– as this will provide insight directly to the General Manager’s conceptual analysis of his/her environment and his/her ability or not to group relevant information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager is a problem solver (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to analyse the relevant information, this will also indicate if he/her is action prone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager has an inherent problem solving process (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a personal problem solving process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager provides his/her concept for feasibility testing to the team (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a personal problem solving process to formulate his/her concept, this will also confirm that he/she has a planning team, and there is a formal planning process that will be used to validate diverge information as part of his/her analysis of information. This also eludes to his/her ability to compile conclusions. This in turn leads to main conclusions and then ultimately into an integrated main conclusion.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will provide the understanding and awareness of the situation by the General Manager and in so doing enable him/her to be able to respond and be innovative in the exploitation of the market place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The General Manager has a synthesized holistic picture of the situation, with a concept of competitors in the market space and provides a conceptual solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Data that will provide the General Manager comprehension of the information in which the problem resides so that he/she can formulate his/her hypothesis. This hypothesis is not to be conveyed to his/her staff. It is his/her understanding of how the problem will be resolved. Thus alluding to the presence of a General Manager’s personal problem solving process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The hypothesis is a negative insight that will reflect on the General Manager. This General Manager’s hypothesis is not to be conveyed it is to measure the contributions of the staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will provide insight to whether the General Manager uses business concepts or MBA models to do his/her work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How the General Manager understands business tactics and concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will indicate if the General Manager is working on the fly or in accordance to the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will provide how the General Manager groups his/her resources to achieve the objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser No</td>
<td>Category (Itemised Category)</td>
<td>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q)) and why method is appropriate</td>
<td>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | his/her business concept | • The General Manager provides innovative solutions to problems (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to analyse the relevant information, this will also indicate if he/she has the ability to be creative)  
• The General Manager quickly imposes meaning to a problem (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to analyse the relevant information and to provide an interpretation to exploit opportunities that can lead to gaining the initiative)  
• The General Manager provides the planning group with factors for information collection (Q–this is to confirm that the General Manager’s ability to departmentalise relevant information for analysis, this will also indicate if his/her aware of the situation is appropriate)  
• The General Manager realises the dynamic interaction between factors (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to link the analysis of relevant information. This will also indicate if he/she has the conceptual ability to build a picture of understanding during the deliberations of factors which will result in them building the holistic picture in their minds)  
• The General Manager sequences the factors (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to build a picture during his/her deliberation of the relevant information, this will also indicate if his/her conceptual ability to provide the right factors)  
• The General Manager provides a hypothesis for the problem (Q– as this will confirm that the General Manager has a personal problem solving process, and has the ability to analyse the relevant information, this will also indicate if he/she has the ability to synthesise the deliberations. This will indicate that the General Manager has not left any room for creative contribution from his/her staff. This will also indicate that the General | • This could also show that there is no formal allocation of resources.  
• This will provide insight if the General Manager is on the strategic or the tactical levels  
• This will provide insights on the General Manager’s ability to separate the operational level and the strategic level.  
• This will show that the General Manager has interpretation ability, by translating strategic aims into tactical objectives via his intent formulation.  
• This will also allude to what process the General Manager used and all factors considered.  
• This will show the role the General Manager and his/her planning staff will play in the formulation of strategic intent |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate)</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager has not levelled the tactical level and will frustrate his/her personnel)</td>
<td>• The General Manager expresses the mine’s purpose in a written Format (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to communicate on paper ) • The General Manager expresses his/her aim for the mine in a written format (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to synthesise his/her understanding of the task at hand, this will also display his/her ability to translate into a simple concise written communiqué) • You understand the General Manager’s aim for the mine (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to convey and communicate to his /her subordinates in a simple, concise manner and this will also indicate if he/she is found credible by the staff) • The General Manager indicates what needs to be done to achieve the mine’s strategic problem (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to analyse the relevant information. This will also indicate if he/she is involved and action prone) • The General Manager provides you with a list of desired results that will solve a specific problem (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to formulate end state, this will also indicate if he/she is to provide the staff freedom of movement in the preparation of course of action , this will also indicate the general manager's ability to sequence his/her solving of problems ) • The General Manager provides guidelines for planning and implementation of his/her intention (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager ability to guide his/her staff in the planning process, this will also indicate that the General manager has a personal problem solving process which has assisted him/her to compile these guidelines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser No</td>
<td>Category (itemised Category)</td>
<td>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate</td>
<td>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5      | Communication                | • The General Manager's concept for the mine is displayed (Q–this will confirm the General Manager's understanding of the situation and parameter of problem solving for the staff)  
• The General Manager finds analysis easy (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to analyse the relevant information. This will also indicate that there is a personal problem solving process)  
• The General Manager allows his/her team to present a large number of solutions to the problem (Q– as this will confirm the General Manager team will provide options for decision-making, this will also indicate the involvement of his/her staff in the planning process)  
• How and when do you provide guidance to your staff for planning? (I–this will provide insight directly from the General Manager on his/her ability to formulate a message and its presentation for understanding to the staff. This will also indicate critical timing)  
• How do you convey your understanding of the situation to your staff? (I–this will provide insight directly from the General Manager through his thought process of formal or informal dissemination of information)  
• How do you convey your understanding of the situation to your superiors? (I–this will provide insight directly from the General Manager’s ability of when to use formal or informal dissemination of information to his/her superiors, this will focus on approval and mandating information)  
• The General Manager concisely conveys his/her concepts for the mine (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to verbally convince his/her staff that this is the concept of operations, he/she will also indicate if he/he is accepted for his/her position or his/her ability)  
• The General Manager instils in you an inner feeling of trust (Q– as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to inspire and instil a vision)  
• The information will provide insight whether the General Manager has the ability or not to inspire and instil a vision.  
• The information here will provide insight into the General Manager’s role in the planning cycle, if there is a planning cycle and how it is activated.  
• In what grouping will the General Manager present his/her understanding of the situation?  
• This will provide information on the General Manager’s ability to communicate his/her operational concept  
• Provide information to support whether there is delegated decision-making and trust. The General Manager can inspire his/her team to buy into his/her intent translating into the company’s intent  
• It is not beneficial for a manager to energise members from his/her position |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q)) and why method is appropriate</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | Manager’s acceptability by his/her staff | • You understand the primary problem after the General Manager’s briefing (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to translate complexity into simple concise understandable terms)  
• The General Manager displays a realistic understanding of the implementation of his/her mission and vision (Q–this will provide insight if the General Manager is level-headed, his/her acceptability by the staff, this will also indicate his/her ability to assimilate with what is actually transpiring on the front lines, that expectation are sensible and practical)  
• The General Manager make his/her intention clear to everybody (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to communicate clearly and concisely)  
• You understand what needs to be achieved after the General Manager’s briefing (Q–as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to convey his/her message in an understandable manner. This will also indicate his/her credibility with the staff)  
• The General Manager’s briefing signifies his/her ability to convey his/her visionary thinking (Q–as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s conceptual and cognitive ability to formulise an acceptable message for the staff. This will also confirm if there is a personal problem solving process present, as this is what the General Manager will have to use in order to formulate his/her visionary thinking)  
• The General Manager communicates his/her desired end state for the Mine (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to analyse the relevant information via a personal problem solving process, in order to formulate an outcome for the mine. This will also indicate if he/she can communicate in simple, concise terms)  
• The General Manager grasps the organisational culture |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser No</th>
<th>Category (itemised Category)</th>
<th>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate)</th>
<th>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to comprehend the impact of the organisational groupings, this will also indicate if he/she has done an appreciation of the personnel in order to assist with the appointment of the right staff in the right position)</td>
<td>• The General Manager grasps the mine’s organisational politics (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to position his/her team for success)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to comprehend the impact of the organisational groupings, this will also indicate if he/she has done an appreciation of the personnel in order to assist with the appointment of the right staff in the right position)</td>
<td>• The General Manager displays moral courage (Q–as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s belief and perseverance in the course of action. This will also indicate if he/she can make difficult decisions, and if there is a framework of ethical business practices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to comprehend the impact of the organisational groupings, this will also indicate if he/she has done an appreciation of the personnel in order to assist with the appointment of the right staff in the right position)</td>
<td>• The General Manager radiates confidence in his/her plan (Q–as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to convince people to follow him/her and that his/her resolution is correct. This will also indicate if he/she leads from the front)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to comprehend the impact of the organisational groupings, this will also indicate if he/she has done an appreciation of the personnel in order to assist with the appointment of the right staff in the right position)</td>
<td>• The General Manager has good judgment of people’s abilities (Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to identify capability, capacity and competency of staff for possible assignments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to comprehend the impact of the organisational groupings, this will also indicate if he/she has done an appreciation of the personnel in order to assist with the appointment of the right staff in the right position)</td>
<td>• The General Manager’s passion emits a strong sense of urgency (Q–as this confirms whether the General Manager is action prone and can deliver on his/her promises)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to comprehend the impact of the organisational groupings, this will also indicate if he/she has done an appreciation of the personnel in order to assist with the appointment of the right staff in the right position)</td>
<td>• The General Manager encourages dialogue between all levels of the organisation (Q–as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to establish an environment where communication is done. This will also indicate if he/she has the ability to mandate individuals to function and to make decisions within his/her environment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Q–this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to comprehend the impact of the organisational groupings, this will also indicate if he/she has done an appreciation of the personnel in order to assist with the appointment of the right staff in the right position)</td>
<td>• The General Manager has an articulated vision (Q–as this will provide insight into the General Manager’s ability to analyse the relevant information and that he/she has a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser No</td>
<td>Category (itemised Category)</td>
<td>Possible questions will be indicated as follows - How I will gather the information (Interview (I) questions and questions for a questionnaire (Q) and why method is appropriate</td>
<td>What information do I need to gather in order to answer the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal problem solving process. This will also indicate if he/she is action prone) • The General Manager energises his/her team by position (Q– as this will confirm if the General Manager is hiding behind his/her position to lead and has to force compliance as opposed to eliciting participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal questionnaire for the planning staff of the General Manager

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY

a. The questionnaire that you are going to answer, concerns you as a member of the staff of the General Manager. It is not a test, but merely an information exercise. There are no correct or incorrect answers.

b. Please answer the questions honestly and not according to how you think others would expect you to answer.

c. The information is processed by a computer.

d. Your answers are confidential and no one has access to your answers.

N.B. - No names are to be written anywhere on this document

SECTION A: Demographics

Provide the following information by filling in the relevant number within the blocks provided. (Just one number per block).

1. Your Gender (Male = 1 ; Female = 2)  
2. The Company Age (Number of years example : 10)  
3. Your position category of the company (Executive = 1 ; Functional Manager = 2 ; Supervisor = 3 ; Other = 4)  
4. Your time in current position (as per question 3) (Number of years example : 06)  
5. Your length of service within the company (Number of years example: 10)  
6. Your Home Language (English = 1; Afrikaans =2; African = 3; Other = 4)  
7. Highest Qualification ( Matric =1; Diploma = 2; Degree = 3; Post Graduate = 4)
SECTION B: The Strategist – Leader

Read each statement carefully. Decide how you feel about the statement, in respect of the General Manager, by choosing a number from 1 to 6 according to the scale below:

I Disagree completely 1 2 3 4 5 6 I Agree completely

This is how you experience your General Manager.

Remember it is what you think and not how others judge you!

1. The General Manager’s discernment will provide stability to deal with unexpected circumstances  
2. The General Manager proactively meets challenges  
3. The General Manager is decisive  
4. The General Manager is highly visible  
5. The General Manager uses the chain of command to get the job Done  
6. The General Manager focuses on delivery  
7. The General Manager drives change  
8. The General Manager is creative with his solutions  
9. The General Manager allows decision-making on all levels  
10. Events get the better of the General Manager  
11. The General Manager immerses him/herself in the details  
12. The General Manager provides direction for strategic alliances  
13. The General Manager gets things done correctly  
14. The General Manager empowers subordinates for succession  
15. The General Manager prepares him/herself to contribute to the strategic planning process  
16. The General Manager displays the ability to identify problems  
17. The General Manager can make sense of a changing environment in a simple, concise manner  
18. The General Manager makes choices  
19. The General Manager inspires confidence in you  

SECTION C: Awareness – Problem Framing
Read each statement carefully. Decide how you feel about the statement in respect of the General Manager by choosing a number from 1 to 6 according to the scale below:

I Disagree completely 1 2 3 4 5 6 I Agree completely

This is how you experience your General Manager.

Remember it is what you think and not how others judge you!

20. The General Manager presented his/her SWOT analysis to his/her Staff
21. The General Manager uses technology to manage information
22. The General Manager instituted a process to ascertain all relevant data of the problem
23. The General Manager provides an explanation of the circumstances that led to the problem
24. The General Manager ensures that all participants are on the same level in terms of knowledge of the problem
25. The General Manager share his/her interpretation of the environment in a simple, concise manner
26. The General Manager provides information as often as possible to ensure awareness of the environment
27. The General Manager activates collaboration sessions
28. The General Manager provides a process for gathering information pertaining to the situation
29. The General Manager continually scans the international landscape
30. The General Manager activates the planning process
31. The General Manager butts into the staff functions on a regular base
32. The General Manager’s problem solving ability improves during a Crisis
33. The General Manager presents his/her understanding of the mandate from the board
34. The General Manager is purposeful during a crisis
35. The General Manager can identify the problem
36. The General Manager confronts problems head on
37. The General Manager exploits opportunities
38. The General Manager is driven towards action
SECTION D: Deliberation

Read each statement carefully. Decide how you feel about the statement in respect of the General Manager by choosing a number from 1 to 6 according to the scale below:

I Disagree completely  1  2  3  4  5  6  I Agree completely

This is how you experience your General Manager.
Remember it is what you think and not how others judge you!

39. The General Manager displays his/her ability to departmentalise Information
40. The General Manager is a problem solver
41. The General Manager has an inherent problem solving process
42. The General Manager provides his concept for feasibility testing to the team
43. The General Manager provides innovative solutions to problems
44. The General Manager quickly imposes meaning to a problem
45. The General Manager provides the planning group with factors for information collection
46. The General Manager realises the dynamic interaction between Factors
47. The General Manager sequences the factors
48. The General Manager provides an hypothesis for the problem
49. The General Manager expresses the mine’s purpose in a written Format
50. The General Manager expresses his aim for the mine in a written Format
51. You understand the General Manager’s aim for the mine
52. The General Manager indicates what needs to be done to achieve the mines strategic problem
53. The General Manager provides you with a list of desired results that will solve a specific problem
54. The General Manager provides guidelines for planning and implementation of his/her intention
55. The General Manager’s concept for the mine is displayed
56. The General Manager finds analysis easy
57. The General Manager allows his team to present a large number of solutions to the problem

SECTION E: Communication
Read each statement carefully. Decide how you feel about the statement in respect of the General Manager by choosing a number from 1 to 6 according to the scale below:

I Disagree completely  1  2  3  4  5  6    I Agree completely

This is how you experience your General Manager

Remember it is what you think and not how others judge you!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58. The General Manager concisely conveys his concept for the mine</td>
<td>C73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. The General Manager instils in you an inner feeling of trust</td>
<td>C74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. You understand the primary problem after the General Manager’s Briefing</td>
<td>C75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. The General Manager displays a realistic understanding of the</td>
<td>C76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of his mission and vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. The General Manager make his/her intention clear to everybody</td>
<td>C77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. You understand what needs to be achieved after the General Manager’s</td>
<td>C78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>briefing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. The General Manager’s briefing signifies his/her ability to convey</td>
<td>C79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his/her visionary thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. The General Manager communicates his/her desired end state for the</td>
<td>C80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. The General Manager grasps the organisational culture</td>
<td>C81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. The General Manager grasps the mine’s organisational politics</td>
<td>C82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. The General Manager displays moral courage</td>
<td>C83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. The General Manager radiates confidence in his plan</td>
<td>C84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. The General Manager has good judgment of people’s abilities</td>
<td>C85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. The General Manager’s passion emits a strong sense of urgency</td>
<td>C86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The General Manager encourages dialogue between all levels of the</td>
<td>C87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. The General Manager has an articulated vision</td>
<td>C88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. The General Manager energises his/her team by position</td>
<td>C89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your input is invaluable to our research and the continual development of future business leadership in South Africa.
I Case (Case 1 = 1; Case 2 = 2; Case 3 = 3)

ii GM (Case 1 = 1; Case 2 = 2; Case 3 = 3)

iii Number of this Questionnaire
14. APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT COL (RET) P. FRANKEN

14.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- **Colonel (Ret) Pierre Franken (MMM)**. Co–author of the SA Army Commander’s Appreciation process, appointed as the Senior Directing Staff, attended the British Army SCSD course at Camberley, Commanding Officer - School of Artillery, Chief of Staff - Artillery Formation. He is presently appointed as the Chief of Operations at a Project Management firm.

- **The indicators**. CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. PF - Col (Ret) P Franken the interviewee. Location: Cappuccino’s, Centurion Mall.

14.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

- CB: Morning Col Franken. (Shake hands and sit down next to each other).

- PF: Morning Colin.

- CB: Thank you for the opportunity to have this discussion. (Insert Memo: Commanders Appreciation). In front of you, you have a document which is the first issue on the table. I would like to confirm your credentials and put it on the record together with your permission. Naturally, if there is anything that I put down, that is incorrect, could you please indicate, just help me out.

- PF: With regard to the titles - I only have a MMM and not a SM.

- CB: Ok, thank you.

- PF: (said with laughing tone) Ah! Not that I don’t deserve one!

- CB: (Laugh out loud)

- PF: (Continues) Thanks for that recognition. For the rest it seems fine.

- CB: Reg so.

- CB: Ok thank you very much.
• CB: Thank-you very much for the opportunity. This is going to be an informal chat. We are going to take a look at, as you can see, the research question which is about assessing whether the commander’s appreciation prevails within or can prevail within business. For me, as the researcher, I need to understand your version as a co-author of the commander’s appreciation.

• CB: I would like to understand a few things about the commander’s appreciation in order to put it into context for me. The first question, at this stage, that I would like to ask is - what was your role at the training institution?

• PF: Having attended the senior command and staff course in 1994 and then having the opportunity to attend the British Army Command and Staff course. I got back and provided inputs. Our military was slightly more advanced at that stage than what I thought the British military appreciation was and the essence is that we adopted in the SA Army a an approach where it's not a group effort primarily. It's primarily an individual who determines where he/she or this organisation must go - therefore, the title of Commander’s Appreciation. So, it a personalised thing. If you give such an assignment to a group, you may not get the same answer, because group dynamics are slightly different to that of an individual. Strong leadership, in the majority of the companies and even in the majority of instances in the Army, that I can recall, where there were significant changes, it was because of strong leaders, strong individuals. Obviously they all had supporting bases that could supplement that appreciation, but you need a strong leader to say ‘this is where we have to go’, and then actually have the guts to formulate that, communicate that and implement that. So, the commander’s appreciation in that sense is critical because the individual must determine where to go.

• CB: [3:54] Did you see this as his ownership and his responsibility?
• PF: [3:55] Ja, primarily. I think because of the underlying leader, the visionary aspect of where we have to go. It’s good to follow the normal evolutionary process, because we have done it last year. Let’s just tweak a few things and then we will be ready for next year. So, it is a cut and paste exercise in the staff environment but in the leadership environment you determine you have a longer term view. Say this is where we are and this is where we have to be - how are we going to get there and then reverse engineer it backwards. Extending from the current baselines into the future, sometimes you don’t understand the current reality, never mind understanding the future and I think you will be better off in creating a new future for yourself by having a longer term view and then determining what the gap is and then develop a growth path to get there. In the majority of cases I would think that approach is slightly different than following the evolution approach of every year just adding on another year planning. That is not dynamic and I do not believe that can deliver what an organisation wants.

• CB: [5:23] Thank you. As the co-author of the commander’s appreciation for the SA Army, what do you see as the fundamental key areas and concepts?

• PF: [5:35] I think you must have a very good understanding of the environment in which you do this appreciation and obviously the way we were taught and hopefully still being trained is that we have to assess the environment two levels up and two levels down. So, if two levels up move into an unknown territory like the political environment, like the government environment, you need to understand that, which is not normally your forte. You need to do a lot of research and try understand. If the political level is sort of the higher level of your two levels, then you need to understand what government view on the military portion that you are trying to assess. So, it is very easy to establish a plan on the technical and tactical levels that can be totally irrelevant if you relate that to the big environment because there is
reason according to Mr Clausewitz why you have a military. So, obviously there is a
direct link between the government and the military institution. I think the first point is
therefore that you need to understand your environment and you need to define all
the relevant factors that are applicable. Normally, people have a set of generic
factors which might be irrelevant but as times change, as environment changes, as
government changes, you need to change those factors. I mean, in the many initial
appreciations, water may never have actually featured, now water becomes almost
a strategic issue. So, on the higher level, you have to look at resources. I mean, if
you want to have feasible resource driven strategy you need to consider all the
relevant factors of which, in this case, I mentioned water. You need to understand
the factors and then I think you need to understand your own capabilities. Now you
look at two levels down. I mean you can dream up the best plan, but if you don’t
have the resources to actually make that plan work, then you don’t have a plan or
strategy. So you need to know what you have and what your own capabilities are. I
think those would be the key issues: understanding the environment, define the
relevant and applicable factors and then know your own capability and, in the
environment, I would also then by implication include the possible scenarios in
which you, this military entity, would be deployed. Meaning, is this offensive or
defensive, is it peacetime or is it combinations thereof. You have to design the
capability to fit into the most likely 1, 2, 3, scenarios.

- CB [9:01] ...You, mentioned the fact that there is a relationship between
government and the military. In your experience what do you believe is that
fundamental difference?

- PF [9:12] ...I think the military will hopefully, with time to come, still remain an
instrument of government to manage directly and sometimes even if it has to be
enforce certain rules and regulations and thereby I don’t mean overlapping with the
police but I mean enforcing when the integrity and sovereignty of the government is at stake, then obviously you will have to apply a more forceful approach. In that sense, when you deal with your Commander’s Appreciation, that will always be one of the scenarios that you will have to accommodate.

- PF [9: 59] You cannot design a kinder-garden military capability. That military capability must have the ultimate capability to deal with war like scenario.
- CB [10:14] You mentioned the word ‘design’. What is your understanding of the word design and concept - I believe the military uses concepts?
- PF [10: 23] Ja, they use concepts from a doctrinal perspective which can be categorised in design concepts, as well as approach concepts - so both are applicable in a sort of operational art environment. When I refer to a design, it is more likely in the environment of formulating that specific capability. In other words, you need something concrete - a vehicle that will represent the military and in that sense it's like building, designing, developing as opposed to a concept of deterrence. So in this sense, the word concept, in my explanation has a dual application.
- CB [11:27] As a co-author, do you believe that the essence of the commander’s appreciation is a feasible tool for the commander?
- PF [11:38] I cannot think what else a commander can do. How can someone who is really a worthwhile commander manage and command a military capability without doing his own home work?
- PF [11:58] Ja. He needs to understand, to say ‘this is what I have to do, this is what we must do, and the how and the what we must do’. That is not necessarily his
forte, because that is why he/she hopefully has specific staff that must actually make sure that the plan becomes supportable.

- CB [12: 27] Don’t you think that this is an autocratic type of leader, who does this type of stuff or is there, flexible, ingenuity, initiatives - are these things prevalent in this commander’s appreciation?

- PF [12:38] I think appreciation wise, it is a mental activity. (Insert CB, is that conceptual) I think it is an exercise that utilises a lot of brain energy, therefore I think you have to be autocratic in your mind, if I can use that, but in applying whatever you have thought-out. You have to use your leadership, your communication skills and sometimes your charisma to communicate that with your subordinates - make them part of your thinking. Make them understand your thinking, otherwise your initial autocratic thoughts will become an autocratic entity and I don’t think that will be good when it comes to the understanding and acceptance and implementation of strategy.

- CB [13:35] Ok. Thank-you for that. Do you believe that this Commander’s Appreciation has room for improvement, after you have communicated it - is there a tool, a mechanism for this?

- PF [13:58] I think any appreciation {CB: Memo problem solving process) is open to changes because the commander does not have the luxury of spending hours and hours, day in and day out, on his own. He needs to have an idea, a conceptual framework of what needs to be conducted and sometimes the staff, although in the majority of cases they will not have the insight or the ability to change that conceptual framework - they will highlight implications, shortcoming and things to be added that strengthens the framework {CB: Memo the commander conceptual framework} So, the commander will utilise his staff to build that framework, to strength that framework - so, yes it will be open, but once the framework changes
the commander will then have to weigh it up against an alternative framework or set of frameworks and will have measure everything against the initial analysis because obviously you will have frameworks that will suit a specific problem statement. If the framework changes, then you will have to go back and say “does this new framework still fit the problem statement”?… {CB: Ok, so there is a link … a causational link} For sure. I think you have to remain open to say, “Ok - this is the framework. You will take a little bit you add it, strengthen it and if the framework does change or has to change obviously then there was a flaw in the initial thinking. There might even be a question on the commander’s ability to formulate such a framework.

• CB [15:58] If I take for arguments sake Schwarzkopf’s concept of the Iraq war. You are au fait (familiar) with that concept {PF: Yes} It was a grouping of words - it was not even a half a page long and he utilised and got so many things together. Isn’t there a challenge that your concept could not be understood or so vague that anything could fit into it?

• PF [16:28] The answer is yes. If you leave that conceptual framework on its own and let it fly and give it out to someone else who was not part of your thinking then you stand the risk that you will have something totally different because it can be wrongly interpreted. So that is why the commander’s appreciation starts off with an individual commander. Then there is a fairly well integrated process where this conceptual framework needs to be established so that there are no misunderstandings as to what this framework actually represents. Once you have finished with that, then everybody should understand what needs to be conducted at the various levels.

• CB [17:23] So there a planning process where this Commander’s Brief fits in. Is it part of the planning process?
• PF [17: 30] This conceptual framework will outline and ultimately will lead to a campaign design. The campaign commander or military commander needs to communicate with other high level ranking people in the military or even in government. He can’t confuse them with all the technical and tactical military jargon. He has to use civilian jargon that represents his military campaign. That is why a campaign design can be anything else if you read it. It can represent many things but when you get down to the actual understanding and unfolding of each of those campaign elements then you can relate it to military structures, military actions, military objectives and so forth.

• CB [18:37] Now that you mentioned that you are not using military jargon. Is this framework then determined by the competency of the commander’s language. What is this thing call command language? I have heard this used and referred to. What is your understanding of command language and business language?

• PF [19:01] I think in certain organisations where the level of maturity differs, you will have a wider range of language and in essence this can actually be the same. It depends on the level of expertise that is prevalent in both organisations, but also the background of those people. Recently I attended an executive development programme and one of the prescribed books {CB: Memo get the book }, that we had to study was on strategic management. If your read through it, it looks like its been written by a military person because the language that is in some cases being utilised in a civilian environment has actually been extracted from the military environment {CB: 20:01 Interjects …so you are saying that there is a link between the military and business environment} and that is I think the usefulness of operational art that you could use like operational concepts. My understanding and application is that operational concepts at least in the military handbook Soom part 7 {CB: Memo reference to the staff officer’s handbook Soom 7}. Those concepts you
can apply in your personal life. You can apply it in your business. I am using it now in my new business environment. I use the same concepts in a business environment and I don’t see any reason why you can’t use it. When I spoke to Major General (ret) Johan Jooste some time ago he said his experience because he was a senior Major General in the SA Army with a lot of management qualification behind him, I think he cum his MBA at Stellenboch, he is using the same military approach in his business environment. He said to me “Business is like a war – you have enemies – your opposition or competitors and you have a business to run”. So yes, the more mature the organisation is, the less the deviation will be in the sort of jargon - management jargon or military jargon.

- CB [21:41] In the light of that can I say that command language translates an understanding?
- PF [21:47] Correct. If I have to say this organisation has to be offensive. If you take the military environment, it means that organisation will most probably have the posture to conduct offensive actions or conduct an attack on some opposing objective. In the civilian environment, an offensive sort of posture means that organisation, in my understanding, has adopted a growth strategy. So, if you have established that then having a common language will translate a specific understanding. {CB: Interjects ….how is this understanding obtained?} Well based on the progressive training that people have under gone in the military, offensive has a specific definition and offensive has specific sub-groupings and everybody understands that. They should understand that.
- CB [23:03] What is your understanding of the strategic direction?
- PF [23:06] It is made up of intent. I think intent is in my understanding {CB: memo from the author of the commander appreciation} is my desire as to where I want to take this entity for which I am responsible. So my intention then describes how I will
move my resources in achieving a specific objective - so that’s my intent. If I have a problem statement and I have a possible solution, the intent is that line, maybe that dotted line that actually connects those two. So that gives me a specific, almost like a laser light in the night, if you look through night vision goggles. If I indicate a specific target then you, with night vision equipment, can then see that light, but nobody else can see it. So, the two with the night vision then know exactly where we are aiming and they know what the intent is to maybe engage that specific target, because there is link between what I am thinking and what the objectives is. That is why I say that maybe the dotted line, in a sort of graphical sense, can depict a representation of intent.

- CB [24:45] Did you have any concerns as a co-author of the Commander’s Appreciation, while you where teaching it, that there were any short-comings in the way it was taught?
- PF [24:59] At that stage, this whole introduction of a higher level of military doctrine was totally new to many students. I think in the 1st year when we presented this operational art {CB: memo this was in 1997 staff course…} I was in the fortunate or unfortunate position of being a directing staff and later the Senior Directing staff member {CB: Memo at the SA Army Collage} and 3/4 of the people (students) failed the initial exam because the level of thinking required is totally different. I picked up the same sort of challenge, when I attended the British Command and Staff course in 1995. That was only 2 years after the American’s started using this operational art, which they borrowed, if I can use that nice term, from the Russians - this whole concept of operational art. So, in this whole roll out of operational art throughout various countries, each country has its own understanding and when we brought it back from Britain, supported by a person like John Brooks {CB: Memo Col (ret John Brooks that attended the US War College) from America. We thought it was good
and the level of thinking was quite appropriate but the training methodology at that stage was more cognitive on maybe level of 1, 2, 3 (CB: Memo use Unisa cognitive taxonomy). When dealing with military art, operational art you need people with a cognitive capability, skill capability or cognitive skills of maybe level of 4, 5, 6... so that in itself became a training issue. You can then understand that a Commander’s Appreciation is not an opportunity for everybody. It is a person with a specific cognitive capability that can link the technical with almost abstract thus moving from something concrete to something that nobody can actually visualise. You need to have that cognitive capability.

- CB [27:38] So, if I understand you correctly, you are looking at possibilities for the future by linking certain things from the past {PF: interject Correct} and those things in the future are not in a comfort zone? {PF: interject Correct} Now you mention that the commander’s appreciation is not for everybody. Do you believe that everybody should be trained? Do you believe that there should be a staff appreciation on the similar line or do you believe that this is an exclusive group?

- PF [28:03] I think that the cognitive capability should be developed in senior officers or senior management people but the commander’s appreciation, I think, is the responsibility. It’s only a privileged few that can actually, in my mind, maybe a subjective view, who can play on that ground. But everybody in my experience is au fait in that environment. In the staff environment, you need people with similar types of skills that can do innovative thinking to support that process. So, yes the thinking skills should be there but you need people with holistic skills that can group the various building blocks and then you have specialist people who can actually focus on one of those blocks. If you take some of those people who are specialists in one of those blocks and you give him the whole tool set, then he will mess it up. I am a firm believer that the commander’s appreciation {CB: memo… this can be used as a
selective tool to see if the candidate will succeed or not} is a natural thing for only a few people and a nightmare for the rest.

- CB [29:36] In that vein, you have been a directing staff, you have been an inspiration to a lot of people while you train - you have been a senior directing staff and a commander. Out of your vast experience, how many people honestly got this new way of thinking - seriously got this, per course?

- PF[30:06] If I would have to add a percentage to that, to make it more tangible, I would say 5% to 10% at the most {CB: interjects Got this concept} who have the natural ability that needs some {CB: Interjects tweaking} unlocking and training. The rest, you can almost slavishly drive them but they will never adopt that natural capability.

- CB: [30:34] I would like to link on to what Mintzberg says about the MBA that teaches members to analyse. Do you want analysers or synthesisers? I am building on synthesis, as you have said - we can teach people to analyse but not everybody can synthesis?

- PF: [31:00] Correct. That is why I say that cognitive thinking should be in training. Environment should expose people from level 4, 5 to 6 so that he can get to the synthesis part and when we have something new, the conceptual frame that the commander has now designed, then he can revert back to his subordinate staff to evaluate the next level - level 6. Moving from the analysis to the next level of synthesis is the more difficult one because that is where you have to be creative and many people will not understand that new thing that you design. So now you have this bright idea and the rest of the people don’t understand what you are talking about. You now have to break that down and make it sizable chunks for your people. You get the Einstein people that can dream of those concepts but then they can’t communicate to their people, they can’t transfer it; they can’t make it digestible
to the people. These are not normally good managers or good commanders. The 5% that I am talking about are those people who have the ability to formulate those conceptual frameworks and then have the leadership and communication capabilities to communicate that and implement it. Communicating is one thing but implementing is actually the more critical event - if I can use it.

- CB [32:44] Do you believe in charismatic and inspirational leaders?
- PF [32:52] Yes. I think almost like Newton’s 1st or 2nd, every action has an opposite equal reaction. In order for follower to get emotional, you need something, and that something, in the majority of cases must be an emotional thing not a physical thing. You can’t put people on an escalator because that is a mechanical thing. You must have movement in the inner soul of the people and that can only be achieved primarily by leaders who have a charismatic approach - that is inspirational because I must energize my subordinates. I must activate my subordinates so that they become energized and activated themselves, otherwise it is like a majorette or puppeteer. If you let the various strings loose then the whole puppet collapses. You must create energy so that the puppet can stand alone and then almost dance on his own in accordance with your intention. {CB Interjects ….and believe it is his and internalize it} Correct. I think that is the art of leadership - to communicate something that is unique, something difficult, especially to people who don’t understand it, make sure that they do understand it and give them the capability to make it their own.
- CB [34:35] Thank you for you time and contribution. It is highly appreciated.
- PF [34:41] It is only a pleasure; please don’t hesitate to ask for any other assistance.
14.3 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW OF CLARIFICATION MEETING 25 JULY 2009

- CB [00:00] Good morning Pierre. Welcome back. (Shake hands and sit down next to each other).
- PF [00:06] Morning Colin. Thanks for the opportunity.
- CB [00:09] Thank you. We have now passed the first phase of a general discussion and I would like to ask you some specific questions relating to the Commander’s Appreciation. As a co-author and member with vast knowledge, I would like to get down to essences and core related factors. The first aspect at this stage that I would like to look at is the campaign planning process. {CB: Memo the campaign planning process} You are still familiar with the campaign planning process? {PF: confirms Yes} I have just taken out stage 1 and 2 of the campaign process. Stage 1 is the review of the situation and stage 2 is the commander’s appreciation - those are the two things that we are going to concentrate on.
- CB [00:51] The first question that I would like to ask is, what is the role of the review of the situation - your understanding of the role?
- PF [01:01] I think what is important, is that it is not only the first but also the critical, the deliberate process of the military strategic appreciation. Here all the relevant role-players confirm their own situational awareness with regards to their own situation and the situation of their own forces as well as the opposing forces situation as well as general things like times, seasons, sun, moon and climate conditions. Just to get a very good situational awareness as to own forces, enemy and surroundings.
- CB [01:40] Is there a formulised grouping of this information?
- PF [01:43] Yes. You normally start off with the opposing forces, your own forces and then general factors, such as the times, stats of the moon, any hurricanes or floods and rainy conditions because that’s the situation now and it can impact. It is an input
into your cognitive process from where you have to start deliberating, from that situational level.

- CB [02:22] Thank you very much. Can I use the word data pack and I say that this is a data pack that you have put together from which you will now do your analysis?
- PF [02:33] Yes. I have also experienced in the past that you receive a sort of folder of a specific assignment or operation. It provides that data for you, regarding enemy situation and all relevant aspects that you might need to know before you start with your appreciation process.
- CB [02:54] Thank you very much. We will now move over to the commander’s appreciation process and brief. The 1st phase is the Military Strategic Analysis (MSA). What is your understanding of the role of the MSA?
- PF [03:06] I think what one needs to understand is that it provides you with a problem solving framework. I think that is an important aspect to start off with so it is a scientific process first but in terms of the value and role of it (MSA), it provides you with a framework of a solution for the problem at hand.
- CB [03:36] Now, that solution that you have. What are the core elements of the MSA and how will you find them?
- PF [03:42] I think, my understanding is that if you need to formulate a concept, a driving force within which you try and find a solution, within that concept as part of the process you will identify broad options. Then from these options you will then arrive at a course of action and then you make a decision as to which of those options are feasible. You can also do tests in terms of validity, feasibility and sustainability of those options in order to make sure that when you start off with the campaign - it is feasible.
- CB [04:30] Can these MSA core elements differ between commanders resulting in each commander having his own?
• PF [04:51] I think they will differ from situation to situation because obviously when you get an assignment it will come from a higher level, most likely a political level from which you would most likely get certain parameters in which this operation or campaign will take place. You will get parameters from that level to say ‘consider the following’. From the political level, they have most likely foreseen that NGO’s, or economics or partnerships may play a role in the campaign, so they want you, from the military level, to accommodate it within your appreciation process.

• CB [05:49] Thank you. That concludes the MSA. The next phase of the commander’s appreciation is the conceptual general analysis of factors. What is your understanding of this conceptual analysis of factors?

• PF [05:52] Those are the main contributing factors that will influence the formulation of this framework. In other words, your own capability versus the aim. Do you have a possibility of actually achieving the aim with your own capability because eventually if you get an understanding of that, it will determine the range of broad options that you have. The same argument can be followed for the enemy and for the terrain, because you need to formulate that to get to broad options in order to solve the problem. I think what is critical, is that you have to be as broad as possible, so as not to be predictable. I think that is part of the art of campaigning - you should not be predictable. That is why you have to be almost like a Douglas McArthur, to think outside the box, in spite of all the recommendations. You have to consider all the factors and then get to an option that is feasible, but that will surprise your opponents.

• CB [07:09] Ok. How are or are these general factors unique?

• PF [07:15] I think, generally they are sort of standard but depending on the type of campaign that you may encounter, there might be specific factors that you need to accommodate. When you move from a conventional inclined campaign to a peace
support environment, obviously the factors will differ and the approach towards it will differ.

- CB [07:57] Thank you. How are these conceptual factors determined and by whom?
- PF [08:01] Those conceptual factors are determined by the commander because he first had to do his understanding of his campaign instruction that he has receive from his superiors. Analysis that will determine them - by saying, from me to be successful in this campaign, I have to consider the following factors and I need to get answers from those factors.
- CB [08:24] Thank you. That concludes phase 2 and now for phase 3, which is the formulation of a campaign concept or operation concept. What is your understanding of the formulation of a concept?
- PF [08:45] I think what is critical is that it first provides a very broad framework as how you will solve this problem. You still don’t have any detail but you have a framework on the ‘how’ of the solution.
- CB [09:02] What is the role of the operational concept?
- PF [09:11] I think, in terms of the military strategic appreciation, that provides the framework within which the problem has to be approached.
- CB [09:22] Now. Who will be utilising this concept?
- PF [09:26] I think within the military environment, your key planners will have to use that as their baseline within which they have to plan, otherwise your set of permutations just become unmanageable. {CB interjects …So is that seen as parameter and boundaries as you mentioned before?] Yes. Boundaries within which planning can take place, because the concept has spelled out the ‘how’. What needs to be done now is - the staff involved must determine ‘with what and how’ it can actually be implemented. So at the end of the day, you need to add resources to it - that provides a framework.
CB [10:11] Thank you. That then concludes the formulation of the campaign or operational concept. Phase 4 - the commander’s brief. What is your understanding of the role of the commander briefing?

PF [10:26] In each planning cycle, you will have planning staff. You will have key roll players within it who has to attend it and then you can decide based on time and concurrent activities what needs to take place. Your senior planner will have to attend the commander’s briefing {CB interject … Does any commander or lower level commander attend or is it just planning staff?} It is a good practice to make them available because they eventually will have to execute what needs to be conducted, so they actually become specialist advisor for you as the planning staff as they know what is where and what their capabilities are but sometimes you don’t have the luxury to have them available because you may be fixed within an operation already. That is why you have a planning staff and execution staff. If you have the luxury of time, you can combine the planning staff and add the commanders.

CB [11:33] Thank you. Who conveys this command brief?

PF [11:36] According to me, there should only be one person to do that - the commander. That is where he actually puts his stamp on the process. His intention must be made clear so that everybody knows who is in charge, what the commander wants and that there is no uncertainty who is the boss man.

CB [12:02] What is communicated and to whom at this briefing?

PF [12:04] I think it is a confirmation of the planning process so you recap on the situation. You will clearly spell out the operational concept. You will confirm what specific factors need to be considered. You will also spell out the specific timeframe within which this needs to be conducted and then in terms of an audit trail maybe spell out in what format you need to have these documents and deliberations
because that becomes a controlling document in itself {CB interjects … Do you see that this commander … command brief inspires and conveys visionary insight? }

Yes. It should. If it doesn’t, you will loose your planning staff from the onset. I think that is why it is important that the commander himself addresses the planning group because that is where he can energise his people and where they have confidence in what has to be conducted. Sometimes the campaign can be scary and if he can’t convince the people that this is the right thing to do, then that degree of uncertainty will just be enhanced when it gets to the lower levels. So confidence and leadership is crucial from the beginning!

- CB [13:44] Thank you once again for you time!
- PF [ 13:48] It is my pleasure.
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- The indicators. CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. HG - Col Heidi Gunter the interviewee. Location: Wonderboom Military Base.

15.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

- CB [00:00] Afternoon Col Gunter, (Shake hands and sit down opposite to each other). Thank you for this opportunity. I would like to confirm your biographical information. You are the Officer Commanding School of Signals. You attended the South African War College and you did the Joint Staff Course, which is actually beneficial for this research. You helped with the revision of the Functional Commander’s Appreciation and you were the programme leader for that executive program. How many times have you presented the executive programme?

- HG [00:36] Afternoon Colin. The biographical information is correct. Well, I have led and facilitated the executive programme for the 3rd time this year within the School of Signals for the Senior Telecommunication community of the SA Army. Please, you must not be under the illusion that this is a chalk and board process. It is outcomes based training and it resides in the conceptual thinking domain, as this is the most senior proficiency course for the telecommunication specialists in the SA
army we act as facilitators to ensure conceptual self-actualisation of the senior cadre.

- CB [01:05] I am doing research to see if the commander’s appreciation prevails within business and in order for me to do this, I would need to identify the core elements of the commander’s appreciation, for mapping into a research instruments so that I can relate the commander’s appreciation to business and answer the question of whether or not the commander’s appreciation prevails in business. As the first order of business, seeing that this research is done for academic consumption, ethical compliance requirements are high. Based on this, would you mind reading the following. I am here to provide any explaining if required and if you agree please sign it below. This brings us to the first question - what is your understanding of the campaign planning process and the commander’s appreciation? Where do they fit within the planning process of the army?

- HG [01:49] Colin, I have no objections to signing the ethical prescripts and find it reassuring that this is so predominate in the research field and is something that I will be instilling in the School of Signals shortly. Well this brings me to the campaign planning process which is the mechanism through which the military solves problems - big ones, small ones and complicated ones. Warfare is not for the faint hearted, but the solving of its problems is not unique, thus making the campaign process an acquired skill. Please don’t be under the impression that everyone can internalise this methodology. You would be mistaken. This internalisation is one of the contributing factors that differentiate the commander from a staff officer, hence the name commander’s appreciation. Well, the first two elements of this campaign planning process is the review of the situation and the commander’s appreciation and that is where they fit in as the first two phases. Well, I use the campaign planning methodology to activate my STP [CB: memo STP = short term plan], so
therefore this campaign planning process can also be seen as part of the business plan establishment. One highlights the process and not the content, making this process user friendly in any context even within business.

- CG [02:49] Thanks for that. What is the role of the review of the situation according to you?
- HG [02:51] Well ....the review of the situation is there to sensitise you as the Commander and provide you with an ability to group data and information which is relevant, pertaining to the situation in which you find yourself. Mostly problems that you receive from your superiors need understanding and internalisation by the Commander and in order for this to take place you need to systematically work through and place parameters on the vast amount of information out there. The military perspective allows you to look at the external areas of interest and internal areas of influence as the first set of parameter development related to the military problem. This will overcome the overloading of the commander with irrelevant information which could also affect the decision-making capability of the commander rendering the commander ineffective. The review of the situation is to act as a filtration process in order to determine appropriate information and data prior to analysis. If this filtration process is not done by the commander, it will lead to analysis by paralysis of the commander. There will be no creative understanding by the commander of the situation, let alone a conceptual solution. Therefore it is essential as a commander that you make yourself aware of the unknown and known aspects concerning the military problems by looking externally to acquire a sense of positioning. That’s you, as the commander within the governmental space, interdepartmental, international determinants and missions. What is your political mandate and the expectation from the civil oversight in the military space? Just to digress a bit, as from 1994, the South African military has been under civil oversight
with the establishment of the Secretariat of Defence which places us in support of
the political environment and internally looking within your own environment as to
capability, capacity and competence and by mapping the external environment with
the internal environment. This will lead you to acquiring the real picture!

- CB [04:19] What are the types of elements within the review of the situation,
  according to you, that the commander needs to be aware of?
- HG [04:21] Well, the first concept is that of relevance. This is very important here.
  You will have a lot of information and data that will need to be filtered and therefore
  there should be a rubric from which elements can be leveraged. You will have to
determine which is relevant to your situation, in order to do this types of information
gathering. This necessitates grouping of appropriate data together. This can be
seen as a five-drawer filing cabinet where information is not analysed but just filed
into the relevant draws. The review of the situation entails much more than a
random collection of documents, information and data, in practice, the commander
with the use of his staff is to collect relevant information as a deliberate effort. This
is attained by establishing an awareness of the situation of available information.
With access to today’s technology there is a growing concern that a Google search
will suffice. This is however not considered the review of the situation or research. In
order for this to be effective, it is suggested that the review of the situation is
presented to the Commander and the planning staff by the appropriate staff and in
the process provide common understanding. This does not excuse the commander
from verifying and doing his own research and information gathering to ensure his
development of a clear understanding of the situation.

- CB [05:46] What is your understanding of the Military Strategic Analysis (MSA)?
- HG [05:47] Once again, I must take you back to the filtering process that I
  mentioned above. The review of the situation gathers the information that was
pertinent for the operation at hand and placed this information and data within the 5-drawer cabinet, for the operation at hand. This can also be referred to as a data pack. Now the commander’s approach changes to that of analysis not just collection, therefore the information in the drawer, called the Military Strategic Analysis, in our cabinet will be used. This supports the thrust of the MSA which can be seen as the first analytical conceptualisation of the environment by the commander within which the conflict is taking place to create or develop his awareness and understanding. Let me be blunt at this point and put the MSA into perspective. It is the cornerstone of the whole commander’s appreciation. If you don’t get this correct, the rest of the analysis will be questionable and possibly futile. My reasoning behind that is because if the problem is not identified and the positioning of that problem is not done properly, which should reside within the mind of the commander. With the proper justification of that problem by the commander, this commander is moving on thin ice and in the wrong direction. According to me, the MSA commences with the analysis of the received strategic guidance from the Higher Commander. The external environment is up next. In order to determine clear understandable results that are to be achieved, the commander’s interpretation of the MSA will reveal his identified primary problem. This cannot be done by anybody else other than the Commander, as this will provide insight into what the mission should be and what the campaign end states should be achieved in order to address the primary problem, overcome and identify mission constraints and what the resource allocation should be. After this analysis, the commander will be left with external requirements that he will have to verify and clear with his higher commander. The focus should be looking at external factors - what will have an influence on the core business. The MSA can be seen as the Achilles’ heel of the commander’s appreciation, which in turn pivots around what is relevant.
• CB [06:57] What core elements do you think play a role in the MSA?

• HG [06:58] Well, the central element, theme or category according to me, contributes to the concept of governance. This will provide an interpretation of the strategic determinants focusing on the state departments, international organisations bodies including NGO - non governmental organisations, such as the Red Cross, that will influence the efforts to carry out the mission or impact on the military strategic objectives. The first element to me, will be regional determinants. This will provide insight into the region and in our case SADEC, NATO, United Nation (UN), and African Union (AU). You need to link the participation of these environments to the specific problem in order to sort out all the mandates needed for intervention. The second element should be economics - who is going to pay for what? Is this operation sanctioned by UN or AU or both or SADEC? What is the economic conditions and abilities of the region or country in which the conflict finds itself, in order to afford this intervention or assistance or participation. And, if they can’t, then who will foot the bill? What participation is needed? The third element is legal. This will provide insights as burden of proof. These elements are the indicators for information gathering. Sovereignty plays a large role, thus posing the question of whether or not it can be breached and if so then by whom and how. This is very important for the commander. It shows legitimacy of actions. The forth element is current acts and strategies which need to be used as possible constraints or boundaries. For an intervention force, it will provide the parameter in which you may operate internally and externally. In short, what is allowed and what is not allowed. Don’t take it for granted that what our law permits us is to do, is allowed in the rest of Africa. We have a very liberal constitution - back to the strategies. There are the strategies pertaining to international, regional, our country and the SANDF and any multinational clusters that are signatory to addressing the intervention on
behalf of the mandated fraternity. The fifth element is the media - as CNN is now entering the digital world and monitors all conflict, their influence is to be appreciated. These are the critical elements that will form the foundation of the environmental understanding for analysis within the MSA.

- CB [08:32] What is your understanding of the conceptual analysis of factors?
- GH [08:34] Well, it is conceptual analysis of general factors. The general factors can be seen as the heart of the commander’s appreciation. This analysis will provide the commander with a mechanism to master vast amounts of information and draw relevancy from them. The commander’s interpretation will be enhanced by a process of quiet contemplation, of deep thought and of refreshing creativity. One of the pitfalls here is that the commander makes conclusions without doing an in-depth analysis of the factors. We refer to this as justifying a plan without an appreciation. This is a big NO! You are to reach the plan after the analysis of the general factors. The analysis of general factors must lead to the achievement of the end states that were determined as an output of the MSA. The general factors are not to be considered in silos - focus is to be on the dynamic interaction between the factors as this will ensure that the conclusions that are made will comply with the 5w’s. These 5 w’s are made up of who, what, where, when and what thereafter. Without the 5w’s, the commander won’t have a firm footing or have grounded his plan or solution. It is essential that you commence the analysis by indicating appropriate facts that impact on the situation from your file cabinets appropriate drawer. The analysis of the fact will result in you presenting your argument and reasoning of that fact. This will then lead to a conclusion formulation. Conceptualising can be seen as the instrument through which reality is understood and given meaning. Your cabinet drawer of facts is what you use here. If you add any new facts all the factors that are affected by that new fact will have to be re-analysed in order to ensure the impact of
this fact. Be very careful not to perpetuate the analysis by continually adding facts and factors - but this must also not be seen as if you can’t add facts! Being human you tend to miss certain things. But you must weigh up the time spent on additional analysis with respect to the value it will add to the operation. These actions of the commander can negate any surprise or limit the time of the sub-unit commander’s preparation due to lack of decision-making. After each one of the general factor analysis there will be a main conclusion which presents an integration of the main themes, their deductions and conclusion. The possible actions to be taken are identified by the 5w’s. This will provide the first line of integration. Once all the general factors have been analysed, the commander has to form a clear picture in his mind of the entire situation and in so doing, provide a platform from which he can provide a possible solution. This platform will be achieved with integration of all the main conclusions.

• CB [11:15] How are the conceptual factors determined and by whom?

• HG [11:16] In short, general factors are determined by the commander. This is also given as part of the guidelines for planning by the commander to his staff to ensure focus. You as the commander will have to introduce methods of screening the information. This can be expedited with the use of specified general factors which will provide a rubric from which to drive relevancy to ensure that only that which is necessary to enable decision-making is utilised. This will determine what general factors are to be analysed. This sounds very easy but don’t be misled. It is the most difficult part of the appreciation as you continually feel that you as missing something. Unfortunately time is the permitting consideration.

• CB [11:56] What is your understanding on the formulation of a concept?

• HG [11:57] Well, the concept according to me is an expression of the commander’s will. In a nutshell, the message that you convey to the people, so that they
understand your intention indicating what needs to be done in order to achieve the strategic military goal and solve the primary problem as indicated by the commander during the MSA. The concept is made up of the commander’s vision and his guidelines for planning and implementation. It is intangible although you putting it down in words. It is providing an understanding of what the commander is striving to attain in words and how he is going to achieve his end states. A concept is determined by you as the commander. Don’t forget that the commander’s concept is there to initiate the planning process therefore the concept can be seen as the commander’s ability to draw a picture with words in support of his intents. This concept becomes the point of reference for the planning staff against which their planning results will be measured. There is no difference been the operation concept and a concept. A concept is a concept. The concept’s interpretation and meaning is triggered within the minds of people. It does not help to give your staff exactly what is to be done. There must be room for creative thinking by the staff as opposed by military orders which tell subordinates exactly what to do. Orders are not a concept. Orders, in the military, are the implementation of a plan, which in turn is the result of the planning cycle which was activated by a concept. The concept provides the planning staff with an understanding of the intention of the commander and the parameter within which to move. The concept must still give the planning staff the opportunity to decide on how possible options are to be addressed - the what of the concept will amount to space for initiative and creativity by the staff.

- CB [13:17] What is your understanding of the commander brief?
- HG [13:18] Well, according to me, the role of the commander’s brief is to convey his/her concept and guidelines to the planning staff. This will in turn activate the planning process. The commander’s brief is a unique opportunity for the commander to demonstrate what he has learnt and his understanding of the military
problem. This understanding is made up of the following - the overview of the
situation, emanating from the MSA, resulting in authorization and positioning of that
military problem within the environment. Then the primary problem is scrutinizing via
the conceptual analysis of general factors resulting in an integration and synthesis
of all main conclusions from which the commander formulates his concept from this
holistic overview and understanding. At the end of the day, the briefing is your
guidance to your staff, in order to enable your staff to develop a plan that needs to
be executed by your subordinate unit commanders. That is also the guidelines. It is
not to pin point how things must be done. The commander’s brief conveys the
“what” and not the “how”. The how is left to your planning staff to draw up for
approval. These options developed by your planning staff are to be referred back to
the concept for suitability. The briefing is presented to the planning staff. Each
military formation has planning staff made up of specialist portfolios which include
the following senior staff officers - personnel, intelligence, operations, logistics,
financial, doctrine and training. You don’t provide your data pack to your staff,
including your appreciation. It is only the commander’s brief that is communicated.
You give them guidelines and references. I stress again, not your appreciation. You
have now given them the guidelines as to your intent. This starts the planning cycle
in which they go and build their plans (options) accordingly.

- CB [15:07] According to you, what is intent?
- HG [15:08] Well Colin, this can be seen as the most significant success factor of the
commander’s appreciation. According to me, “intent” provides the commander with
the encompassing or synthesising of an aim, a target, meaning and purpose, all
leading to a concentration of his intellectual understanding of the situation. Your
staff and subordinate commanders must understand what you want to do as the
commander. The intent is according to your core business and is a fundamental part
of your appreciation. The commander's intent embodies his thoughts and actions. This is something tangible that he has drawn up. Your intent will manifest once you have synthesised the outputs of the MSA and conceptual analysis of general factors. I see that the vision and mission formulation and so forth is part of a team effort. It's not an individual. The most you can do is to guide the formulation thereof.

You, as the commander, provide your intent. Keep in mind that there is a link between the intent and vision therefore the vision and mission is not left to one person to work out. I provide the intent and they develop the vision and mission on a practical level. My work is to provide them, the planning staff, with my concept and guidelines and they provide us their planned options, which are measured against the compliance of the concept, after which an operational plan is drawn up. That plan is then seen as an operational plan or a day to day level 4 plan. In my case, the school plan. That is how I couple my resources such personnel, logistics and finances to the plan. This process can be utilised anywhere. This is evident with so many people that have left the system and are making use of these principles.

There is another concept called mission command and it fits in, according to me. The situation will dictate its application. The commander has the tools and he needs to manage it. Although you are a commander, you manage in accordance to the situation. You need to be flexible in order to ensure execution but still in the guidance or parameters of your concept.

- CB [17:05] Is the command appreciation process limited to the campaign planning for operations?
- HG [17:06] Not at all. This is not just used within the military for combat operation. This is a methodology for problem solving irrespective of the context within which it is utilised. Although I am in uniform, campaign planning process and especially the commander’s appreciation is part of my day to day management tools. The
commander’s integration within the day to day management is based on how you were trained and how you have internalised the problem solving process. This supports the notion that you are skilled for all purposes within the military promoting the adage of “you manage and fight how you train”. The use of this process within the day to day management will coach the staff in terms of the campaign planning process so that when the problem hits the fan, the process will be like second nature to the staff and as this School is a Centre of Excellence, we must practice what we preach and be very professional at it. For the staff, this will be integrated into the school plan and that is how we use the commander’s appreciation process as the tool for the short term plan. A plan is a basis for change. It is not set in stone. It is a guidance. You need to be flexible of process as well as mind in order to incorporate the situation.

- CB [18:59] Thank you very much for your time and insight Col Gunter.
- HB [19:00] It was only a pleasure.
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16.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW:

- CB [00:00] Good morning retired Col Andre Coetzee. Thanks for giving me this opportunity and your time. First order of business is the compliance with the ethical requirements. Please read the sheet and sign it. Could you provide me a synopsis of your military career, focusing on all the contributions you had on command and the commander’s appreciation development?

- AC [00:25] Colin thank you. I have no problem with the ethical compliance sheet and will sign it. Now, back to the question. Yes. I left the Defence Force after 32 of years of service. I think I spent, most probably half of that as an officer. My career was more in the technical environment so I do not have much operational experience. Although, I could contribute to that in my career I think, if one takes my junior courses, where the normal courses I went through - R6 and all the leadership courses which, I wouldn’t say taught me that much but I gained by reaffirming specific concepts. I think my main break in life came when I did the Senior
Command and Staff Course in 1997. Prior to taking that course, I had never had a commander’s appointment as I was mainly in charge of technical people, but the Staff course sort of opened my eyes to a few things especially when we started to do things like the commander appreciation. There were lots of discussions with all the combat operators, as they had knowledge and operational experience. They could not grasp this thing called the commander’s appreciation and I didn’t know why as for some or other reason from the first exercise I grasped this thing called the command appreciation and a light went on in my life! Subsequent to the staff course, I started at 3 Electronics Regiment as the 2nd in command. I was then approached by Brig Gen van Broekhuizen, to take over the R8 Course as I had just completed the staff course. Now the R8 course, when I did it previously, was a tactical course. It was managed on the tactical level – a higher tactical level and it was just a beefed up R6 course, where you completed a large signal appreciation. A week later, you still did not do very much more! It was at that time, that I realised that we had to change our career training of the senior cadre as well as our signaler’s way of thinking. Going to staff course without having the commander’s appreciation background leaves one at a deficit because the other corps do preparatory training. Yes, they do. Therefore, I felt the R8 course should be a preparatory course for the staff course. At that point in time there was not much on the commander’s appreciation and I think that was the time that I started to bring into the R8 course what I learnt on the staff course although it could be seen as a very Mickey Mouse basis. I think though, it was a start for a lot of things for the Corps of Signals. We wrote a few exercises and I think this was the first successful R8 course into activation of conceptual thinking! Thereafter, I went to 3 Electronic Workshop, where I was appointed as the Commander. At that point in time, I realised that I had to do something in my new unit. The unit I took over was in the
transformation process, so there was an opportunity for change. I realised that if I as the commander don’t know what to do, how will I be able to tell my people. So, we went through a lot of preparation and I sat in my office for ages deciding on what to do, how I must give guidelines and how the technical environment may experience it. Then one day, it dawned on me, that I have done all these courses and I have done all these things - the Defence Force had sent me on courses! I must go through all the processes that I have been taught and that is where I started using the commander’s appreciation process to the extent that I think, after three years of leaving the unit, we beefed up our military traditions, we had done more maintenance on generators in three years than a contractor did in one year with quarter of the money! So, I think that is where I started experiencing this thing called the commander’s appreciation. From there, I went to the project environment. I had a good mentor in my life, Col Gerhard Assink. There I experienced the same stuff. Every year we had this planning cycle. Gerhard would give us the guidelines and we would do the planning and by hook or by crook, things worked out very well. At a point two years ago, I decided that it was time to leave the Defence Force and I took leave from the force.

- CB [05:40] Do you feel that what you learnt in the Defence Force has helped you in the civilian fraternity?
- AC [05:41] Absolutely. I have now been in two organisations – I was on the mines for 8 months and if I see just how the mines do things and manage projects, it is atrocious! They have a lot of money and they fix their problems with money but if they had proper planning they could get away with about quarter of the amount of money spent. So, I saw that and I tried to implement a few things by providing options of what we could do to make it efficient. Maybe I achieved something there! Then I started at Natcom Electronics. Again I saw that the private sector is very
different from the military but what is not different is the fact that, one still needs a plan, guidance and leadership. If you don’t have a leader then nothing happens. You need a leader that’s a champion. You need a leader that tells people where to go, what to do, but not how to do it. The leader is to give guidelines on what must be done and then somebody must go and do the planning. The leader must not do the planning, the staff does the planning. Unfortunately, the staff planning does not happen and it is left for the leader to do and that is why in industry you have a leader who thinks he leads. I am not talking about an infantry platoon now. I am talking about giving direction on where the company is going. It is not just leading business-wise or money-wise. It’s leading on occupational health and safety, it is leading on process, on ISO standards. Leading on all types of matters - leading on production. If the boss does not know where the company is going, then nobody else will either!…and if the boss does not tell the people in a structured manner where to go … it will never happen!

• CB [07:40] Thank you very much! Now, to concentrate on the commander appreciation, which you have very import insight as the person who took the paradigm shift from tactical to operational level of war. I will now start posing direct questions about the commander’s appreciation based on the operational level of war to try and draw on your understanding and experiences. The first question being “What is your understanding of the role of the review of the situation”?

• AC [08:04] Quite simply, if you don’t know where you are, you don’t now what you have achieved up to now then you don’t know where you are going to. It is part of the gap analysis. You must know where you are coming from and learn from the lessons where you did wrong. Learn the lesson of what other people are doing right. Learn the lessons of the environment, what we have to do. Then you need that to make the decision on where you want to go to. So, it is all part of this package deal
of building information in your mind in order to direct yourself on where you are
going {CB interject 08 45 … Is there somebody that helps you with the review of this
situation?} I believe that the review of the situation is normally done by yourself. I
think you have staff and you can use these people, use industry and use
consultants to gather the information but when it comes to assimilating the
information, only you as the commander can do this, as you must have the
background in order to make a decision on where you want to go. If you don’t have
this background, you are in trouble. You can’t leave this to consultants. You can’t
leave it to other people to do the work. You must do the work yourself, so that you
know where you want to go. You, as commander need to tell your people where you
want to go, as the leader or champion.

- CB [09:31] Thank you. There is a strategic environment - what is your understanding
  of the role of the Military Strategic Analysis (MSA)?
- AC [09:56] I think this is where I have a different perception to what a lot of people
  have in strategy. I believe that in an organisation such as the military or any
  organisation for that matter, there must be a strategy in order to look at the long-
  term. Where we are going? What do we want to achieve? What is our vision and
  how are we going to achieve it? So, on the defence level, the Chief of the Defence
  Force must get guidelines from parliament, the government. The minister must do
  his appreciation and tell his staff where he wants to go. The Chief’s of the Army, Air
  Force, Navy in turn do the appreciation. So, the Chief of the Army will do his
  appreciation and tell the army where he wants to go. The main importance of the
  strategic analysis is to bring everybody together, and to make a concerted effort, so
  that you can role it down to the lower levels. An appreciation cannot be done in a
  void. It must be done with a view of where we are going and what we are going to
do. It must be like the Southern Cross star. You must look up in the sky and you
must know where the Southern Cross is and where it is going, so that you can follow that direction. I think that is the main role of the MSA. {CB Interjects … So, if I understand you correctly, there are a whole lot of people who help you with this MSA?} Absolutely! It is a team effort. You cannot do it alone. It needs leadership. It needs a champion. It needs somebody to drive it. It does not happen on its own. Just remember, the analysis is done by the commander.

- CB [11:31] According to you, what are the core elements of the MSA?
- AC [11:36] I think number one what is important is the environment. What the problem is. I think that is the main issue. You then need to look at why you are there and what you are mandated to do. Once you have defined your environment, what you have to do, in other words you understand the problem, you know where you are. In environment, people, cash finances and human resources, then you can build up the strategy as to where you are going. If you don’t have these things - the bigger picture of financing, the bigger picture of people, the bigger picture of aids and medical epidemics. You need this type of information to do your analysis.
- CB [13:07] What is your understanding of the conceptual analysis of the General factors?
- AC [13:25] A factor is something that you will identify out of your problem study. Factors will be defined by you. In the military, we have set factors such as, own forces, enemy, that type of stuff, technical factors, maintenance factors and logistical factors. Depending on the situation, you must define the factors that you are going to analyse, because it could change, and that is out of your environmental analysis. The commander will define the factors he wants to use. Factors are just a grouping of activities which give you direction and a plan of where you are going. It is like a funnel. On the top, you are going to have all of these factors. You are going to go through the facts, make deductions and you come out with conclusions. You
are going to group all of these conclusions and at the end of the day you are going to have a plan - that is what I want to do! So, it is a grouping of all the conclusions you made. It can be seen as a summary of those conclusions that leads to a plan and leads to the way you want to do things.

- CB [14:41] Are general factors unique?
- AC [14:42] I would not say so. I would say for an organisation such as the military, the general factors will be unique but those factors will not be applicable to a company that manufactures or is an earth moving company. They are going to have different factors. Weather for instance is going to be a very important factor to them. Finances will be a big factor. If you sell your business overseas or off-shore, things like that will become a factor. For every business, for every task you have to do, there will be different factors contributing to it. The crux is to define the factors - to define the right factors for the right job. This is directly related to leadership. {CB interjects... Whose leadership is it that will count?} The one and only boss. These factors are determined by the boss, the leader, the champion. After his MSA, he will come out with what factors need to be evaluated and to be put through the process - the campaign planning process. Yes he can use consultants. He can talk to people to get information, but the buck stops with the leader, the boss, the champion. {CB interjects … Does the word strategist fit in there?} I believe that every leader is a strategist. I think if a leader is not a strategist, then how the hell can he direct and lead the company and resources. You will become a gopher and nobody will follow you and they will then all do their own thing!

- CB [16:30] What is your understanding of a concept formulation?
- AC [16:50] I think it is quite simple. A concept is, according to my perception, a vision - a picture of what should be achieved and how I would like to go ahead. The picture must be explainable so that anybody else can understand it. They can take
this picture and do the planning, the detailed plan. Although a concept is an idea on how the commander would like to do it, the concept can change. As the staff is doing the detailed planning they will come across things that are not viable and then will go back to you, as the commander, and point out that this concept may be wrong. You, as the commander, will have to tell them that we are going to do that this way or you may have to adapt your concept. So, there is an interaction “wissel werking”. There is a strong interaction between the guy that does it, the commander and the staff that work for him. You must have an understanding and there must be a trust relationship. The financial guy cannot just do his own thing. The financial guy can’t just draw up a set of specific goals that are not aligned with the leader’s concept, the production and development environment, or the occupation health and safety. You can go and define a lot of goals but it can’t happen if you don’t have the OHS environment to back it. It is a concerted plan, within an orchestra. I use the example every time, that the commander, leader or boss is like the conductor of the orchestra, a symphony orchestra, if he does not conduct correctly – there’s problems! Everybody can read their music. If they play their music on their own, in their own time, it will not be a concert, it will not be synchronised and it will not sound cool. But, if that commander directs his people and tells them “you will play this harp, and you will play this now and whatever … this becomes a concert” - this is integrated and synchronised music. So, it is a synthesising of all the different elements by the commander as in the orchestra. {CB Interjects …What of the role of the concept?} The concept is a picture of what you want to achieve. There is a lot of work that has to be done, the detailed planning, by the staff - that’s the planning staff under the leadership of the Chief of Staff. If there is no Chief of Staff, the Commander will do it by himself. In that process, the operational guy will go out and evaluate what he has - what forces, what strengths, what capabilities, what the
enemy is etc, etc … so everybody will go and do their bit and everybody will get up with their plan, but it is a concert plan with one directional leadership by the commander. The leader has now decided on the ‘whats’ and his staff will make the decision of the ‘how, when, where, who and what thereafter’. The ‘what’ is what the commander wants to achieve and he has given guidelines and the staff will do the detailed planning. They will come back and say - on your plan this is how we must do it by presentation of options … option 1, option 2, option 3 so the staff will go and do the detailed plan. If the guidelines given by the commander are not achievable, the staff must go back to the commander and give the reasons why it won’t work. The commander will make the decision either to change his plan or he will provide additional direction with guidelines. So, he, the commander will be in charge of the whole symphony concert. The commander is the designer of the music. If the music sounds bad, he is held responsible!

• CB [21:49] What is the role of the Commander’s briefing process?

• AC [21:51] It is the process where the commander will get all his staff and sometimes his sub-unit commanders together. He will tell them what he wants - this is the problem and this is how I intend to solve the problem, this is what I except of you, I want you to have specific details, check that and that. Frequencies could be a problem, so the commander will tell him that he wants a frequency plan. You give guidelines so that the guy that does the task does it first time right. He does not have to do it again and again. The commander can be seen as a jack of all trades but a master of none. Although he has come up through the ranks, he will have his biases. A symphony conductor does not understand the tricks of the hobo or a violin or a drum or a french horn. The conductor will not have to play the drum or any instrument for that matter, but he must understand the capabilities and capacities of each instrument of the orchestra. He must recognise the sounds they make that can
contribute to the integration of those sounds into synthesis symphony, which produces lovely music. He must understand the frequency spectrum of the violin as to get different sounds out of the violin, according to the music. The music is just music, but he as the conductor must get the sound out of the violin - he must get the best out of everybody in the orchestra for a specific job. The commander presents the briefing in person. My view is, if you are a champion, you must act like a champion - so the commander needs to do that work, nobody else! Not his Chief of Staff, not his Operations Officer, nobody else but that commander because it gives authentication to the process. The commander is standing up there and talking to the troops, inspiring and motivating and rallying them behind the course, cultivating a trust, mandate and passionate. Then everybody becomes passionate about the process. You won’t have to motivate people as they will have belief in what they are doing is right. So, it is only the commander. This could be summarised by the military term spirit de corps. It means to bring everybody together and everybody will be on the same page in respect of the pending operation!

- CB [24:57] What is communicated at the commander's briefing and to whom?
- AC [25:10] The message is to be short and concise. The trick for a commander here is to communicate his intent in the shortest possible time and carry over the crux simplistically. I think telling the staff, this is what we have to achieve is fundamentally my concept. This is what I expect of you now go and do it! If the commander can’t convey this message in 20 min, he is wasting time - his time and that of his subordinates!
- CB [25:39] Now that you are in the civilian fraternity, you have experienced both entrepreneurial life and corporate life. How would you respond to this statement “the commander appreciation can be used within both the entrepreneurial and corporate environments”? 

• CB [24:57] What is communicated at the commander’s briefing and to whom?
• AC [25:10] The message is to be short and concise. The trick for a commander here is to communicate his intent in the shortest possible time and carry over the crux simplistically. I think telling the staff, this is what we have to achieve is fundamentally my concept. This is what I expect of you now go and do it! If the commander can’t convey this message in 20 min, he is wasting time - his time and that of his subordinates!
• CB [25:39] Now that you are in the civilian fraternity, you have experienced both entrepreneurial life and corporate life. How would you respond to this statement “the commander appreciation can be used within both the entrepreneurial and corporate environments”?
• AD [28:44] Absolutely! I need to use an example. I was a member of my son’s school governing body. We had a chairman of the governing body who was actually the leader of the school, because parents run the government schools these days. I frequently told him we are busy doing the wrong things. My portfolio was marketing manager and I was marketing the school. The financial guys were financing the school and they where trying to get money in and do projects and they were approving money for projects but this was not synchronised towards marketing. The maintenance guys were putting in water systems on the fields such as the rugby field and this was also not synchronised. The education committee was doing something and another committee looking after the teachers were doing something else but everybody was doing their own things. There was no synchronisation of effort with planning resources and prioritisation. During one of our segmented approval committees, I told them “guys we need to synthesise all efforts and prioritise efforts that our spending is done effectively and in the best interests of the school”. In order to activate this we needed to do a commander’s appreciation. I told the chairman that he must go away and come back and tell us what we must do. I told him that we will do the planning and we will make a concerted effort. We needed to do it - to construct a strategy for the school which could manifest in a short term plan. We needed to identify our medium term plans and long-term plans and work towards that, otherwise it won’t work. They did not understand the concept. They did not agree with me and they are still suffering. They are still not synchronised. I am of the opinion that they can do it much better. That is one example. If I take the industry where I am now, they have the same problem. There is no leader. There is no effort of where we are going and why we are doing it. There is no strategy for the long-term, medium term and short term. It is totally disorganised and disorientated and it is not effective. By means of going through
this process, you become efficient. The people have a goal to strive for - they strive
to do what they plan - it is their own plans with directions given by the commander. If
everybody drives his own plan towards the main goal, the company will be
successful. I have done it within my company. I have given my technicians
guidelines. I have given my installation teams guidelines. I have given the
production team guidelines and told them where we are going - this is where we are
going, things are changing! People are becoming positive and we are all moving in
one direction. In my division, which can be considered on the small side with 20
people, this is the only way it can work. I look at our research and development
environment, the commander or the MD of that company did not do a commander’s
appreciation and nothing is happen there. Management is done on an ad hoc, day
to day basis. You can’t run an organisation like that because you aren’t effective -
you are not cost efficient and it goes about bucks at the end of the day!

• CB [32:00] Thank you for you insights and time.

• AC [32:05] It was only a pleasure. Glad to be able to have helped!
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17.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

- CB [00:00] Afternoon Colonel Serfontein. (Shake hands and sit down opposite to each other). Thank you for taking the time to speak to me in connection with the commander’s appreciation... first order of business for administrative purposes I would like you to look at this ethics requirement in the document in front of you… if there are any concerns, please indicate and I will do my best to explain. If you find the ethical term acceptable could you please sign it. I would like to confirm your biographical information and address if there is any concern.

- CS [00:28] good afternoon Colin, I am happy with the ethical requirement and will sign it. I will send you an inclusive CV outlining my biographical information, to ensure completeness.

- CB [00:29] I have a few questions that I would like to ask in terms of the commander’s appreciation. The first question I would like to pose to you is your involvement in the campaign planning process.
• CS [00:53] In the past 7 to 8 years I have been directly involved in the Special Forces Campaign planning process …and service mainly in two areas of responsibility… the first area was as the Senior Staff Officer Operations where my main responsibility was the operational planning in the campaign planning process and then in the second phase in the training, where I was responsible to plan both the forces preparation and also special forces school training responsibility on behalf of Special Forces … contributing to the campaign plan in both those spheres for the past 7 to 8 years.

• CB [01:44] Thank you … with your vast experience in the campaign planning process providing a solid platform to commence the following question pertaining to the commander appreciation. The first question - what is your understanding of the role of the review of the situation?

• CS [02:00] …We in Special Forces adapted the campaign planning process a bit …in the sense that we broadened our scope that we look at when we do the review of the situation … when we do our campaign planning process we are at least one month prior to the planning activity… we do a review of the situation …where we do a complete environmental analysis … the environmental analysis will then include any strategic information made available within the DoD regarding the military intent … that is either formal or informal …guidelines or no guidelines received … it is any information that we can get even if it is out of open sources such as media where we start to pick up certain intent. We take it all into consideration so it’s not a formal guideline received - it is very broad and open… then our interdepartmental liaison and coordinating where we have picked up certain strategic intent from government… that is also part of the review situation… and then also any strategic partners that we have internationally …that is either formally or informally part of our business environment …in the Special Forces environment … also in the theatre of
operations where we conduct our business … we take that into consideration where we analyse their intent - what they’re going to do … so it either partners or even opposes in that specific field where we start to pick up specific information… apart from that we then also do a formal threat analysis in getting the general background information about all possible threats in out theatres of operation … those that are formally addressed by us … or those being addressed by other forces and organisations or other DoD organisations… but it is not part of our responsibility … and then after that we also do a detailed analysis of our theatre of operations that are all factors that play itself out in the theatre of operations … all of that is done a month prior to our planning process so that we can get a very good general orientation to what is happening in our theatre and our responsibilities and we then supplement that with strategic briefs by information houses on the different trends security wise in the international or the African spheres … companies like ISS {CB Memo ISS institute for security studies} and others that are either in the security or political environments. They then come and give us a presentation of recent threats. So that is what we in Special Forces have adapted our view of the review of the situation so that we can get a very good and in-depth background information on the current situation {CB interjects expanding on the information electronic or paper based and how it is collocated} There are actually various phases that you go through … normally what happen is a day seminar that we set aside for the specific activity … certain information, say a threat analysis, will be integrated in documents both in the presenting format and also in a supporting document of the proper threat analysis that was done …and it is integrated regarding information received from defence, security and information structure, also the Special Forces information structures and the interdepartmental informational structure such as Nicoc, Def Int and also Special Force information and then that will be one
document that will be presented to us … apart from that then also separate
documents will be presented and all the supporting documents received from the
speakers at the seminar … at the end of that day all the information will be cut on a
CD storage disk. It is then issued to all the participants of the planning process and
used to work through for preparing for the planning process, so then it is available in
both electronic and printed format.

- CB [07:13] Thank you for that detailed rendition… the next question that I would like
to pose is - what is your understanding of the military strategic analysis MSA role?
- CS [07:23] I think it is critical …and speaking on behalf of Special Forces that it is
critical and must take place and that proper guidelines must be generated out of it
for organisations like ourselves … the military strategic analysis takes place in our
format already when the Defence Force starts with their annual planning process …
and the guidelines are generated by senior officers within Special Forces and then
also the Joint Operations Division in terms of our operational guidance that we
receive … in that process the analysis takes place, prior to the Special Forces
planning process and guidelines are generated as pre-emptive measures to guide
the Chief of Defence Force in guidelines that he gives to us … in the organisation
the information then comes to Special Forces and it is then in the written format and
it is general guidance in terms of our operational readiness and preparedness and
how we should then prepare for possible operations … and operational deployments
in the short-term and medium to long-terms.
- CB [08:56] What are the core elements of the Military Strategic Analysis?
- CS [09:05] We are a very flexible organisation regarding this … the reason for that
is the scope of our theatre of operations that we work in … sometimes we receive
specific guidelines linked to specific operational capabilities .. other times it is broad
enough that we can determine our analysis and the scope ourselves as we
continuously scan the environment. Now I have giving an indication of our review of the situation. We have a formal process, but apart from that formal activity we continue on a monthly bases to scan the environment and to make any changes into our review of the situation but also a continuous update of our strategic analysis of what is happening and how it plays out and how our plan can be changed on a month to month basis. That being said, we are extremely flexible in terms of the MSA … now most of our information we receive in the Chief J-Ops guidelines in terms of the force employment plan and that is the guidelines we receive in terms of the formal guidelines… in terms of our analysis that we receive from our organisation is determined - it is either formal within the guidelines that we received in certain factors that are analysed and then in terms of informal anything that might pitch up … we also take that and analyse it as part of the analysis process.

- CB [10:54] Is there a list of core elements that reside within the MSA?
- CS [11:00] We do have certain core elements... it will be factors or it will be areas of responsibility that are either linked to formal participation in operational standby responsibilities... things like SADC standby forces, African Union standby forces and then also the defence standby capabilities …it is arranged according to the span of operational responsibility for example …a counter siege …a counter terror type of scenario and environment and then into a peacekeeping environment in which we play certain roles and responsibilities so there is a set standard on which we annually participate and make sure that we analyse those in detail and then also get the final plan on them… both in the force employment and also the force preparation environment where we then analyse specific capabilities and then plan for certain training responsibilities in those areas of capabilities and then the formal ones are very flexible … I can make available to you certain examples.
• CB [12:20] What is your understanding of the conceptual analysis of general factors?

• CS [12:35] In the formal process of the commander's appreciation ... it will be the process of analysis ... when we in Special Forces say we are doing the conceptual analysis ... it includes all the Unit Officer Commanding ... the General Officer Commander and then some of his Senior Staff that are responsible for analysing but also conceptualising the core of certain areas of responsibility ... so what we normally do in our conceptual analysis we will take ... our operational environment ... our training environment ... our strategic cooperation with other stakeholders and also our support environment and we will do a conceptual analysis ... say in the operational environment about threat analysis plus the operational capability plus our core capability that must be in place and then address those threats and then we will formulate a concept for the force employment environment on which we will base the rest of our planning so then that will be a conceptual analysis of the factors that have influence in that environment ... the same is done for our force preparation environment for example say there is government imperatives in terms of education training and development we take that and those factors are analysed with the guidelines received from the DoD on terms of how it is should be implemented within the DoD. We then take our current environment where we have been accredited as training providers within the SACA and SETA environment ... all those are put together and we analyse those factors together and then we will formulate a certain concept on how we will play out our short-term operations for the organisations ... still supporting our operational responsibilities and those factors are analysed like that and we will develop a concept for each of those ... the same for our cooperation with our other stakeholders ... that is now a national stakeholder ... international stakeholder and partners. We will analyse those factors
and formulate the concept on how we will engage with those role players in support… but the force employment and force employment responsibilities remain the same for the support concepts research and development, logistical support is also based on the same principle.

- CB [15:27] Are these conceptual factors unique or not?
- CS [15:31] I will say 60-70 percent of them are the same as for the rest of the of the DoD units and formations... because we are not unique in the sense that we are standing on our own … we have a large pool of our information overlap … although we are a formation we have a service {CB: memo arm of service, such as the army, air force, navy} like responsibility requirement … for example we will have for each of the various services we will have sphere, areas of overlapping and those factors are also then pulled into our organisation whereas if you see from normal army, they will not have those cooperation activities … the uniqueness of our organisation is that there is a lot of international cooperation and interaction which is not normal for defence force organisations except if it is a certain DoD organisation that is responsible for international liaison but we continuously do that on a day to day basis that is very unique to us … the other uniqueness is our service link that is continuous. The other factor is we have a direct line and also open responsibility to the Chief of the Defence Force that he can give us any tasking at any time that for example we have received in the past operational tasking directly from the president… directly from the minister… or the chief which does not go through any organisation which makes it unique in the sense that any type of information can come to us and then we must analyse that and make it part of our system.

- CB [17:36] How are these conceptual factors determined and by whom?
- CS [17:41] We have a formal process …where we determine it within the organisation and when we go through our annual planning process… then there is
also informal factors as I have indicated that can come from time to time from various role players… eg government departments … it can happen that within intelligence and government departments there is a unique threat … that will then be analysed as a separate factor even if on a very short base in between our yearly planning process or with operational planning activities or it can then be officially linked into our planning activities … so it is mainly …I will say 80-90 percent of the factors are determined by special forces themselves …and the rest whichever stakeholder then wants to have a specific input given to us.

- CB [18:39] Interesting! What is your understanding of the formulation of a concept?
- CS [18:48] What we in Special Forces do and specifically in our planning process … we may wrongly term it … but for example if it is a force preparation concept that is formulated initially … we formulate it as the force preparation strategy … because our concept, actually that we formulated for us is a concept in the medium to long-term and not a short-term concept … because we are working with anything from 1 to 5 years in our planning process … so our concept is formulated as our strategy … but the concept is exactly the same. What happens is that we after we have analysed all the possible factors that might influence the force preparation environment …those factors and the core issues are identified. We also visually display our concept …we worked out a visual concept for the force preparation environment addressing all areas of responsibility in the force preparation environment and also how we visualise this to be played out in the short to medium term … So the concept is then the core around which we will then do the formal and informal force preparation play out of our plan and each and every activity is always taken back to the concept to confirm …yes its still in our concept and applicable and this is how it fits into the concept and this is how we let it play out in the short term one year or then medium term 3- 5 years … for example we have a
medium term schedule for all our advanced courses … there is a medium term schedule - a 5 year schedule in advance … that schedule is linked to that concept on how we visualise our cooperation and with other international organisations … but also with our link to our operational responsibilities in the short and medium term and that is also formulated within that specific concept … we will not engage in medium term training activities with other stakeholders if it is not approved and part of that concept … that is then how we use the concept to also then apply our plan in the future.

- CB [21:13] What is the role of an operational concept?
- CS [21:20] The operational plan for our organisation … because our core responsibility is employing special operation capabilities on behalf of the chief of the defence force … our organisation’s vision is excellence in special force operations … that is our vision…. If that is our vision then the core elements of our analysis … our core element of our planning process is then our operational concept … because everything must support operations … and that is why when we do analysis we first formulate our operational concept and then all other concepts... or then strategies that are formulated in our organisation in support of the operational concept... now our operational concept then addresses the core activities which is based on the threat analysis and also our contingency analysis that is done on behalf of the Chief of the Defence Force where we see Special Force Operational commitment in the short and medium term might play out in the theatres of operations … so that core operational concepts will then address certain areas of responsibility within the organisation … the first - how will we prepare our capability in support of the operation .. that prepared part is then the formal training responsibilities … mission readiness exercise … and then also our co-operation with other governments and government departments and also international
stakeholders and partners in terms of interaction for preparation of operations… that operational concept will then also give guidance to all the support plans that must still follow … that is specifically in terms of our main equipment procurement and research and development … and main equipment procurement plans that are in the long-term that can give guidance for 30 years in advance … how we mean to financially plan our organisation and prepare our organisation in support of our operational plans and also shorter to medium research and development … our sustainment and support … our sustainment in terms of logistical sustainment and organisational structures and then also our human resources … our most valuable resources in the company … how then to give guidance on that and then any other organisational guidelines flow out of the operational concept … those guidelines are then taken as the core information on which the support concepts and also the force preparation concepts are formulated.

- CB [24:31] What is the role of the commander’s briefing?
- CS [24:36] I think the commander’s briefing is the most important part … you can have the best possible plan and have done the best analysis with the best answers formulated in the commanders brief … but if that brief is not communicated properly to the subordinated commander and the organisation that has to support it … it will not be a success in the commander’s brief and in our process, for example after we have started our initial environmental scan and environmental analysis the review of the situation, a month prior to our planning process … a month after our initial planning session have finalised the commander’s brief is then utilised to communicate the rest of that plan to the rest of the organisation… the commander’s brief is used by the General Officer Commanding … in our case he needs special staff to assist him with the compilation of his brief to formulate and to communicate his detailed intent … in terms of concepts to his subordinate commanders … and
then in certain cases specific guidelines what he expects of us in the short and medium term. It is mainly in the form of an end state that is formulated … an end state with certain objectives within it the end state that has to be achieved within the short and medium term … it is critical it is the core element of what he wants to communicate {CB interjects who conveys this brief} in special forces the General Officer Commanding the Special Forces Brigade himself … in person.

- CB [26:34] What is communicated and to whom?

- CS [26:37] The General Officer Commanding utilises that opportunity to make use of some of his staff to set the scene for his intent … for example the senior staff officers such as the intelligence will be used to give a backdrop in terms of the current situation... the expected situation … and the possible threats as analysed. Then he will utilise the senior Staff Officers operations to give an indication of the operations environment and to set the scene as to what is expected over the next year in terms of what is currently happening … and what current capabilities are available and also operationally deployed and then after that the GOC himself gives his intent for the short and medium terms …in terms of our operational responsibilities… possible engagements …how we will execute those engagements in the short and medium term and readiness levels … capabilities on readiness and readiness levels and then he will utilise some of his support staff to indicate the forces preparation support …and then support and sustainment activates, human resources, logistics and research and development - just to give the support activities …the core element is then presented in terms of our intent by the GOC himself {CB interjects how is ownership cultivated} On the operational level of war on which the formation headquarters then operates …ownership is taken by all senior staff being part of the operational planning process. They continuously, either themselves ..or are part of making plans … or part of the analysis process and
briefing they take ownership of that level … as soon as the commander’s brief is given to the unit officer commanding to be executed, a similar process happened on unit level ….so then next sphere the tactical level gets involved in exactly the same method by going through the same analysis process and those commanders on those levels then also get directly involved. They each take ownership on that level and they then execute their specific tasking on the tactical level…

- CB [29:21] Being a fellow student and having completed your MBA recently … do you think that the commanders appreciation can or can’t play a role in business?
- CS [29:37] I think that it is critical that there should be a similar process in the private sector to make sure that proper analysis and guidelines of companies in the private sector can take place … I know that companies make use of specific techniques to go through certain processes of analysis for them …but for sure, with a tweak here and there, in terms of terminology and certain intent … certain factors to be analysed and certain processes … this process can be utilized by private organisations so as to enhance the strategic guidance for those companies and also the formulation of a plan that can monitor on an annual basis the progress on how you actually achieve your end state for that year or even in the medium term for the company of certain goals to be achieved over a certain period… I think it definitely can play a role in business… and has a role to play.
- CB [30:41] Thank you, Col Serfontein for your time and insightful inputs.
- CS [31:00] You are welcome!
18. APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT LT COL (RET) J. BROOKS

18.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- Lieutenant Colonel (Ret) John Brooks (SM, MMM). Co-author of the SA Army Commander’s Appreciation process, appointed as the directing staff at the SA Army College, attended the USA Army Strategic leadership programme. Commanding Officer – 1 Parachute Battalion, Chief of Staff 44 Parachute Brigade. Appointed a Divisional Executive of Faritec and subsequently appointed as an Executive Director of DocQnet Systems International (Pty)Ltd.

- **The indicators**: CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. JB - Lt Col (Ret) John Brooks the interviewee. Location: Bugatti’s Restaurant, Irene Mall.

18.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW:

- CB: [00:00] Morning John (Shake hands and sit down opposite each other).

- JB: [00:08] Morning Colin, pardon for me being a little late there was an accident on the highway.

- CB: [00:10] No problem at all. Your understanding of the Commander’s Appreciation will make up for it by far.

- JB: [00:14] (John laughs and sits down). Now that you mention the Commander’s Appreciation, it provides me with an opportunity to do some introspection. I asked myself why we are not making our budget? Why are my people not making their targets and our budget? You are actually doing the appreciation and once you have figured out in your mind the reason why you not hacking it, then you form an idea of how you think you should do it. Then you sit down with your people and say: “Listen guys, we are not making our budgets. I thought about it and this is why we are not making the budgets … and then you hold back and you don’t tell them …what your idea is ok… So, what do you think we should do then?” They come forward with
their plans and ideas. The whole time what you are doing is evaluating what they say against what you have analysed. And that, in my opinion is exactly what a Commander's Appreciation is all about. The best exponent of that that I found, in my whole career is General McGill Alexander. He actually did more than a Commander's Appreciation. He did a more detailed appreciation and then he used to sit there …when you used to present your options …and your broad options …your general options … detailed options and course of actions … and he used to sit there measuring this up against his plan. He used to update his plan going through. Someone who used to support him was General Archie Moore. Archie Moore was typically a Commander Guy while McGill Alexander was the Chief of Staff - he actually ran the Brigade. I don't think this is totally right. I think the Commander has to stamp his authority. In business it is exactly the same. You know that you have a problem. I was going to say that it's not a battlefield but it is. It is a battlefield out there. There is an enemy and there is terrain and there are factors. So, it made me to think a little bit about this Commander's Appreciation process. When I first started in business everybody always referred to Sun Tzu. I have never read Sun Tzu, I just though how can I really increase my knowledge by reading a few maxims. What I rather like to read and something I have read recently is a book called moving mountains by General Pergolas who was the Chief Logistician of the 1st Iraq war. This explains how he dealt with logistic and the tracking thereof which is important in my type of organisation. I rather read a book with practical experiences for me instead of Sun Tzu which is a whole lot of affirmation. So, how does this all fit into your research? What are you studying?

- CB [04:56] Well my research is focused on the following question “To assess whether the Commander’s Appreciation in the Military also prevails in the business context and if so, to focus attention on the areas of similarity and differences as a
basis to formulate a model for the strategic intent formulation.” My aim is to provide “a model for the formulation of strategic intent” for use by any leader/strategist, as an effective solution to gaining the initiative (in his/her market space), for the realisation of competitive advantage. I have coined the phrase ‘analysis is essential, synthesis is fundamental’.

• JB [11:41] Well, I am telling you that it is the right time for something like that. The world is slowly showing signs of coming out of the global recession and the like, and so when those signs become a lot clearer, companies will be saying ‘alright guys we gone through this. We have taken a hell of a knock and we can’t afford to do this again’ and so there will be a lot of scope for that sort of advise consulting or whatever. When I was doing this, I sort of realised a couple of things that were really important to me. When I came out of the military, I went into a small consulting company which was really great because there was this entrepreneurial spirit and I was utilised as a business consultant initially in the business process environment and then in the re-engineering environment and the like and I enjoyed it tremendously. I never realised exactly why I enjoyed it … it was just so “lekker” there was no-one there to see if I was at the client on time and the like. If I wasn’t, then obviously that would get through and there was nobody who would phone me and say your working hours are between 8 – 5 and you got to do this whatever. You went in there and you did your own little analysis and put your own project plan together and off you went and you had an out put which you had to deliver and make certain you delivered the output. From there we went from one small company to another which was very nice as well. Then at a stage, we were acquired by a huge corporate company. When they announced it, I immediately felt this cold coming over me. I went and spoke to my team and they were uncomfortable. I brought this team with me for a couple of years and everyone was uncomfortable.
We set up this meeting with the board, with the enterprise connection board, and we said “just look, we don’t think that we can be part of this.” They got the Faritec guys in and they spoke and eventually there was a little agreement reached, with a little monetary motivation and stuff, not huge, just enough for us to stay, at that point in time. After two and a half years - now let me tell you this, the very first year we went in, my division and Faritec has been around a very long time and they had a number of other divisions that they where operating on. The first year, my division won the CEO award for the best performing division - that was the first year. The second year, we did not even come close and the last six months was the biggest drag of my life. Let me tell you why. Myself as a person and my team, the way we always have done business did not fit in. We did not fit into the culture you know. If I am the Business unit manager of a Division, I paint the wall in my office green. You as the CEO don’t come to me and reprimand me because of that … so guy how can we squeeze an additional 2 bar out of this customer. This is totally legitimate, but it like that division has fallen behind so how do we make it up. That customer doesn’t really need it, but we can sell that due to my good relationship with that customer. We can do that. They don’t need it right now but maybe a year from now… and that is not John Brooks. Ok, I am also not into this incredible reporting mechanism that they have in corporate companies. Now, if I want to go on leave, I would go to my CEO and say “Mike I will not be here on Monday, I will be in Bloem getting my car serviced … Ag John, “no problem” and on my own, I would go to the HR lady and tell her I am on leave on Monday and could she please sort out the paperwork. I come to the end of the year and I want to take 14 days leave but I only have 12 days. In the corporate environment we have an IT system that drives leave and if you want to go on leave, you have to put in 5 working days before for planning purposes … and then I realised I was previously in a conventional unit - airborne
forces are conventional units but typically speaking when we were out on an
operation or a training exercise in the field we are very much like an entrepreneurial
organisation where decisions are made on the fly {CB Interjects to exploit the
opportunities}... exactly ...as the allied forces para's did you know. On D Day when
they found themselves scattered all over the place, this was not planned, so each
little group decided that they would destroy any German grouping when they had the
opportunity and they did not have plan for that whereas if I had been, I think in an
artillery or armour outfit where everything is done according to the plan/doctrine for a
very good reason. This is done for a very good reason. If I may be blasé, I did so
well on my staff course because my thinking was flexible and creative versus the
more conventional accepted norm, so when I was with Enterprise Connection,
before Faritec, it was very cool because I was allowed to do exactly that. So, I went
to the CEO of Enterprise Connection and asked what the HR process was there. He
explained that basically there were only three. He said they just did this that legally if
you are in an accident we need to have it, so just adapt your process which we did
and it worked particularly well. I mean, I had the most motivated staff in the whole of
Faritec. They had no onus to come to the office. Why come to the office and use up
my electricity ... and use up my bandwidth ... and talk to the chap next to you and
keep him out of his work when you have a job to do – just do it! {CB Interjects ....
Using the tools ... printer to keep yourself busy} ... exactly ...so you arrive at the
client and you only have a meeting at 10, why come to the office. So you finish your
meting at 1300 so why come back to the office ...why not just phone me from the
client and give me feedback, set up an report and mail it to me ...or climb on skype
and let us talk about this ...you know what I am saying - you have a computer ...
you have mobile access ... you have your own printer and all the applications you
need on your machine ... so at the end of the day ... we only saw each other when
we had a monthly meeting … one session a month we spent about 30 minutes in the board room and then went to Baron’s Inn at Woodmead. We won the CEO’s award. The first year was all the excitement and the second year are all these things. We had a strategy at Faritec, but nobody really knew the essence of that strategy. Our strategy was twofold. We had to be customer-centric. Nobody really new what the definition of that was and, we had to make 1.1billion turnover. That was the strategy, …and so every division got its cut of that pain and we then formulated our own strategy. Nobody ever coordinated to see whether the strategies delivered, gelled or supplemented each other. We spoke about selling solutions and not selling products. At Faritec we had it all, but it never materialised. You know where Faritec has now gone, in the last three years. I know about a year ago the share price was sitting at R1,76 and now it something like 5 cents. What I wanted to say ito that is that now I am at this company in which I have a stake and now I realise why I am happier because I am now doing the same things here that I did when I was a paratrooper out on the hill. Ok guys, we spot this opportunity. A hunting analogy could be the following - in front of me is a rooibok. I have a 7.62 for the rooibok and all of a sound there is a kudu (an opportunity ) but I don’t have the weapon for that but I make a plan to get it … you see, we don’t go first say ‘does it fit into the strategy’ … because my strategy is to support my end goal which is to make enough money to retire and I am making it so I have a strategy which looks after my cash flow and the like and everything else along the way is my contingencies. You get the companies and guys that operate very well in corporate companies, I have just found that for myself after trying it, it did not gel.

- CB [26:21] Thank you for that insightful rendition and overview. Moving along - I would like to formulise the following ethical questions, as presented to you in an ethics sheet. Could you please read and sign it. Do you have any obligations?
• JB [26:30] I am willingly participating in this interview and will have no objection to signing the ethical document.

• CB [26: 57] How did the attendance of the American staff course contribute to your career and the Commander’s Appreciation?

• JB [27:03] I think this contributed by exposing me to a different set of ideas. I was also being exposed to a much larger entity than what we are accustomed to in the South African Military. I mean, going overseas to the USA Army War College and spending a year on what they call The Strategic Leadership programme which is the most senior course in the USA Army. This is where they actually select the small group of colonels that will become generals. They are such a huge military and there is a large base of Lt-Col’s and Col’s and not all of them can become Generals. This is where the line is drawn. The Americans get told after this course what stream they now go in. They either go into a commander stream, which is for very few while the others will have to be happy going into the staff line. Some of them stay colonels for the rest of their careers. At the end of this year, they actually have a career discussion with their career managers and corps directors ... { CB interjects. Did you bring this concept of career management back to the SA Defence Force?} No, and I will tell you why. I didn’t bring back that concept to the South Africa National Defence Force because when I was appointed at the SA Army College, we were in a situation where the parameters had already been set as to what needed to happen. I am very proud to say that when I hear names like General Nyanda, General Ngwenyi, General Shoke, I was in part responsible for training on that specific staff course that I presented, there were many set guidelines and terms and in my humble opinion, the content of the course was actually peripheral to what needed to occur in going forward. The interesting bit of that was, we had regular sessions where we had discussions with the various groups. What did your
commanders training look like in Russia …and in China … and in wherever you went to? So what happened there was that there was a lot of input in place that was mulled over. A lot of this input went into development. I am a believer that you get leaders, obviously at all levels, and we were fortunate enough in the South African Military to be exposed to independent leadership very early on. I remember in 1979 being appointed a section leader at the Infantry School and being taken up to the operational area, Oshevello. {CB memo: based in South West Africa} At that point in time, the operational area, and we were let loose as 18 year old section leaders. What did I have to do with my section? I had to make an appreciation and the like. The South African military schooled you for that. The concept in Afrikaans is ‘grond’ and in English ‘ground’ … and those are the things we used for training at the School of Infantry. That is nothing other than a Commander’s Appreciation at a really minor level - at a really junior level {CB Interjects so that started sparking conceptual thinking already then} Absolutely! Absolutely! If you look at what you sort of covered, the broader picture, then I think where I was fortunate and it goes about enthusiasm because the military was my life. This was it! The next course that you went on tactically was the combat team commander’s course, at the Army Battle School. I was fortunate enough to command a combat team in the final exercise and then moved on to the combat group commander course. When commanding a combat group, it comprised of artillery, mirages and the whole shebang and the planning staff. I then went on the senior command and staff course and was appointed as the Chief of Staff of one of the teams (Blue) for the final exercise called Zenith. This was phenomenal. This was all the build up to the commander appreciation. When I got around to Exercise Marathon, on the Army Command and Staff course, the commander appreciation, to me, was almost a natural thing. When I went overseas to the USA Army War College, we did a strategic exercise
repositioning forces across the world on a dummy computer simulation product and we never went through the full commander's appreciation, nor the full planning cycle. We just 'sort of' did a commander's appreciation- myself and the Israeli Colonel who was with me on course, as we were 38 internationals on the course. We sort of finished in a couple of hours and twiddled our thumbs for the next 2 and a half days while everyone else was putting there stuff together. Here was the interesting thing, why did I finish my commander's appreciation so quickly? Well, it was the schooling I had. It was a natural progression for me but not for the Israeli guy. They don't do this {CB memo campaign planning process) alright. They think what we do in terms of the whole planning process is a waste of time because this is what they say “so, if the Egyptian come in or the Syrians come in from the north and threaten, then they have to go through this planning process.” Well, the Syrian will be out by the south before the planning has been completed. They go through the process, but don't formulise it the way we do. It is all intellectual. They stand in front of the map and they build this plan and they agree on it there and go out and do the job, so that everything is still fresh in their memory. This is not like us that who have to go back to our logistical staff - what is the grid reference of A echelon { CB Memo the supply organisation} ... has to move to .... {CB interjects ... they have an overlay in their mind} ... that it {CB interjects ... and that the schooling they use} ...

Everything else is drills. I will tell you what I learnt at the United States War College is that where our {CB: Memo ...the refers to the RSA Command and staff course) ...our directing staff teach the stuff, we don't facilitate the learning process. So, if I have a strong personality as a directing staff, I will be down loading my views and cloning the candidates with your views. At the United States War College, we were divided up into what they called 'seminar groups' which holds 16 people each and each person came from a different environment. So, in the group of 16, in my group
of 16 for example, we had two internationals - a South African and an Israeli, we had somebody from the Air Force, the Army, we had somebody from the Marines, Navy, we had somebody from the Coast Guard and somebody from the various departments that have to do with the military. We had males and females. A topic like “The Commander’s Appreciation” was therefore discussed, debated and dialogued and everybody threw in their two cents worth. There was a directing staff member whose purpose was to elicit reaction, for example ‘John, you have not said anything in the last 10 minutes! What do you think?’ His job was to elicit this dialogue and then, if we, decided that this is what the commander’s appreciation should look like, then that is what we implemented. Everybody had ownership as this was a fundamental element. Every single day you went into your seminar group and you had these very relaxed discussions over a cup of coffee. You had a program, so you knew what was being discussed. You had material to research. You knew right in the beginning exactly on what day you had to discuss what and what the output of each of that was, so you came prepared. You only came unprepared once, because the directing staff was at that level and would pick that up and rip you up in a very nice way. So everybody had input. On my return I tried to implement that in our Command and Staff course and I think to a degree it really worked. However, in that time it was not a formal part of the curriculum. We even tried to bring back what we called the lunch time lectures, so as to do what we used to do at the United States War College when you put your name down and say you want to give a lecture about South Africa or the South African military over lunch time. Everybody would go and get their lunch. You would get on to the stage in front of the podium and start talking. I did two of those at the Army War College and five college and high school presentations promoting South Africa. It is all about dialogue. I think that is the crux of any plan and strategy - the way you dialogue it
because dialogue means communication and not necessarily understanding. So, it is having a dialogue, conveying your strategy or what you think you want and having your people and team understand what that is and then allowing them to take part in the dialogue as this is a two-way street. They need to input into it for ownership. If your employees don’t accept ownership of your plan, whether it’s is a project plan, a technical plan or your strategy, I tell you this emphatically, it isn’t going to work. You can force your plan onto anyone. In business however, you can’t force your plan from the top. You have to throw out the bait from the top, and then you got to get people to accept ownership as they will drive the plan going forward, leaving you to steer the ship. At the end of the day, that for me is very important.

- CB: [42:10] Col Brook could you please provide a synopsis of your military career.
- JB: [42:10] Well, all the following actions contributed to the Commander Appreciation from my perspective. I attended many courses at the Infantry School made up most of infantry drills. After this, I specialised in airborne strategy and tactics at 1 Parachute Battalion, 44 Parachute Brigade, 44 Parachute Regiment, combat team commander course, combat group commanders course and culminating in the SA Army Senior Command and Staff course practical examination. My appointment as the commander at the United Army War College strategic warfare exercise held at the US Army War College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, as a foreign student, was a highlight in the process. All of the experience gained during the above career culminated in my being appointed as a directing staff members at the SA Army College as I attempted to plough back all my experience and knowledge into the Senior Command and Staff Course, which primarily focused on the formulation and executing of the commander’s appreciation.
CB [42:53] The campaign planning process you experienced that side and the South African campaign planning process. What is your understanding of the role of the “review of the situation”?

JB [43:02] Well I have two things which are very important on this issue. Firstly, the purpose of the review of the situation is to familiarize yourself, as commander, with exactly what the problem is that you have to deal with - the problem at hand, which needs to be solved and then identify all factors that form part of the problem, either influencing or generic. Secondly to bring the planning staff to a point where you are all on the same level in terms of what the problem is that you have to deal with so that there is no ambiguity. Furthermore in order to ensure that everyone participating in the planning process is at the same level in terms of knowledge of the problem at hand {CB: interjects … Does this mean that everybody does a review of the situation?} For me, the review of the situation is understanding firstly from the commander’s point of view and secondly, ensuring that the planning staff all share the same understanding {CB memo … So you have one data pack from where you move with the same info and there is a communal understanding not necessarily an accepted understanding but a communal understanding?}

CB [44:36] What is your understanding of the role of the Military Strategic Analysis (MSA)?

JB [44:40] You must just remember that this was not called the MSA in my time. My understanding of this and the role of the MSA is once again twofold. Firstly, it was environmental scan which aims clearly to define the level at which you operating and then to identify the influences from above, laterally and below, that could have an impact on the environment. These need to be taken into consideration when formulating the plan. Secondly, I also said, broadly defining what you are up against, because now already you are starting to look at a broad enemy picture. You can
speculate what is typically going to take place in a country - that’s what an appreciation does. You already start to think of the challenges you are going to face. That’s my understating of the MSA.

• CB [46:03 ] Being in the USA and now with the introduction of civil oversight in South Africa - according to you, what is the military’s role?

• JB [46:09] As negative, as I see political influence, there is absolutely no way that we are going to get away from it. It will always be a factor at any level of the organisation. In our case, if you pull it to the business case, you can have the best plan in the world, but if the board, in the business terms the governance side, does not accept and endorse that you are going nowhere! {CB interjects … If I understand you correctly. The Sec Def and the board both play the governance role?} Exactly!

• CB [46:23] What are the core elements of the MSA?

• JB [46:24] In my opinion, this is made up of the following aspects - defining your mission, defining your constraints, defining what the end result of your action must be, defining what you have to contend with such as enemy, terrain, broadly defining what resources you would require, broadly defining what resources are available and identifying potential contingencies that require consideration.

• CB [47:41] What is your understanding of the conceptual factors analysis?

• JB [47:42] In my opinion, once again I have sort of identified it here. My understanding of conceptual factors is the identifying of what factors will play a role in you trying to solve your problem. Whether or not you have a set number of factors and I know that we {CB Memo the SA army and defence} had this little list which was the base list. On it, was enemy, own force, terrain, time, weather. You know, there were a couple of these things, like political factors, or whatever the case may be. I say, yes, in general you typically would have a set number or list of conceptual
factors because there is only so much influence. The more au-fate you become with what you are doing, the more you will refine these lists. However, what I also said here is that I think there are other things that play a role. Political influence, for instance, can't be standard. You have to consider the period of time in which you are operating. So, although you have a standard list, although political influence will always be a factor, the context in which you analyse things will change. If you look at a strange thing like weather, where we used to look at prevailing weather patterns over the last 10 years of history - well the fact of the matter is, can you still do that or do you have to take climate change into consideration in order to do that. Strategically defining the nature and scope, the big picture of the influence that these factors will have, so my answer is - yes and no. Yes, you can have a list, which can be added to or ignored and no, you have to look at where you find yourself!

- CB [48:41] Are general factors unique?

- JB [48:42] This is a yes and no short answer. Yes, because I would think that you would have general factors such as enemy, weather etc every time you plan. As a matter of fact I think that you would bring up your standard list every time, and then eliminate that which is obviously inappropriate. No, because I believe that “period of time” in which the problem finds itself, as well as “political intent” at that given time, might result in a different approach to analyzing the general factors. 49:20

- CB [49: 36] How are conceptual factors determined and by whom?

- JB [49: 37] Well the short answer is collectively. In my opinion, the following individuals participate in this activity, namely the campaign commander, chief of staff, all senior staff officers, all senior arms of service and participating corps.

- CB [49: 57] What is your understanding of the formulation of a concept?
- JB [50:08] I was very clever here. I actually had to do some research here. I think two things are important to me. The first of two critical steps in the commander’s appreciation. This is because of the concept of the planning parameter, as they exist in the commander’s head and thus vision. The following aspects are important in the formulation of a concept, according to Schopenhauer “concepts are mental representations”, which in this case emanate from the commander. Concepts are mere abstractions from what is known through intuitive perception and in this case emanating from the Commander’s experience, knowledge and skills. So that is where a concept comes from. Secondly, Nietzsche said “every concept originates through our equating what is unequal”. It is a conflict situation in our mind to try and solve a problem, which in this case emanates from the commander’s initial mental analysis of the problem and what has to be done to solve it. In my mind, a concept is a mental representation of the commander’s intent which will manifest in the commander’s brief.

- CB [51:08] What is the role of the operational concept?

  - JB [51:14] The role of the operational concept is set by the commander. Herein lies the critical aspect. The role of the operational concept is the challenge set by the commander to his/her operational planning staff to identify the weakness and the strengths of the operational concept and to accordingly eradicate the weakness and exploit the strengths. This now puts one on the road to formulating the optimised plan for me by using this concept as the cornel from which to depart. Yes, the concept will provide movement for creativity.

- CB [51:57] What is the role of the command briefing?

  - JB [52:10] I think this can be said in one concept for me. This is actually the second of the two critical steps in the commander’s appreciation. This is where the commander stamps his/her authority over the entire process. Where he/she
conveys his/her vision, conveys his/her commitment, inspires confidence and lays the foundation for an enthusiastic and motivated planning process. {CB: interjects … If you refer to the commander stamping his authority …does that elude to an autocratic type of leadership? } No, not at all. I think his style, his concept, his vision is the desired end result that needs to be achieved because in warfare and in business the buck stops at the commander. It is fair to say that I give you a lot of room to work in but if this battle fails then the commander will carry that with him for the rest of his life. I am not talking about getting rapped over the knuckles for not making it, but to carry this on his conscience for the rest of his life. He can’t adopt a liaises fair approach. This is true as well in business. It is not the divisional manager that reports back to the board. It’s is the commander/CEO who stands in front of the board. You can’t come in front of the board and say, “I gave my people a lot of room and they came up with this - well this failed! I am terribly sorry”. What I mean by stamping authority, is how the CEO sees the solution of the situation. I don’t want to use the word parameters. In the planning field, where this planning process should take place, there are two things that are important to me and we must not confuse the commander’s brief with the giving of orders. So, during the giving of orders, the plan has been made and everybody has decided what needs to be done. All have bought into it and have to convey this to all the others participating. Now he gives his orders and stamps his authority down, by saying, within reason, this will happen, I know it’s going to work, and he motivates and inspires all, in terms of the plan. The commander’s brief is more of a guiding tool, again within reason, you are given scope but I want that! Creativity will still destroy the world one day, so one needs to keep a reign on that! {CB Interjects … If I understand you correctly, the difference between the Commander brief’s and order … commander brief initialised the
planning cycle, after the planning cycle you will have a plan that is implemented by orders?} That is correct!

- CB [55:23] Who conveys the commander’s brief?
- CB [55:25] What is communicated and to whom?

- JB [55:26] What is communicated is part of the element of the second critical step as discussed above. To whom - to both the planning staff and the participating forces. How he/she does it depends on their unique style. My recommendation is that this should be done in detail, of course, to the planning staff and an initial motivational action to the participating forces.

- CB [55:47] Final question - is the Commander’s Appreciation relevant in business, as a proponent of both worlds?
- JB [55:52] Absolutely. I think already the business environment, in which I am in, uses elements of an appreciation without even knowing it. So, typically speaking, you also go through your vision, mission formulation and that sort of thing - on the longer term cycle of three years and you revise that on an annual basis. Then, every year, you revise your budget, you revise your objectives, you revise your goals and you revise the tactical approaches that you use. So, yes, you do. I mean, you consider every year when you sit down to build a plan and consider all the factors that will influence the company’s survival. If you are a good business person you will adjust these, as these influence change. So, I think there is a really good place for the commander’s appreciation - call it the business leader’s appreciation in business. My only concern is and I will take you back to the discussion in the beginning - the difference between the corporate and entrepreneurial environments and the manner in which this type of tool will be manifested into those two organisations, those two types of organisations! {CB Interject … but it is relevant to
both organisations - it is just how we will implement it. One might just be on an overlay that might be a five day work session, but the essence is the activation of conceptual thinking. If I make the final comment by saying that conceptual thinking is not limited to levels and based on individual ability and if you can simulate the individual’s ability and grow both, you are actually stimulating his conceptual ability. If I understand you correctly, it is relevant for the business world. How you implemented it might differ. One might just be on an overlay, the other on a five day work session?} Absolutely! This is exactly what most employees want. They want to be excited. They want to have ownership. They want to be part and feel part of this thing. They want to feel that they have given an input into this. If they have all of this - you are going to hit your targets!

- CB [58:34] Thank you very much for your time!
- JB [58:35] Cool. It is only a pleasure!
19. APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT MR N. MCGEORGE

19.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- Mr Noddy McGeorge is the Acting Vice President BECSA PDA
- The indicators. CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. NMG- Noddy McGeorge the interviewee; Location: The Office Block of BHP Billiton Marshalltown, Johannesburg.

19.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

- CB [00:00] Afternoon Mr McGeorge. (Shake hands and sit down opposite to each other). Thank you for this opportunity. First order of business - could we please look over the ethical requirements. If there are any questions, please feel free to ask so that I can provide you with an explanation. The first question - how is strategy formulated with the mining environment?

- NMG [00:23] Afternoon Colin. I have no problem with signing the ethical document and understand the necessity. Probably the best way for me to explain is - what is our strategy and how it comes about. Once you understand how it comes about, then it will probably make more sense. A lot of the questions are very themed around the way you talked it. Right, the way our company is structured. Let me draw it, then you will understand. This is a very important point. Let me draw it on this flipchart then you can take it with you. Ok. The first thing that is important is the fact that we are broken into what we call customer sector groups. The customer service groups are made up of products; so we have one for aluminium, one for metallurgical fault, one for thermal coal and we have another one we call base metals which is copper and metal - we have another one called steel, stainless steel or steel ferrous metals and petroleum. Ok. You understand the principle I am getting at? {CB acknowledges with Yes} These things live in their own world. {CB memo is pointing and referring to} Very important that they don’t try and cross over. Ok. You
don’t all of a sudden want to say that we will cross subsidise this business with that business and that business with that business. They must become stand alone businesses. Right, within thermal coal, for instance, we have obviously a head office. Let’s call it CSG and under that we break into assets ok and asset does not mean single it means region so we have asset South Africa, asset Australia, asset America. So underneath that, we take the South African example - under that we have sites that are the actual mines and then we will have a site which is Middleburg mines, a site which is Klipspruit that which Richard Kenny was on about, a site which is Khutala, Dean Hoare. Structurally this is very important as this ‘world’ must stand on its own two feet. {CB memo point to each mine} It gets dealt with as a business. Its own profit and loss contributes to the bigger group. So, from a strategy point of view this strategy must be on its own {CB Memo he is referring to each mine} and every year you go to the organisation and say “here is our CSG strategy”. So the thing that is important here is - strategy sit there {CB Memo the country asset level is shown and emphasised} and does not sit here {CB memo show the higher levels of the organisations} Very important point. So what is good for South Africa might not be good for the whole business. Ok very important point. Now we have people in here that sit down and think about the world’s strategy and the key things about coal strategy. Once you understand the business {CB memo Mr McGeorge remove the first flip sheet and commences with the second one} the coal business - if we take the coal business. It works like this. The world produces approximately 6 billion tons of coal. You take about 1 billion into metallurgical coal - metallurgical coal is specifically use to making steel, it is small and unique within the world, leaving 5 billion tons which get broken up into: 800 million tons is sea-born which is export coal and 4,2 billion tons are used domestically. In other words, you are burning it for power very close to where you are. A place like China burns 1,8 billion
tons on its own. Ok now this here {CB Memo} is based on the internal dynamic - the value base these prices in this world {Domestic} tend to look like this {CB memo refer to graph depicting price vs over time, where the price is constant over time} against time and the price will just be enough to induce a small return. There is no big profit margin in this world {domestic} however in the seaborn world this price is a volatile and a traded market. That price over time will have highs and lows { CB Memo… the drawing depicts lows and high over time over time } Ok, the big differences between these two worlds and that creates a big strategic intent, which I will demonstrate now! {CB memo Mr McGeorge remove the second flip sheet and commences with the third one} … so on that bases if you have a price that’s doing that, the best way you want to manage this - you want to have a position. If this price is this curve here, you want your cost to be there {CB memo… the explaining of the peaks and lows with the fixed costs} That is what you would like. So, you can take advantage of the upsides of the cycle and you are protected in the down cycle. Ok that is what commodities are. Petroleum and what averts cycle prices and that is how we manage it. Understand this dynamic - it is about managing volatility. The risk is to get to that {CB Memo to of the cycle} so that thing, to get to that world {CB memo… seaborn} you need large. First you need in coal at a low cost because you are trying to achieve that {CB memo the peak of the cycle} and to take advantage of the cycles you need long life other wise we don’t get all of the cycle in. Ok and seaborne. So our strategy becomes the fact that we are a seaborn exporting coal company looking for large low cost long life assets so that’s our game. All of a sudden someone comes to us tomorrow and says we need you to go and put a new power station in South Africa. Going down our strategy fixed prices, maybe we might, maybe we might not. If it doesn’t fix our strategy - that is the point. It is outside of strategy, so if you want to, then motivate it. You will have to motivate it
very well, as it is outside your strategy. {CB interjects Would there be interchanging or supplementation between domestic and seaborne?} Yes. That happens all the time. At a place like Middleburg mines for example we produce both {CB memo Domestic and seaborne coal}. Let us talk more about market switching. In principle that forms the basis of other strategies around the world. {CB memo Mr McGeorge remove the second Third sheet and commences with the Forth one} So imagine that somebody says to me ‘open up a new mine’. That is the first question everybody asks me. Let’s put a small technical thing on that. I have a ton of coal here. Ok now export quality is higher than a power station, so let us look at it in two ways, the difference between the two markets, energy and coal. When you export coal, you don’t want to send rubbish sub-standard coal. This is about a 23 mega joules/kg type of coal {CB memo domestic} This is about a 28 mega joules/kg type coal {CB memo Seaborne} so do you see that these are different products. Ok …I start with one ton on the ground. I have a choice. I can either send it there {CB memo domestic side} and I get a yield of that product of 100 percent or I can {CB memo seaborne- export} put up a wash plant, as coal can be washed. To get to this, I have to physically wash it of which I produce 30 % of the ton for export and the rest is going to be waste. Of that waste, I can reprocess and I can retrieve about another 15 %. I call that middling, which is similar to the domestic grade. That is my choices I have with my coal. Let us look at the finances - the revenue list this stuff. (CB memo …domestic side ) Taking the South African example you will typically get R100 per ton. Now that will be for the whole ton of coal. The mining cost will most probably be about R60 a ton so you don’t have to do any beneficiating as you are not washing it, and you don’t have any logistical cost as you are right next to the power station so you make R40 a ton. This world, being the export world, you will get $100 dollars per ton. With exchange rate we are talking about R700 rand per ton
but that is not for the whole ton, so it will be R700 x 0.3 {CB memo …that the 30% of
the ton that can be exported} so that will be R210. You still go 0.15% of the ton that
you have recovered as middling at R100 per ton which will provide you with an
additional R15 so the total revenue will be R210 +15 = R225. It will still cost me R60
per ton to operate. However, I had to process this coal. I will have to pay for this
wash plant that will come to about R5 per ton. So I will still have to send it down to
Richards Bay for export. This price is measured at the tariff for Richard’s Bay which
will cost me about R20 per ton for transporting. Summing up the revenue for the
export of the ton will be R255 – R60 -R5 – R20 = R140. Now ask yourself which
market do I want to go to for each ton that I mine. You can play yourself very quickly
into the game. Now this $100 is a high price. Take this down to $50 and do the
sums. All of sudden you are very close to what the domestic costs are. Keep in mind
that the domestic cost does not change. Remember our strategy. You are constantly
faced with a switching choice on what you want to do. Now invariable the export
market is better than the local, as you need long-term secure contracts to this
domestic supply whereas in the export it is the volatility of the market that you are
playing. Now that is the strategic choice between the two. You need to move
between the two gaps. {CB Interjects … who makes this call} Well this is answered
when you design a mine depending on the quality that you get in the seam. In this
case, we have a power station right next to this particular mine so when we design
the mine, we will look at the situation and make a choice as the mine is designed.
What will then happen, as you are operating on the fringes of the mine, you will look
at what you produce and you will send the quality stuff that way (CB memo ..Export
grade) and the worst quality stuff this was {CB memo domestic use } and again you
will play the gap. Some mines don’t have a power station next door - you can take a
look at Anglo. They are either Domestic or Export. We are one of the few mines that
do both because we have got that facility right next to us. Ok again the key thing is that it is not our strategy (export) that is our strategy (domestic). This the export and seaborne just complement our strategy … {CB Interjects …So the domestic market is the bread and butter vs the profit with is the export operations of BECSA?) This is not bread and butter. {CB Memo refer to the export side} Just look at the numbers. This is really the money. If this went to nothing, { CB Memo exchange rate} you would most probably stop doing that and send it all this way {domestic} then you have a business problem not a strong business model (domestic). It is sort of strong and sustainable but it is very small. That is survival stuff. Remember there is money in managing risk. Volatility is risk. If you can manage it, there is money in it and that is our way of thinking, right - that is putting it into perspective. Now we are getting a strategy that should provide insight and assist with some of your questions.

- CB [16:42] Thank you for this remarkable rendition and for your insight, your understanding of the strategic planning process used to formulate the strategy- how you got to the above.

- NMG [16:44] I have done it a few times, in my previous appointment. I see to it that it is done by the mandated individuals according to the process these days. Right, what do we do? First of all we understand that dynamic as discussed above, then we build a model of the total electricity supply in the world, so we know all the power stations and we know what they need and then we translate that into coal requirements. So in other words, we are defining the market. Once we know the market, we define all the possible coal reserves in the world that map to that, then we have a list of all the mines in the world and we link them. We do a supply and demand - balancing between who is going to be the most likely supply in the world and we forecast what the potential prices are going to be. We do that every year and we update it every six months {CB Interjects … is it a formal process?) Yes - a
very formal process. {CB Interjects Would it be possible to get a copy of the process?} No. That would be seen as anti-competitive, but in fact, think about what we showed you there. What we are doing - all coal is going to electricity. All what we have done is turned coal into electricity and you have mapped the market of the demand vs the supply curve of coal, cost supply curve and you know where you stand based on the supply and demand curve. Obviously where the supply and demand meet this equilibrium point will typically provide the pricing for coal in the world and this is it. That is the game. I must then have an intelligence database where I can see all my competitors. In the coal mining there is probably about 70 mines, maximum 100 mines in the world, that are doing exports. I will come back to why there is a restriction and outside of the 100 mines, I will have to have a think to know what the operating costs are then to forecast the coal prices, straight forward logic. So why is export so unique? Remember coal is a bulk commodity. There is lots of it - 6 billions tons of it - even 600 million tons. Just think about it. How do you move 600 million tons around the world? Think about how many ships you will need. So you need major logistical infrastructure to get into the exporting game. You will need a railway to get from the mine to the port. You need a major port to load ships. You will have to get access to the ships. You will have to have a port to unload it where the power stations are, then get it form the unloaded port. 2/3rd of the game is logistics and when you run a logic chain anywhere, you need it to be optimal. You can’t afford un-optimised logistics. It will cost you a lot of money. That is why we have a railway and a port tied together. They will expand together so you make sure that the mines are mapped to transport networks. It is a whole country thing so that not everyone can walk in and become a coal exporter because logistics are the key. So if you have your little 1 million ton mine that doesn’t help you. You can’t become an exporter with that because you have million tons and you mine it over a year, you
are mining less than 100,000 tons a month. When a ship comes in there is 250,000 tons, so you have to mine for almost three months before you have a ship ready. Your cash flow is zero for three months - not easy! So what tends to happen is that the smaller players will go to agents who will try to combine small players together and then you get a bit of this agency trading in the market. {CB interjects… Is this big within the industry?} Reasonably I think. Well if you look at it as a commodity, oil is traded about twenty times before it gets to the client and coal about ten times.

- CB [21:09] What is your understanding of strategic intent?

- NMG [21:11] Strategic intent means vision to me. I think the debate is around the fact that you have a strategy and how you actually go and apply it to day-to-day business. That is what I believe and see as strategic intent and I think you can get outside your strategy but still have the right intent. For example, let’s take it in a South African concept, like we are now under threat from power. You know we do not have enough power stations. I have coal mines and I am exporting, that is my strategy and I am there. However, I am under threat from the government who say that they will take away my export licence. I might then open a domestic mine to suit my strategic intent, licence to operate type of debate. That is what I mean by strategic intent. You have developed the strategic on very sound principles, but you never can be absolutely cast in stone that there is a whole lot of other stuff you do to actually get to that strategy. To me, strategic intent is all that other stuff on the outside to make it happen.

- CB [22:20] How do you communicate BECSA’s strategic intent?

- NMG [22:21] Ok. We are very clear on that simple phrase. Now let me not use the word BECSA let’s use the word energy coal. Remember it is a CSG, that is our strategic intent from a business view. {CB Memo This provides the opportunity to state that there is more than one type of strategic intent – supports my notion of a
CEO intent and company intent.} To make the most money now becomes where we are aligned to BHP Billiton. You most probably hear BHP Billiton talk about multi-resource. We fit in with their normal process. We are larger, long life seaborne and their is a logic as to why, when you get to BECSA. That is BECSA’s strategy so that governs everything we do. Now how do you put that into practice? It is about how you get your people and the people to operate, and to set your operating standards to do those sort of things. Once you have built a mine, the question is to get to the next level which is more of a tactical thing than a strategic thing. It is now the tactics you apply to your organisation to get to achieve what you want. Now the way we do that is that we come up with a simple vision or mission you could call it. A simple slogan we call ourselves, BECSA best in class. That is what we want to get to. If we do that, then we are going to get to the low cost part of our strategy and then we pick the selected pieces in BECSA and we operate. Let’s be BECSA best in class. Not the leading edge and all that nonsense. We just want to be such, that we are up there with the best for what we do. Not the best - as that means something different.

{CB interjects What is the link to the mine from your fraternity? What do you send Khutala?} We send them “BECSA best in class”. That is it - that is what they get on a site. You are there to operate. It’s not to think how that site is going to get better. Someone has already done that for you. You are to go and get the job done and perform on the site to actually execute the strategy, not to sit and think about the strategy that has already been told to you - you have been given a parameter within which you are to operate. This is a domestic only mine or it a multi-product mine and export mine that has already happened. You are the general manager on the site. The way you can do best is by BECSA best in class, off you go and do it – it’s that simple.

• CB [25:08] How do you perform an environmental analysis?
• NMG [25:09] When you build a mine, there is multiple sides and multiples levels to this. When you build a mine, you have very important processes on how to spend project capital in the business and it goes all the way from BHP Billiton. It is replicated throughout and you have a three pronged approach to spend capital. You start off independent, in the identification phase selection or identification phase study. What you do in that point in time is like you do some design work, you get it up to a reasonable level of accuracy and that triggers the thing in our world, and it also triggers the governance that has to follow it. It is called an IPS. From IPS you move into a period of selection phase. You have most probably heard it called a lot of other things such as pre-selection phase and whatever. In that point in time you have to have all your permits in place. By then you are doing a detailed environmental design work. You are also testing your mine’s ideas and you are looking at your impact as you have to have all those things in place to do whatever you are doing. Then your definition phase is about doing it, so there is really environmental design work. What happens in what we call pre-feasibility or selection and the thing which is very important about that is that once you have built it, it is compliance more than design. A mine that is running can’t actually do anything more than that because it has a permitted a set of designs, you just comply. That is what they do. It is a compliant exercise and that’s what they do on the sites. The whole environmental thing is done in the environmental phase.

• CB [27:06] What type of factors would you analyse in terms of external and internal impacting on the environment?

• NMG [27:10] Well the different levels of the business do it differently. When we do our strategy, the big one at the moment is climate change. You know that is a big thing. At that level you will start talking about the things that will change the business on a twenty year horizon. It is the length of a duration it takes to impact to do what
you want, and we have those decisions at the CSG levels. We sit down and start talking about climate change, whether it won’t, whether you want, what to do. They sit and have the weird and wonderful debates. Similarly you can imagine at the group level and the BHP Billiton level. They are also going to have the debates because how is it going to affect the whole portfolio of the setup. This recession is happening now. You can imagine at the BHP Billiton level, they have huge discussions. If China is coming back and is the green roots and at our level it does not happen. We can’t exchange what we have. We have designed the mine. It is there. The best you can do now is execute so that you support the game. So the big thinking happens at CSG/group level. If it was big enough to change the strategy, we would change the strategy. It does or it doesn’t. Then based on that strategy, we decide to take that site at local level and you find the best way to support the strategy like the “BECSA best in class”. Let us take climate change. If all of a sudden we are going to be super green, our strategy may change that we will be the largest whatever … the greenest coal company in the country. If we are going to be the greenest coal company, we will find some way to actually make operation make us green. We might become the least water suppliers or the best water treaters as we do a lot of water treatment. We might be the best water treatment company with the best water treatment practices. That’s the support from the strategy and then the debate. That’s how the dynamic happen. If you let the dynamics happen at the bottom, then you are feeding strategy from the bottom upwards and not from the top downwards. So it is more important to have the debates at the right level.

• CB [29:51] How and when do you provide guidelines to your mines?

• NMG [29:59] It is done via a formal planning system supported by a formulated documented strategic intent. They get the slogan “large, long life low cost etc …” whatever. Some of them debate, when we show them the world, and the dynamics
of the prices, what are the markets looking like. We go and have a sit down session with some of the more senior people and show them some of those things. It is more of an information session and we don’t create a formal document because again it has some very important anti-competitive things. To be careful, you try and communicate to the point of general information. Back to what I said, a site has to do. The mine has got to deliver the tons, cost, safety - that is their world. They don’t deal with revenue. They don’t deal with anything else. They have their three things to do. Off you go and do it! Now again, if you have only those to do then, you don’t have strategy. Strategy moves further up the line. More people who have exposure to it and understand it then go do what they have to do.

- CB [31:07] What were the difficulties experienced in implementing strategic intent?
- NMG [31:10] From a group point of view, thermal coal. This probably goes back to when we started, back in the day when we were still Billiton. I don’t know if you will remember the company Billiton with Brian Gibertson and before that we were two companies called Transit-tel and Rand coal. They merged into what was called Ingwe and then Ingwe was a portion of Billiton. Billiton had aluminium almost to where we are now and that point in time we thought right, now we need to aim and we need to articulate what strategy means because when we were still Transit-tel /Ingwe, we were only South African based. Our whole world was South Africa and we could not get an outside base on the strategic foreign controls. You know the foreign exchange stuff. So we tried, but we couldn’t. The only way we were going to get the company to be internationalised was to take the whole Billiton offshore. That is why Billiton was formed. It was a way of get the South African business into the international market so that we could become an international company. Now when we were just South Africa, we had some exposure to prices but it was also restricted as you can image in the apartheid days. To try and sell coal on the world market
was a tough job but soon, as we had to get into international, then we understood our worlds a lot better and in the domestic world we were South African and reliant on Eskom for domestic and exports and whatever but in the international world it is suddenly a different world. That is when we had to start thinking about strategy. That is when I created the document called “a case for coal”. We did a lot of work analysing. This was back in 1994. At that point in time, we actually did a very detailed analysis of the world market. We understood it all. We did everything and came up with what was tried and tested competing in fields like gas. At the time, the whole world was deregulating the electricity thing. This was in total turmoil and one tested strategy a lot. It turned out to be a solid strategy and from that point we were clear on how we were going to globalise and from our coal company we went and bought assets in Australia, in Columbia, in the US and that dictated our internationalisation based on the understanding of our coal strategy so that is how it came about. The strategy has not changed much since then.

• CB [34:36] Pleas give me a brief overview of your career.

• NMG [34:40] I am actually Zimbabwean. I came down to South Africa as a learner miner at Durban Deep. After three months, they sent me to university. While at university, I obtained my blasting certificate for coal. That is how I landed up in coal. After university, I moved up the ranks by starting as a miner, shift boss, mine captain. I went overseas and did some work in Germany. I came back and became a mine manager. I led various projects, commodities, strategy formulation and eventually some of this stuff. A highlight was the case for coal, where we created Ingwe we had 15-18 mines altogether. We had to integrate the big mine and one man shows. So, one of my first business type projects was this optimisation project portfolio. It was called the Pot Project. Out of that project, we span four of the collieries. Those four formed the bases of Iswiwe which was the first big black
transaction. Iswiwe turned into Xxara emitting that starting project that I had. Those mines have massive domestic tonnages but value-wise almost worth nothing. Along the way, I have managed mines, both open mines and closed mines. I am still doing strategy stuff with the new waves of mine designs.

- CB [38:23] Thank you for you time and insight into the strategy formulation.
- NMG [38: 27] It has only been a pleasure. Glad to have been of assistance.
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20.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- **Background Project Link.** ProjectLink was formed in 1997 as a closed corporation and performed consulting work, primarily in the banking and financial sectors. During that time the first iteration of the ProjectLink methodology was developed. Over the next five years ProjectLink was awarded a number of contracts in other business sectors such as manufacturing, telecommunications and smart card development. In 2002 the company changed from a closed corporation to a private company. It was during this period that ProjectLink started to expand. Most of the projects at that time were IT related but over the next 7 years ProjectLink diversified into the mining, agriculture and aviation industries. ProjectLink also develops training courses, software products and other management methodologies.

- **ProjectLink Vision.** We will be recognized as an internationally preferred supplier of project management products and services. Our vision is bold for a small company but we have gone a long way in achieving this vision. ProjectLink, though a strategic alliance with ProjectCentric Ltd in the UAE, have performed several contracts in the Middle East and Australia.

- **ProjectLink Mission.** ProjectLink continually scans the project management environment to identify, develop, improve and deploy international best practices in project management to our clients across all industries. We pride ourselves in our ability to predict trends in project management and to develop products and solutions that turn these trends into solutions. ProjectLink has developed a number of unique models that differentiate our service offering from that of our competition.

- **Interviewee.** Mr Werner Meyer Managing Director.
The interview indicators. CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. WM- Mr Werner Meyer the interviewee. Interview Location: Cappuccinos, Centurion mall [ ] between these types of brackets the time sentiment of the recording will be indicated { } between these bracket observed actions and memos will be indicated.

20.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

• CB [0:00] Good Morning Mr Meyer. Thank-you for availing yourself to participate within this research. (Provides him with two documents namely the interview schedule and the ethical letter of consent). Firstly the schedule is discussed with the aim of the research and the research question. After this, the ethical consent form is discussed. The first thing we would like to do is to confirm the ethical consent form. {WM read it and signs the ethical consent form}.

• WM [0:40] I don’t have any problems. Everything looks fine to me.

• CB: [0:43] Provide a short synopsis of what prompted you to become an entrepreneur.

• WM [0:47] I am thinking back at the time when I started the company. I was 27 at the time and that was in 1997. I was doing project management at the time and what really promoted me was when I read an article on 3 guys starting a consulting company and for whatever reason that looked like a very interesting thing to do. At the time, I was a project manager working in an organisation and I said to myself this is something I really would like to do but as with most people that start a business, you are very nervous as you have a job, you get a salary and you have a perceptive security. I say perceived security. I mean, I think the risk to entrepreneurs is exactly the same as for the guy that works for a salary. The only difference is that the entrepreneur actually knows it. The guy that works for the salary does not know that the company can go down and they can get retrenched. They live in some sort of perception of security. That time I said to myself, ‘I am 27. If I start a company...
now and give it a go - there are great opportunities you know. If you do that, you could work for yourself. You can make a lot more money'. It’s interesting. You can really do the stuff that interest you, you don’t have to sit in some corporate environment all the time, and I also said to myself ‘if I make a mistake and this is a complete mess in the next two years or three years I will be 30 and still have enough time to build a career’. So, I resigned from the company where I worked and was out of work for about two months and then I got the first contract and from then I never looked back. So I think the initial reason was actually the appeal to be working for myself. There was the appeal to work from my house, to work on my own, to make my own decisions and not to have other people direct me in what to do.

- CB: [3:23] What is your understanding of the concept ‘entrepreneurship’?
- WM [3:26] Well that is always an interesting one. I have actually often thought about that, because I don’t actually look at myself as an entrepreneur, you know, but when I talk to people and tell them what I do, then they tell me this is exactly what you do, as I have started a couple of businesses in my life. At this moment, I am a director of two companies. I have a couple of small ventures, where I help people out with starting a business and so on. Within business and within the company where I am at, a lot of the work I do is to generate new business, new business ideas, new business units etc… I don’t really think of myself as an entrepreneur. I think the concept of an entrepreneur is someone that sees opportunities where other people don’t see opportunities and when I have a discussion with others on a specific idea which I think is a great idea. The people, who are not in that mind set, seem to see a lot of the problems, where I think for me there are always opportunities. So, maybe the focus in the mind of the entrepreneur is more to see opportunities as opposed to the threats. So, for me, an entrepreneur is someone that can see opportunities where other people don’t see and they have got the mindset to discount the risks
and some time at their own peril to discount the risks some more. Now to me that would be an entrepreneur. The other thing is when they see something, the first thing that comes to mind is, there is a business opportunity and can I do something with that.

- CB: [5:31] What are the attributes of an entrepreneur?

- WM [5:35] Well I think one or two of those attributes emerged in the previous discussion. But I think the one thing is the ability to take risks or to live with risks. Yes, definitely that is an entrepreneur. A lot of my friends are also entrepreneurs and if I look at them and the way they operate, it is the way they look at risks and the ability to accept risks and to deal with those risks, not to completely discount risk or to go into something blindly, but I think that entrepreneurs essentially have the ability to see the future a bit clearer. Where other people will see chaos, the entrepreneur would see some sort of a pattern. Here and there is an opportunity where other people would just see a big problem. I think it is those two things - it is the ability to see something that could be in the future and then to discount the risk and take the opportunity and not to step away from it. This is the biggest difference between a guy that works for the company as an employee and an entrepreneur. The one guy is prepared to take risks the other guy is not!

- CB: [6:58] Is an entrepreneur an opportunist or a strategist?

- WM [7:07] I think both but at different times in the organisation’s growth process you would be different things. I think the initial attribute is the opportunist. To see an opportunity is paramount so then you are an opportunist. I don’t think that entrepreneurs are walking around and looking for strategies but they are looking around for opportunities. Once they have an opportunity within the framework of our skill set and own knowledge and own experience they would devise the strategy. You know, I have this knowledge, I know these people, I have these assets and I
have money. I know something about this, so my strategy could be mapped out in my mind, with plans to capitalise on the opportunity, and I actually think it is both but one definitely comes before the other one. There is a timeframe and they don’t happen together, and you won’t do the two together. In my mind, the first is definitely opportunity and then later on it is strategy.

- CB: [8:30] Explain strategy formulation within your organisation?
- WM [8:37] That is an interesting question. I think I will firstly have to say that in our organisation, even though we are doing very well, the company is doing very well, we are not very big on strategy. If I compare our company to some of the other companies I know, the one only thing I spend my time on and senior management spend their time on is not strategy and I often see that in companies. What is very clear is the vision of the company. That is something that is clear to us and the strategies that follow that vision to implement certain objectives that we have identified for that vision, that to us as we go through the process to actually doing that, to us the vision, from my perspective and I must break it down into different levels. My role within the company goes a lot around the vision of the company and a lot less around the strategy even though I am still involved in that. As far as strategy goes, the next level of managers; the operations manager, the systems manager who look after the software systems, the human resources manager, the training manager and so on - their roles will be more around devising those strategies, implementing them and refining them etc. So we have a very strong vision which is firm and we have strategies, so we are very clear on that. But, the soul focus is not on strategy now. Maybe it should be, I don’t know. But to me the biggest success factor for us is service. You know, if we can deliver good service, we could for some reason be successful but we don’t have to have all the fancy strategies and all that. In our business it is quite simple. Actually, most businesses
are simple. We focus more on delivery than on the strategy. I have dealt with companies in the past because of the type of work we do, we deal with other companies and often at the strategic level and I often find companies where the focus on the strategy is so big and that seems to be the only thing. I am not saying though that they are not doing so well. To me it seems that strategy for them is everything but their service delivery is not that good and people aren’t necessarily happy - the client is not necessarily happy. I think people often get carried away especially in senior management and I know a couple who actually get carried away by the strategy. That is everything to them and although I think it is important, I think that there should be limits. To us I think there is a fairly good balance. I think we can do more around strategy but the main focus is actually on service delivery and that is the thing that has pulled us through and created more work for us. To be concise, don’t focus on the strategy, its development or the plan, as they are just vehicles leading to action. Rather, provide service delivery. The plan is important but the action is more important in support of the vision of the organisation. Whenever I talk to people I ask them where their vision is and if they are struggling should they do this or not. I always refer them back to the vision of the company. So they have to know if you are going to do this are these action going to support the vision or are you just keeping yourself busy. That to me is the biggest driver.

- CB: [12:23] Explain how you handled the growth of your organisation?
- WM [12:35] Now that is a big challenge, because we have grown substantially over past couple of years, grown at an average pace of 30-40% per year over the past 4-5 years. It has been a journey. When we started out, I had no idea of how to handle it and won’t say I have now. All I can reflect on is how we did handle it. I think the biggest challenge I had around the growth of the company was organisational structure. There is a structure that works in a company if you have 10 people. The
same structure is not going to work if you are 20 people, and similarly the 20 people structure will not work if you have 40 people. If you want to go beyond that, you need a different structure. So, being the owner of the company and the one who started the company, I was faced with those difficult mental barriers to cross. When you appoint people, it is going to cost you money so now you start thinking in your mind, because one of the things an entrepreneur will do, as for me, is to always optimise. You know I would like to get the best results at the lowest cost. I don’t want overheads and unnecessary management, but the mindset that I had to embrace was to create structure with overheads and expenses. If you want to grow, you have to do that. I actually realised that as an entrepreneur, I am not necessarily a good manager. That took a while for me to figure out, because that is a difficult thing to say to oneself, but once I got past that piece of emotion, I actually realised that I am not the best manager. The reason for the company’s existence is based on other things I did and not because I was a good manager, but I understand good project management. I understood good project methodology and that is why the company started. The nature of the company forced me to become the manager, which is annoying to me as I am away from my interest, it is actually frustrating for me, as I am away from things I actually like to do. What I have done over the past 2 years, I have appointed some managers. I have appointed an operations manager, a financial manager, a human resources manager, a systems manager and a training manager in order to get people to take care of the administration. They are management. What I did 3 months ago, I approached a friend of mine who is the CEO of large property group. I have known him for a couple of years as we did some consulting together. I actually asked him to get involved in the company’s structures, to go into the future. Yes, it is an expensive exercise, but for me to find somebody knowledgeable in structuring companies was important. I am of the
opinion that I would not be able to do this myself as I don’t have the knowledge or the experience or the interest and to me to get somebody like that is a good thing as it creates me as the owner of the company with the opportunity to step away. People in the company have a certain perception. The people will tend to please you more than an outsider and that is bad as that creates the wrong behaviour. So, what this guy has been doing for the past 2-3 months is looking at the structure of the company. He is looking as the job descriptions, at the operational efficiencies and all things like. To me, that is the next step in the growth of the company. I think one of the things as an entrepreneur is, if you want to grow your company, you need to recognise where your strengths are and you have to admit to yourself that you are not good at everything, even though you don’t want to. I think the second thing is sometimes you have to put money into getting the right structures in place. You have to take the knocks, because in the long run it will pay off. If you have a good structure, you can grow the company. If you have a very thin structure, you are not going grow beyond a certain number of people or a certain level of revenue. That has been the biggest challenge for me. Appointing people and cash flow was not such a big thing. I suppose cash flow was a small problem because as you get bigger in an organisation, you fall under different tax regulations. In the past we paid VAT every two months but from this financial year we need to pay tax every month so that is a big burden on the company as you don’t always get that money in as you pay on invoice. So, around the finances, we have had to be careful. We had to be conservative in the way we manage the finances. The bigger issue was structure. This was a challenge and still is but we have sorted it out.

- CB: [18:19] How do you access and distribute information within your organisation?
- WM [18:24] I still have to find an organisation where at least half the people are not complaining that the company does not communicate. That seems to be the norm. I
don’t think that any company can communicate enough. When I talk to people at Microsoft and we often deal with them, they also complain and they have all the technology and they push information to you. So, information distribution to us.

What we do is the following - there are a number of structures; we have a monthly newsletter which we send out to people to communicate day to day events, new people joining the company and some subject specific information about of new trends etc - so that is the one way that we distribute information. The second way we distribute information is through information sessions. We have information sessions where we actually invite the whole company. This happens once every two months. At those sessions, we share specific information about new HR policies, changes in the company, new appointments, especially at the senior level, and then we also distribute information on a one-on-one basis. What I do and what the HR manager does and what the Ops manager does is that we meet with individuals in the company on regular basis - we just to talk to them and find out how it is going. That is the one-on-one communication. My experience with this has been that one-on-one communication is just worth a lot more. You get a lot out of it. You get a lot more buy in and a lot more commitment whereas the big session is all nice and we have a beer afterwards and everybody is happy. The personal one-on-one stuff is so important and unfortunately the bigger the company gets, the more difficult that gets. I think that people would leave an organisation or resign a lot easier, if you haven’t spoke to that person for a couple of weeks. If you are in touch with that person on a regular basis, you create an emotional link and that is what we want to do in our company. We want to retain people but obviously we will lose people because that’s the way life is. You also get new people. Those are the ways in which we communicate and talk to people. We are looking at a couple of ways to
improve that, having recognised some of the challenges. Those are the formal forums though.

- CB [21:12] How do you consider environmental factors (access to capital, competition, etc)?

- WM [21:19] Well, we do consider that, but I must say that is not a very big thing to us. It is not a primary drive in the kind of work that we do. We do come up against competition from time to time, but that is not such a big issue to us. We really go out and investigate or we study our competition and it may be something we should do in the future. If I look at access to capital, which is not something we really acquire, the company has good cash flow for the kind of business we are in. We don’t need extensive capital investment. Once we get people on board, they generate the money so you don’t have to invest into equipment. It’s not a very big thing to us. However, if I look at some of the other businesses that I am involved in, there is very specific investment required. I will normally investigate that before hand to make sure that we can get bank loans and capital. In the current business, environmental factors are important. The biggest factor affecting us because we work in different parts of the world, there are a couple environmental factors that we will consider in South Africa and it differs by country. In South Africa, the biggest environment factors that we would need to consider at the moment is Black Economic Empowerment. The biggest obstacle presently in our business is that we can’t find skilled people to employ. We struggle enough to find skilled people to make part of the company, let alone to give ownership to the company. You don’t want to be irresponsible. We learnt a very bad lesson a couple of years ago with a BEE deal where we lost money. This can be seen as school fees not to be paid again. For us in South Africa, BEE is the biggest factor. The other factor that we have to deal with is around tax laws. South Africa is quite strict and rigid and the tax laws are not
helping us at all. You know, it is actually very difficult. We often are not able to do things as we have to manage cash flow in order to pay tax, so to us, it is very restrictive in the way we pay VAT, for instance, it is a small thing or more a specific thing the way to pay VAT. We would prefer to pay VAT once we get the money in, but we pay VAT on invoice. If a customer pays in 60 days, we take a knock, so, we have to keep a couple of million in reserves in the bank, just to manage tax. That is annoying and I think that stifles business opportunities in South Africa. When I talk to other entrepreneurs, this is the type of thing that makes people hesitant to take on an opportunity. To us, that becomes an environmental factor. As far as the rest of the factors are concerned, South Africa is not too bad. When we worked in Australia and when the Middle East, some of the environmental factors which are difficult includes labour laws. This is different from South Africa and it take a while to figure out and also in other countries the tax laws are completely different to that of South Africa so we have to consider that and be very careful. I think also in those counties, aspects such as access to capital come into play. Competition is not a big issue to us. When we go to other countries, we would be sensitive to the competition, but we are confident about the level of service that we provide. We are not too phased about this as we know that we can match the competition when we come up against them.

- CB: [25:51] Explain your understanding of the following four types of entrepreneurs and indicate where you position yourself:
  - The calculating inventor or The inspirational innovator
  - The optimist promoter or The builder of strong enterprise
  - WM [25:59] I was thinking about it and my perception of it. I know where I will pitch myself. My view on this is that you need somebody who sees an opportunity and who would calculate the pros and the cons, either sit down and do the business
case or at least in the back of their minds they do the calculation. So, if I buy so much of that, I am going to come up against that. That is the legation. I have to bring it into the country. I have to adhere to that. I would like to link one of the previous questions to this illustration where it was asked entrepreneur or strategist, once you have seen the opportunity and evaluate it. Some of this has to do with the evaluation of the opportunity so the calculating guy would go and do the calculations where the inspirational innovator would be more excited about something he would tend to achieve. I would think though that he would also motivate other people to come to the party and get them excited about something. If I have to choose between those two - I am the calculator. I like to do the sums and the calculating and the rationalisation of whether it’s a good idea or not. Then the second part optimist and promoter vs the building of a strong enterprise. I would say the builder of a strong enterprise would typically be in my mind and looking at this would be somebody who had a vision to build a big organisation where they become some senior manager in the company or organisation or their vision for themselves to have a company or an empire and people that report to them. Optimist and promoter was a bit of a difficult one. When I saw the promoter, I related that to the boxing world. I would say the optimist promoter is somebody who also tries to achieve through other people. They would promote other people to get their ideas and would be optimistic about an opportunity. It is somebody who could sell. It is somebody who is a convincing sort of individual, where the other one would not be that convincing in terms of their sale skills to build the empire. If I have to choose between the two, I would go for the first one as my style is not empire building. My vision is not to have a big organisation where people report to me and things like that. I think that there is a part of an entrepreneur who wants to build a legacy. Thinking in terms of the company though, even if I am not part of it I would still like
to leave that legacy. I would definitely put myself down as a calculating inventor. On the second grouping I see myself as a promoter, convincing people that this is a good idea, this can work and we can make it work. I think that promoter could also be marketer. One thing that I can do, is convince people to buy our services, because I understand project management very well. I can be very convincing to explain to people how this will help them to solve their problems. I think I can market the service but I am not a sales person.

- CB: [30:33] How do you capitalize on an opportunity?
- WM [30:36] I think I usually just do it, it is very intuitive. When it is an opportunity even though I would do the calculations I would typically not do a business case. I would typically not sit down and do the NPV and ROI’s. I would sit down and make a few sums but not around the basics standard calculations. I would calculate the following - I have so much money, it will cost so much, it will make me so much and then I will do it. That process will take me 15 mins to decide whether I will be doing something or not. Sometimes it works and sometimes it does not, but not everything is successful. The way I would sit down for 10-15 mins and I would rationalise the opportunity. I would look at past experiences and that kind of stuff. I would go through a list of things. It is not really a checklist that I have to go through. If I have to enter into contracts then I consider the risks. If I enter into a contract how can I get out of it? What are the opportunities to get out? What do I do if things go wrong? Do I have access to funds and resources to do something? To me, that is usually one of the biggest things if I have access to resources. I would be more confident, if I want to do something and I have the money, the skills and the product. I would have the tendency to be more optimistic about that opportunity as opposed to if I have to go and create the resource. Firstly, I would have to go to the bank and find the money. Then I would employ a person to do this - I would then be more reluctant
to take on this opportunity. It is a really quick exercise and I would do it, sometimes at my own peril. I would keep in mind that you win some and you also loose some.

- CB [32:41] Explain the organisational structure within your organisation and why it was chosen.

- WM [32:50] The organisational structure of the company at the moment is that I am the Managing Director. There are five managers who report to me, that is an operations manager, financial manager, training manager, human resource manager and systems manager. Now that structure exists because of the functions in the company there are essentially four functions in the company - the consulting function, the training function, systems function and what we call the product. Now the product function does not require day to day work by the resources that are applied within the other areas. So there is a manager for each of those areas and the human resources and financial are the supporting systems. So that structure, in the kind of business we are in, which is quite people intensive, works well. We have survived with that structure. The frustration in that structure is the MD, who wants to get rid of himself. So, in the future, that structure will change to get someone else into the position of the MD and I would become the CEO or chairman of the board whatever the case might be. But, that is the structure we have at this moment. The structure evolved from the services that we deliver. It is a functional structure, even though we do project management we don’t do projects. We are actually an operational company and we provide a service. That’s the important thing about the company - we don’t do project management, we are a service company.

- CB [34:59] Explain the use of a business plan within your organisation.

- WM [35:06] In the past it was virtually non existent. It was all in my mind and I would look at the bank account and I would say ‘we can do this or we can’t’. The business plan was more on gut feel. Over the past two years, we started to formulize that in
various areas. We were a lot more strict on expenditure - the revenue vs the expenditure. It wasn’t that formal but a lot of people had to report and forecast their expenditure and their income etc, etc and we have now reached a stage whereby at the end of this month each department must hand in their budgets for the next three months and they will be in control of that budget. So, in terms of business and planning of the business that is one part that is more on the financial side, in the other part of the business, we are actually creating business plans for each of the business units now so each person is in control of that business unit. He is now responsible for his own business plan. The challenge is if you don’t make an individual responsible and accountable you land up with the problem. That is a hard lesson I learnt. If you make somebody the manager of a business unit without a business plan they will run away and do whatever they want to because they are there to earn their salary and not there to grow the business necessarily. I am not negative about people. That is just how people are when they employed. The one big change I had to make was to have them accountable to me. The development of a business plan was about accountability so that those people can take accountability for their own actions and it also gives me a yard stick on a KPI basis if you have not performed against your business plan. So, the one area is around performance and the other area is just around the general health of the business. As the business gets bigger, I can’t get to everybody and that gives me a leading indicator of where we are going. Are we going to have money in the future? What does the market look like? Do these guys actually understand what is happening and it just helps us a lot. If I had to start up a new business now, one of the things I would do much better is a formal business plan. There is a lot of value in that, so take the time. I think the reason why people don’t do it, is because it is a bind. You know, it is not a nice thing to do and it is time consuming. So, in the past we haven’t
used it formally, but starting this year with the involvement of this consultant who has actually helped us to put that in place.

- CB [38:19] How do you pick up signals in the environment that allow you to trigger major shifts in strategic perspectives in order to position your organisation?
- WM [38:25] To me this is one of those weird things. The biggest indicator to us is the market. Every day, I would look at the driving forces for our customers. Because the customers are in the gold mining community, I would look at the gold price every day because that to me is a leading indicator whether we are going to get work or not, sustainable or not, whether they have capital or not. The same goes for platinum. I look at the platinum price everyday because of the customers in the platinum market. If the price goes down, we are at risk. So to me, those are indicators of the current work for the sustainability of the company. Then I look at other things such as the share prices. We also do work in the telecommunication market so I also monitor those specific share prices because to me those are leading indicators to whether the company will have the money to pay me. The kind of work we do, the consulting work, is very often seen as a luxury. It is something of you can hire a consultant if you have money. When people don't have money, they get rid of the consultants and rather use their own people. So, to me, those are some of the signals. There are different signals. I would look at the markets which to me are very important while something else I would look at is to listen to the guys who are working with the customers. They pick up things a lot earlier than what the markets have picked up. Two months before the thing actually starts, the guys are saying this and there is talk to stop that project. So, to me, those are leading indicators when I look at the company’s survival. Internal information I think is one of the biggest things I would look at. Last year I picked up that the markets are going down and we have resources that are finishing up on some of the projects. I would
then start to look at getting rid of people. It is a bad thing to say, but it is about survival. This unfortunately is a reality because I am managing the risk. I don’t want to sit with spare capacity and there is no work. I can always hire people again - it is not that difficult to hire people. So that is how I look at the environments, those are the markets and what people say. The government talk about labour brokerage and its termination, I have had a couple of discussions with people who are a lot more exposed. They are prompting us to change the way we do business. We have to steer away from the body shop model because if you are in the body shop model then you are a lot more exposed to that kind of thing than if you are in a consulting environment where you are providing a managed service based on deliverables. We are specific and to a large extent do that and we will be changing that. We have specific plans in place. We are not actually changing. What we are doing is just repackaging it to the customer. We are getting stricter when we engage with the customer in order to enforce the whole idea that this is a managed service. We audit this guy and we are going to deliver x, y and z and he is not your employee. We take the tax and we monitor and also have the right to change this guy if he is not really providing the service. So, by structuring the way we engage with the customer, we think we can manage around that. I think also, that the level at which we operate is a lot higher than a lot of the labour brokers. I don’t think we are particular exposed to that, but we are very much aware of it.

- CB: [42:24] Who makes key decisions concerning strategy and operations within your organisation?
- WM [42:32] The responsibility within the business unit lies within the business unit. My challenge is that even though I have the right to overrule any decision it is counter productive. If one of those guys takes a decision and I overrule it once, then each and every time they have to take a decision they will come back to me. I am
actually disempowering them and myself and I am creating a bigger problem for myself. What I do sometimes is I have to close my eyes to the decision and live with that problem as I can just see where they are going, but I have to allow them to make mistakes within a certain boundary. So, it is left to those people and I will monitor that. I think over the past year and in some cases I was maybe too lenient and gave them too much power. Here and there I had some bigger problems which needed my personal attention, which I am also correcting now, but I also don’t want to look over their shoulders as that is counter-productive, then I might as well just get rid of the managers and get a bunch of assistants and I can then just monitor them and this will not help me at all!

- CB: [43:49] What are the most difficult aspects of implementing your vision?

- WM [43:53] The most difficult part is to get people to understand the vision. You know when you are an entrepreneur you think differently. Now the guys who sit there as the managers, they think about their salary at the end of the month - if you get them to look beyond the 8-5 job and to share the vision. I think sharing the vision is one of the greatest things and the test that I would sometimes do when we have an information session, I would ask “what is the vision of the company” and I am not getting the right response. All it is telling me is that I am not communicating that vision correctly and I think a vision is to be communicated continuously. It is not something you can say once a year and everybody well remember it. To me it is something you have to live. The biggest thing of the vision is to get everybody to live and believe in the vision and that is a lot easier said than done. Once people understand the vision, which is not the case with everyone, I have seen tremendous results. When they come to me and say “I have done this and this because you said you want to do this in the future”. They can see the line - that makes me very happy!
• CB: [45:30] Are there any additions you would like to make that you feel I need to know about entrepreneurship that we have not touched on during the interview?

• WM [45:33] Well there is a couple of small things. The one thing is the lonely road and I think the best thing for me is to talk on a regular basis to like-minded people. The best people I can talk to are also entrepreneurs who share the same problems. They have the same legal hassles, resources, that sort of stuff. For me, one of the things that helped me through some of the difficult periods is to go to talk to people who are also entrepreneurs. I think it is always good to talk to people with the same challenges - to get that support structure and network as people in the company are sometimes very difficult to talk to as they has a different mindset. You know there is a good reason why they are employees. I am not knocking them, without them the company would not exist. So, to me the employees are the most important people, it is just about the way they think about things - it is not entrepreneurial. It is also good as we all can’t be entrepreneurs. The fundamental attribute of an entrepreneur is their ability to see an opportunity where others don’t!

• CB [47:11] Thank you for your time, insight and willingness to help. It is really appreciated.

• WM [47:13] It is good to talk about these things. It also gives me an opportunity to align my mind again!
21. APPENDIX L: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT MR T. VAN DER WALT

21.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- **Background RealNet Properties.** RealNet Property Group was founded in 1996 by Rothea Olivier. RealNet Holdings started franchising its concept in November 2001 and subsequently RealNet has grown a national footprint. RealNet is a real estate franchise business, specializing in second hand residential sales, letting and auctions throughout South Africa. RealNet soon realized that it is also in the business of making a difference in people’s lives. Their reputation and culture are built on living the company’s core values everyday, being action orientated, respected, true entrepreneurs, living the value of abundance and making a difference in other people’s lives, and they know when they do it right, the business and brand grows. RealNet gives the client peace of mind that their property is being offered for sale across the world over the internet and when a purchaser is found, the sale will go through without any hassle.

- **Vision.** To be the most respected Real Estate Company in the country and to have the most profitable Franchises in South Africa. To empower our Franchisees to obtain the biggest possible market share and to assist our agents to constantly achieve above average sales and income.

- **Interviewee.** Tjaart van der Walt, CEO

- **The interview indicators.** CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. TW- Mr Tjaart van der Walt the interviewee. Interview Location: Real net properties Headquarters in Brooklyn. [ ] between these types of brackets the time sentiment of the recording will be indicated { } between these bracket observed actions and memo’s will be indicated.
21.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW:

- CB: [0:00]: The interview schedule and the ethical letter of consent was provided. Firstly the schedule is discussed, with the aim of the research and the research questions, after which the ethical consent form is looked at. The first thing we would like to do is to confirm the ethical consent form.

- TW [0:27] I have read it and don’t have any problem signing.

- CB: [0:28] Provide a synopsis of your career, highlighting contributions to corporate strategy development.

- TW: [0:47] I have been in business my whole life, from standard one the now grade 3 after finishing university where I studied town and regional planning. I opened a town planning firm in 1980. In 1987 it was the biggest in the country with a head office in Rosebank and six offices country-wide, although I was more focused on the technical side of business. Strategy did play a role, without me specifically focusing on strategy so it was more a natural process at that stage. After that, I went into property development and into project management where I studied and managed ten thousand low cost housing project and infrastructure and because of that always needing finance, I studied financial management and I went into corporate financing and all sort of financing businesses. My partners and I, at that time, bought businesses out of liquidation or if they were very distressed which were in the fertiliser, sugar and beverage industries where I specialised in turnarounds. Having done the fertiliser turnaround business successfully, I was then approached by our co-partners which were SCMB GENSEC, Ellerines, ABM Amrow and Nedbank who was the banker to do a turnaround on the beverage’s company which was highly distressed. I was appointed chairman there and at that stage also did my MBA. We focused on classical strategy development in that specific business. That business was turned around and 3 ½ years later was sold to Pioneer group and the Ceres
fruit group and is still going very strong, much expanded the business manufactures
of Pepsi all the Pick an Pay, Woolworths, Macro choice cool drinks, Lipton’s ice tea,
Hooch, Smirnoff ice and stuff. When that business was sold, I took a 3 month
sabbatical and in that time I was approach by a company called Frazer Alexander
which is a national mining service group with a current turnover of R 2.5 billion. Their
CEO asked me to assist with a turn around strategy on one of their divisions called
Frazer Alexander Bulkmec. That was the first time I facilitated a strategy workshop
and that led me to setting up a company called Stratsolve which after that facilitated
up to now, over a period of 8 years, many strategy sessions with customers such as
BHP Billiton and the Ingwe group, in Daimler Chrysler, one of their divisions and at
Nedbank some of their divisions of Volkswagen heavy vehicles and a lot of other
smaller companies. I also, in that time, did an advanced strategy course at UCT and
five years ago, I bought shares in the RealNet property group which is a franchise
business with about 68 franchise offices nationally.

• CB: [4:39] What is your understanding of the concept ‘Strategy and its
development’?

• TW: [4:45] I think strategy is to try and determine what must be done in order to take
us into the future of a vision where we want to be. So it very focused on the “What
and not the How”. If we think about strategy in short it is not just about having a
workshop for 2- 3 days developing a document. I think the most important part of
strategy is the strategic discussion that needs to take place on a continuous basis
because business is very flexible and very liquid and ongoing and in times like this,
timing is very important developing a culture of strategic discussion from the
employees, from the bottom to the top. This is very important. Obviously if we look
at the development of strategy you have to start from a base. It is important to
understand and obviously if we say we want to know where we want to go, we are
also talking about our strategic priorities. What is our competitive advantage, differentiators and also what are our growth strategies but before you get to that to have to understand why do you exist. What is the value you are adding to customers so that they actually need your services and products? If you haven’t got a clear understanding of that, you haven’t got a business. If you focus on that, the money will follow and I think when it gets to strategy development we know there is many ways of developing strategy. I know Mintzberg’s book Strategy Safari set out the ten different philosophies and directions. Whether it is process drive, financial driven or analytical drive or the classical way of doing external and internal analysis and what goes with it. If we look at strategy development, it obviously will start with a vision, mission values and stuff. Understanding why we exist and then starting off with a plan. The plan and the strategic discussion and the implementation thereof is probably the most important part.

- CB: [7:25] Expand on the concepts of “Corporate and Business strategy”.
- TW: [7:29] I think I will start looking at corporate strategy versus business strategy. Business strategy refers as I see it refers obviously to classical value chain that Porter set out. We have process that has value and if it is a manufacturing concern, inbound and outbound manufacturing, logistic marketing and sales and your support functions being HR, finance, research and development and all of that. So that is typically a business where normal functions are involved. Corporate strategy, on the other hand, encompasses a strategy where a lot of business or national offices are under an umbrella company, whether it is a holding company or whatever it is. That holding company’s reason for existence is probably more focused on the internal investment for investors and shareholders and also it will have a different vision of what it wants to do than the business component that is more focused, I would say
very much on growing the wealth of the group. It is not directly involved in the business processes.

- TW: [9:18] I think the role of the CEO is not to get in the way of the managers and the employees. I would say in my case, I might be wrong, but I think this is one of the most important parts where it differs for the Military who have set out a way of doing a lot of things. The CEO has to have an open mind in order to be able to listen to everybody, right down to the bottom person that sweeps the floors. The development process needs to involve all the members of the company in different ways depending if it is a turn around strategy. I think in turnaround strategies one can become very autocratic as De Bono states the “orange gumboot mode” there is no time for consultation and everything that goes with it. The CEO’s role is to ensure that everyone participates so that there is buy-in, into the plan. Secondly, the CEO is the sponsor or owner of the implementation of strategy. If the strategy is not implemented well, the person who will have to take the rap is the CEO and that is where a lot of companies go wrong. The plan is done and the CEO thinks he can walk away from it as there are other people that will implement it, but that is where the CEO needs to give direction all the time. This is where he should dabble.

- CB: [10:45] What is your understanding of the strategic planners role in “Strategy Development”?
- TW: [10:55] I must say facilitating. I think this is the time that you could have specific people in the company to focus on strategic planning and they develop the strategy. It is like asking consultants to develop the strategy of the business - they can never do it. They can provide a framework within which managers develop the strategy and the same goes for the company - you can’t give the strategy development to a few people. That is a function of everybody in the company.
• CB: [11:35] Explain your understanding of “Intended strategy and Realised strategy”.

• TW: [11:38] I think obviously intended strategy for me is specifically where we want to be as opposed to realised strategy which is more facts based, such as specific issues that need to be addressed in order to make sure that we can counter threats or capitalise on opportunities that are tangible and right in front of us and available. That is the way I understand it.

• CB: [12:19] How would the development of strategy accommodate “turbulence in the environment”?

• TW: [12:22] I think turbulence is probably one of the best things to happen when you are developing strategy. Turbulence is amazingly good detonator, if I can call it that. You know, it sets everybody free to think, to look at new ways, to get out of the normal mould. I think it provides the opportunity to do strategy, because then people are also willing to accept change.

• CB: [13:09] Explain the role of the board in the “Strategy Development”.

• TW: [13:13] Well, I think this is underrated. I think a lot of Boards are only there to comply with governance. I think if we look at the board of a company it is all about strategy that is where they should be - other than governance I think the board’s role is in strategy. That is why the board is made up of people with the most experience - especially if you have non-executive directions as well. That role can be very important.

• CB: [13:48] What is your understanding of the concept “Strategic Intent”?

• TW: [13:50] Strategic intent for me is what you want to achieve - the innovate stuff, the more into the future, more where we want to be as opposed to strategic imperatives. It is just the opposite of strategic imperatives. It is where we want to go. I would say, in practice, no matter what people would say - at the end of the day, the
company’s strategic intent is very much driven by the CEO. There is always one person at the top. If you look at Jack Welsh, he obviously made use of a lot of people to get direction and the end of the day, it was him that drove it. His business was very much Jack Welsh! We can see how one person can change a company.

- CB: [15:03] Can corporate strategy development be associated with entrepreneurship?

- TW: [15:11] I have never thought about that one. I take Microsoft - the entrepreneurship started right in the garage and it grew and I don’t know what is happening there now. I think the entrepreneurship happens down there in the pockets, while at the corporate level it is very much about market share globally, return on investment that sort of stuff. So, I would say Corporate strategy development can probably have an influence downwards but I would say it lies lower down.

- CB: [15:51] What role will the ‘life cycle of organisation’ play, within the strategy development?

- TW: [16:02] I think it plays a role because when you are at a start-up phase of the life cycle you can do everything at the back of a cigarette box. You are very much more focused on tactics. It is more tactics in my environment competing. When you grow through the growth phase into the mature phase, you have to start. In the start-up phase, you can very much do strategy as the owner, but on the corporate level you have to involve many more people. You have to have a very gook look at the statistics and financials and use a great deal more data and process where necessary when you do strategy in your mature phase.

- CB: [17:10] Is strategy development a reactive or a proactive process?

- TW: [17:13] I would say it can be both reactive and proactive. You know, ideally it should be proactive but typically if you look at the economical crunch now - if it was
not for the economical crunch and especially the last dip now we took last year and the previous year where the banks went belly up, I think that forced people into being proactive but it was something that happened that forced us to become proactive, so they go hand in hand. So let’s take the military for instance. You are not going to war - everybody is happy and there is lot of peace and nobody is threatening each other, it is because of the threat that you are prepared to go to war and now you start figuring out tactics. Actually when it gets to the time you will have tactics but you will get people of the Romans that time decided proactively we will build a big force because there are lots going on. So we also build proactively a military for something that we for see in the future.

• CB: [18:30] How is a personalised vision of the CEO integrated into the company strategic development process?

• TW: [18:36] I think, what is import about the vision is obviously communication like strategy. The biggest place where it goes wrong for implementation is communication, communication, communication! But, the vision must have good purpose. It must make sense and it must have something in it for everybody. It must be understandable and it should be short. So, if you are asking any employee in the company, they could say what the vision is. They should say - our vision is to be “the most respected real estate company in the country and to have the most profitable franchising business in the country”. It’s simple and the vision must be something that can be used daily. We want to make this decision - will it make us more respectful? Will it make our franchises more profitable? If yes, then let’s do it. You know, it must be such a practical thing and you must enhance it through many things. You have to communicate it at every function and it must be woven into your newsletters. It must become the culture and ingrained into the company if you use culture and values. The CEO of IBM coined the phrase “elephants can’t dance” and
from that it was stated that culture is an important part of business. It is not just the
important part - it is the business and that is where the vision and the values walk
hand in hand. We also give prizes in our company - tangible prizes for tangible
examples of how people live values in the company annually, for instance it is
abundance that goes far beyond their duty. You have to make it tangible and talk
about it every day so people know how to use it. There must be a practical side to it
as well.
• CB: [20:39] Which documented planning process would you prescribe for use within
corporate?
• TW: [20:48] A planning process for strategy formulation is a difficult one because
this is where every organisation, in every type of industry and where ever they are in
the company life-cycle can differ. One must be very careful. If you go to the book of
Mintzberg’s Strategy Safari book, it starts where there are blind people looking at an
elephant. The problem is that it all depends from what angle you are looking at the
elephant as to your interpretation and how it is assimilated. One needs to be very
careful that planning doesn’t derail that which is already in the minds of people. I like
the idea of strategic discussion on an ongoing basis with the board and the
management team as well as on an individual level. The planning process can stifle
a lot of stuff. We are actually planning to get to asset outcome when you look at how
people like Clem Sunter does strategy formulation. He once did a division of Anglo
American in four hours – that’s it for the year, without anything on paper, any facts,
any analysis because there was a lot of information in the people’s heads. They
could go and pull together and they could go and check it afterwards, but obviously
in some cases it might be necessary more for business plan, less for strategic intent
and more for strategic imperatives.
• CB: [22:41] How did you communicate your vision within the company?
TW: [22:44] I think I did mention it. You obviously have to make sure that people understand the vision very clearly. It must be very simple. People must understand it. It is to be interwoven into you newsletters, it is training, session company functions, you must have tangible examples. When we receive a letter from a customer, this Franchisee was so amazing. They did this! We have so much respect for them. We would send that letter immediately to all the other Franchisees in the rest of the country and say how our vision of respect is starting to show in the market place. So there must be tangible examples of the manifestation of the vision of the company.

CB: [23:24] What are the most difficult aspects of implementing the CEO’s strategic intent?

TW: [23:28] I think, probably to get people’s mindsets right. To get them to understand that we can achieve things - the strategy should not be out of one’s reach and people must believe that they can achieve it. One of the things we did which I thought worked very well, we annually brought out a newsletter that was dated into the future – let’s say three years ahead. It was written as if it was that day and all the things of our vision was in there and how we achieved it, so that the people could see the pictures of it and read an article about how we achieved it. This allowed people to understand because everybody has a different view on everything. Let’s look at integrity - our view on integrity, the Middle East, the Americans, the English – everybody’s view on integrity is different and it is the same with visions!

CB [24:40] Is there any other comment you would like to make?

TW [24:46] Yes - on your topic. I was in the military - only in the national service. I think one must be very careful to think that you can apply strategy and business management as the leadership structure of the military. I think a lot of good can be
used out of it but the military and autocratic behaviour is totally on the one side whereas liaises fair and innovation type business are on the other side; where people can work whenever and however they want to work. They don’t have to be in the country but as long as they do their work, so those two are on the different poles and in between it everywhere is also the truth. So, the truth is not only in one place, where would the leadership structures be better in place and where would it be more applicable, because I found when I worked with a lot of military people in the company that there are certain things that they definitely lack. They have a serious belief that the way they do things is the way it should be - they are missing that intuition part, the feeling part and the emotional part of inspiring people and giving a free hand on certain things. Something else I picked up is that it is very process driven. Business is not about processes alone. It is good where it should be. I also found that strategy in the military is very processed and there is a total planning process. For certain things it will work. I believe that where decisions are to be made fast, like in turnarounds, we can’t. But where we need some autocratic style it can work!

- CB [27:00] Thank you for your time, insight and willingness to help. It really is appreciated.
- TW [27:22] It was only a pleasure!
22. APPENDIX M: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT MR D. HOARE

22.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- **Overview.** Khutala Colliery is one of the largest underground coal mines in the world. The first coal was delivered to the adjacent Kendal power station in November 1986. The mine is situated west of Witbank in the Mpumalanga province. All underground coal is exclusively mined for Eskom’s Kendal power station, situated close to the mine shaft. The open cut coal is supplied to both the Kendal power station as well the inland metallurgical market.

- **Appointment.** Mr Dean Hoare, the General Manager Mining Khutala Colliery.

- **The indicators.** CB- Colin Brand the interviewer, DH - Mr Dean Hoare the interviewee. Location of the interview: Khutala Colliery, conference room. [ ] Between these brackets the time segment of the recording will be indicated. { } between these bracket observed actions will be indicated. The pausing of the interviewer or interviewee will be indicated by …

22.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

- **CB: Time (13:56).** After being processed by the security, I reported to the reception at Khutala Colliery. The receptionist accompanied me to the GMM office and then onto the boardroom. On entering the board room, I found Mr Dean Hoare and introduced myself. We sat down at the conference table. He was on my right hand side. I then asked if he would have any reservation if I made use of a recording device for the interview.

- **DH: I have no objection to you using a recording device.**

- **DH: [0:00] What is your current work?**

- **CB: [0:03] I run the Enterprise Information Systems Master plan for the Department of Defence. This basically put all the telecommunication and information system into...**
one plan and then we utilise it. That’s presently my function. It’s quite exciting but I believe you have to keep current with a whole lot of stuff. One of my pet topics is trying to get strategy correct, finding out if the strategy is actually driven and where it comes from and to try and keep myself sane at the same time.

- DH: [0:35] Yeh.
- CB: [0:36] Thanks very much. This is just an ethical letter.
- DH: [0:42] Ok.
- CB: [0:46] I have to put in to ensure that you have not been forced or coerced and that the questions… {DH: leans forward in his chair to interject to confirm}
- DH: [0:48] This is a standard thing.
- CB: [0:49] Yes. This is a standard thing. {DH reads the ethical document and signs it in my presence}
- DH: [1:12] So, it’s not an honorary doctorate they are going to give you! {CB laugh and response}
- CB: [1:16] No unfortunately. This is one of those that you have to do the work and the years and pain and everything that goes with it. Thanks very much. I see you have gone through a few things - the questions on the interview list, I know there are quite a few.
- CB: [1:44] The first question I would like to pose is - please provide a short synopsis of your career in the mining industry that led to your present appointment.
- DH:[1:47] I have been in the game for 25 years, I think. My career started off with national cardboard in the UK. That’s where I did my schooling and then I was transferred out to South Africa to the gold mines. I was in the gold mines for five years and worked my way through the ranks there, then I went back into coal which was my base from the UK. I think you’re known in terms of how you get into a position like this. They are very structured in terms of the training programme
outcomes. Once you have graduated, we call them peps - professional in planning or training or pits. We were called in those days, junior mining engineers, and you go through a process of obviously education. Some onsite induction and then you go out and there is a very structured development programme which you enter into on the mines. You go through all the various departments and the operations is a very specific training programme that you go through. It’s all detailed. You are then assigned mentors and coaches. This is all in preparation for your employment and future deployment. I currently coach a few of the graduates that are coming up now. Then you go basically and get the statutory tickets - government certificates for competency, for blasting, for mine managers, for engineers and whatever your line is. Then over a period of between 5 and 10 years you will get promoted through the ranks based on competency, knowledge and ability and at a point you will become a mine manager. This is also a legal appointment - a 3:1 as they call it, when you become a mine manager, so to speak, in the eyes of the law. You therefore have a legal appointment as you are responsible for the safe operation of the class of mine that you are appointed to. There are different ones. There are coal, fiery coal, underground gold, hard rocks, surface mining whatever. I had the opportunity to work in most mining environments - underground, surface coal factories, difficult mines, plants and through very many of our operations. They also transfer you quite a lot to different areas to gain various experience and to work with different people in order to prepare you to handle tough situations. There comes a point when you are assessed and placed into a managerial position. Having gained a lot of the skills and experience to run a big operation like this with 3500 to 5400 people, you need to have, a good understanding of all the mining aspects, both real and soft aspects, especially the soft issues. Well for me it is and will always be, to be seen by the men and women in the trenches. They must see and hear the General Manager’s
message from the General Manager. Running a big mine in South Africa with the current legislation is a challenge for all our charters and our stakeholders. To be able to work in what is a basically a high risk environment, well recognised, under the watchful eye of an international mega corporate like BHP Billiton. So the governance issues and safety issues are very important. These will reside on the shoulders of the mine manager, therefore the mine manager should have inherently sound judgment to be able to distinguish between the mines needs, staffs’ abilities, access to resources and the technical knowledge even though it gets less as you go on. You need to understand where the big issues are and also to coach the people that you are bringing through the ranks so that is how you become a general manager - lots of things. There are very few general managers that go up to CEO level and above. They will be in this position with at least 15 years experience, probably more than 20.

• CB: [6:19] Thank you very much for that insight.

• CB: [6:21] The 2nd question. Please explain the structure of the BHP* Billiton/Khutala in order to indicate your communication/reporting lines both upwards and downwards.

• DH: [6:31] Ok. BHP Billiton is the biggest commodity company or based in commodities in the world. As you know they have quite adverse portfolios, but it is more particularly from a mining or a petroleum base so thus this is their core business if you can call it that. There are CSG - customer sector grouping. We fall under the energy grouping which includes petroleum and coals, metallurgical and energy. Marius Kloppers, a South African is basically the chief in charge based in Sidney or Melbourne. I am not sure where he bases himself as there are two main offices. Then Marcus Randolph will report to him. He is in charge of the commodities and I think he has diamonds as well, I’m not sure. And then reporting to Marcus is
our president for energy coal, Jimmy Wilson who has just been appointed last week Wednesday. He then runs all the coals and the mines that produce coal for the power station market not the metallurgical market. He has operations in USA, Australia, South Africa and South America - Columbia area. Reporting to him is the sort of South African leg which is a combination, but really Billiton South African which is primarily dealing with the aluminium of the world. So there is a Billiton South Africa with a dotted line through Marcus and other places. Aluminium business, chrome business and manganese business - but Jimmy is really on the edge coal side if you look at my line. Our CEO Marnie Dryer reports to him. He is actually the president of the South African energy coal business or BECSA (BHP Billiton Energy Coal of South Africa) which has three primary mines currently, Middelburg mines, Khutala and Klipspruit. We have a VP, there is an executive committee that reports under Marnie and an operations committee under the sort of, let’s call it the executive committee, BECSA central committee, my boss which is the vice president of operations Wilco reports in on that. I then sit with Wilco on the operation committee, the OPCO with Marnie as the chairman. I then as I say again report to Wilco. I run the mine, I am the employer representative 4:1 which is a legal appointment so I represent the interest of the employer, but I also from a governance point of view, have the DMR Department of Minerals represent the executive and whatever for the mine. So I represent the mine. I have then to report back to BECSA, corporate and back to Melbourne, ultimately the results on the mine, financial, volumes, safety and all that stuff. We have a standard sort of reporting methodology which is pretty much in line with, good accounting practice. I also report to Eskom - being the primary customer. They have account managers that look after this business, that are dedicated to it and I liaise with. We have a monthly meeting with them plus other meetings. Feedback quarterly result meetings.
with their executives. That’s probably it – we’re not much into the export business at
the moment so we don’t have to report back to Richards Bay really. That’s it to my
level and I can tell you all the way down from the Heads of Departments for the rest
of the day.

- CB: [11:58] Thank you. That was great - which brings up the next question. What is
your mandate, as received from BHP Billiton? (I qualified the question with the
following interjection …I made the assumption that BHP Billiton gave you, your
mandate, is this correct?)

- DH: [12:13] Ja. They give you a set of guidelines that start at the top with a set of
values. CB[12:20] Interject with I saw a few nice ones when I was coming in. Are
those the values next to the road? DH [12:26] Yes CB [12:27] One important one is
a win – win relationship is fundamental, integrity. Is it a formal document that comes
down or is it a formal meeting? DH [12:38] You get over arching policies and
procedures, like the sustainability policies and values policies and all those types of
things and you know statements made by corporate, their underlining, then you get
a model of how the whole thing works. You get an operating model, for example, we
will get an annual letter of strategic intent from above. That strategic intent will
become more specific as you go and cascade throughout the organisation. We look
at growth or are we cost control, are we new business, are we sustaining, are we
looking for expanding markets, what are we doing? We become more robust. Are
we more long-term, are we more short term, are we more medium term? Looking at
the stock markets, it looks at the environment, so we get some guidance from that. It
ultimately translates what you see over there on the wall {DH points to the current
objective board} which translates into a set of objectives and goal alignment for the
year.
• CB: [13:57] Thank you for that. The next question is to describe your understanding of the strategic planning process used within BHP Billiton. Is it formal or informal? Formal, in the term that everybody gets around a table and everybody does it.

• DH: [14:04] We’ll go up and down. It bounces up and down within the organisation so there will be one from the top and as I say the strategic intents will be dropped down and we will have at least once a year around a table with Klanie Equasi, our chairman. He will have a break away for 3-4 days and we will discuss what the things are - big things that we are aiming for. From there we might modify our mission or our strategic goals and objectives for the year. We then take that back to the mine and again we workshop that and do all the rest of it.

• CB: [15:01] Thanks for that. Could you describe Khutala’s strategic planning process?

• DH: [15:11] We have what we call from a business plan point of view, a process called CAP. I will try to remember, as there are so many acronyms in this. You go through a full year cycle. Problem solving is a team effort even though I conducted my own analysis of the situation. Problem solving and solutions, there re no real original answers. It is inspiration and explanations on doing it differently, so basically looking at making sense of your changing surroundings will include the life of the mine or the asset as it is referred to in the mining circles. The life of the asset will be your departure point and from there you will develop or keep optimising your extraction plans, your resourcing plan, your budgeting plan and your financial strategies are all based on an iterative process. To sort of change yourself in the business or modify to the internal or external business, is a matter of choices which amount to risk vs profit. The process is goal alignment from the top. It’s a matter of developing your measures and targets and then from there cascading it down to everyone’s scorecards so that they can be performance managed.
• CB: [16:33] Thanks for that. What is your role in Khutala’s strategic planning process?

• DH: [16:40] I basically set the direction and the boundaries and leave the detail to the specialists. I provide direction - where we need to go. The guys - we have specialist planners and guys that do that for a living, and they will then do various iterations. They will check in every now and again with the mine managers and me if they are going in the right direction and once it’s compiled it is my job to present it to the board, team of executives and Eskom board.

• CB: [17:18] Great. What is your understanding of strategic intent?

• DH: [17:34] My understanding of strategic intent is that it sort of outlines the principles on where you would like to take the business to. This is where we are and this is where we know we need to be. The intent really is to get there. The principles that we need to apply to get there and how you get there. They are quite specific and it’s not just a lot of waffle that you will read in an MBA book. It is actually very specific - we want to do this with the cost, reduced by percentage, we want to expand our business our base metal business by that much, we want to know. It’s not too long - it’s got to be short and to the point. You can’t drive too many things at the same time. So they will have a few key points such as safety, tons, costs, people, whatever its markets are. Then there will be 3 or 4 bullets under each. This is what you have to drive and that then in quite, clear simple language gives the business direction.

• CB: [19:10] How would you go about analysing the mandate received from your superiors?

• DH: [19:13] Analysing - you must be very clear - you must socialise it around a board room table, don’t assume that everybody thinks that they understand what’s written. Some people might interpret it slightly differently, so we will generally put the
letter of intent up on the board for the executive committee plus the OPCO (operation committee) guys and say right - what does this mean and almost try and rearticulate it, in a different language, but try and get to the same thing. You must ensure that you get a very common understanding and you must understand where you will impact and where you will not impact much, so if you know that actually there are things somewhat out your league then park them. You know what you need to be going for - that's important.

- CB: [20:12] Following on from what you have just said. What would you do to align the intent of your superiors with your intent for Khutala?
- DH: [20:43] You need to understand where your levels of decision-making lie, for you as mine manager to make decisions. You have to be authorised and resolute. This is important because I can’t expect my boss to, he won’t have the time and he does not know the business as well as I do because I am here everyday. He cannot tell me what to do all the time. That is the intent. My job is to say “this is the direction in which I think we need to be going. This is where I need your inputs, do you support or not support or would you like to give a bit more direction or maybe you can see value in somewhere else”. So, it is a two way process. It’s the same with me and my guys. With a mine this size, there’s no ways I can go and make decisions for the guys underground. I can go and visit. I can go and give some advice but at the end of the day it is much better if you almost put the words in mouths so to speak and they come and tell you what they are going to do, then they take full ownership. Take ownership, be accountable and all the rest.
- CB: [21:50] Explain how you will perform your environmental analysis for Khutala?
- DH: [21:58] Well, I carry out my understanding of the situation by doing a SWOT and PESTEL analysis. My comprehension of the situation will be a few lines on a slide or a flipchart to set the scene. Within the mine it is different as we don’t do an
elaborate process much at Khutala, because we are a captive colliery to the Kendal power station. We are mostly a fixed market. Having said that, you got to understand how Eskom are thinking they provide all the capital - it is a cost plus operation. So they pay for all the costs. You must be very sensitive to this situation or predicament all the time and try to direct the business the way you feel that your customers are going to most appreciate it but also tell them the risks. You can do that but the risk is this - just understand that if it doesn’t go right then what?

• CB: [23:01] What are the factors that you would use to conceptually analyse the internal and external situations impacting on Khutala in order to acquire a comprehensive situational awareness?

• DH: [23:17] We do a bit of export. Obviously the biggest influence is to understand what is happening with the commodity price. To do projections on where it is likely to go in the future, so that you can then work out projects, or prioritise your projects into high, low risk, easy, hard and you could do those pay off matrix, whatever you wanted to do, effectively. From an external point of view, the biggest influence - three big influences are export price, exchange rate and let's say your country risk, which is legislations and mining charters, gaining mining authorisations to grow the business. You need to get all that right {CB adds the country risk at this stage has it gone down} DH response It is still regarded as a tier 2, I think, whereas a first world country will be regarded as a tier 1. We're, I think, a tier 2 and then you get the whole of the African states as tier 3 but there is a level of stability. We have been doing business here in mining for the last hundred odd (100) years.

• CB: [24: 53] How do you prepare yourself for participation in the Khutala planning cycle?

• DH: [25:02] Well, there are two dimensions here firstly my personal preparation of the problem at hand for participation within the strategic planning cycle and secondly
my participation in the strategic planning cycle which can be seen as a team effort. My preparation would amount to an assessment of the situation doing a SWOT analysis and possible a PESTEL. The team will do lots of work shopping in terms of the idea generation phase and what if scenarios and all that! {CB interjects with: Is this led by you, or do you have a strategic planner or planning team?} DH response: In order to place this into context, I think from a strategic perspective, as well as operational and tactical level, we are inherently structured into levels and departments, there is a chain of command. Conceptually we do strategic planning as a team - both planning and implementation. Then we will set the specialists off. Sometimes they will do the work and number crunching. They will come back. We will look at a couple of figures and start dropping things off, as you realise things are not practical or the timing not right or it is not viable, you drop off and you develop what you call ‘a go forward case’. Then you get a base case which is different. A base case would be your optimise without a significant capital case. In other words, if you continue more or less as we are with a little sustaining capital or do we want to grow the business and maximise value. Then you would look for a ‘go forward case’, which will require securing capital and a proper due diligence and all the necessary project phases to take it through.

- CB: [26:20] Whom from your staff participates and what are their roles within the Khutala planning process?
- DH: [26:26] The HOD team {CB further inquiry. Do you get in any consultants or any outsiders in?} DH response: Just maybe for facilitation. Normally, at a very high level, when you are doing the strategic overviews, you use them.
- CB: [26:44] Seeing that you are doing this in teams - how and when do you provide guidance to your staff for planning?
• DH: [27:12] This depends on what level you’re at, you know. You go from a strategically, conceptual workshopping environment that will include partnerships, down to the business end. Now you’re getting to a level where you’re doing the life of asset planning, scheduling for implementation. This is the difference between the setting of strategic goals and actually driving the life of asset long-term plan or business plan. You understand the difference between a business plan and a strategic model if you call it that {CB: acknowledges his understanding} It is not just me (GMM) I have a big picture knowledge of the organisation but many of the guys have worked here for 10 years, so they understand the local environment very well and you know, to pick up on people’s particular specialist knowledge and all that, because each guy’s got his own functional excellence, if you like and as a General Manager you would have come from a particular field of expertise, which in my case is mining, but it could be a financial guy, it could be an engineer or it could be anything, you know in this position, so you’re a bit of a generalist but probably only a specialist in one field. So you will have to pull out all the bits and pieces around the table to understand how that dynamic works.

• CB:[28:45] To what extent does gut feel play a role in establishing a holistic picture of your environmental analysis?

• DH:[28:53] You have to have a gut feel. You don’t just do everything on the gut although a lot of people do that though. Analysis paralysis will contribute to that.

• CB: [29:31] How do you handle unanticipated opportunities now that you have a fixed client, there must still be some opportunities to increase revenue?

• DH: [29:35] Unanticipated opportunities - there are always opportunities. We have five seam reserves here so we do export a little bit into the local metallurgical type markets and stuff but opportunities for us is in the export business for the five seams which we own. This is not dedicated to the station and that is therefore an
opportunity and also to change the way we do business with Eskom from a BECSA point of view. This is work in progress. I think the contract has been very rigid for many years. In the future you got to look at the contracts meaningfully and decide if a more contemporary contract would facilitate a better relationship between Eskom and us. Are we adequately sensitised as an operation by the contract? How is our relationship supposed to work? How does it work? This is a challenge.

- CB: [31:03] What are the most difficult aspects of implementing your strategic intent?
- DH: [31:19] I think one of the things about working for a mega corporation is obviously the red tape. Technology locks into ERP systems, HR systems and logistical systems, which in turn will provide you with predetermined information and the check and balances can be huge, that’s one thing. The second thing is that things in South Africa are difficult to change in respect of the legislative imperatives, in the mining due to due process, so to get your stakeholder behind you from an Eskom point of view, from a union point of view and from everything else you have to do takes a lot of time particularly on a big mine. Then you know that change is based on possible mergers or acquisitions - a serious business downturn as we experienced with the global recession. In South Africa the continual legislative changes are imminent. This will mean that the mine manager will almost have to get to hold of the staff for change implementation, to buy into the change, even at senior level are. By the time you sort of get the guys on board, if you not careful with all those constraints, you are into the next letter and next cycle.

- CB: [32:30] Thank you very much. Are there any questions you wish to ask me?
- DH: [32:33] No, I don’t think so; this was quicker than I thought and I am chuffed about that. I hope I have answered your questions fairly openly {CB Response: Yes thank you very much!}
• CB: [32:51] As I said before this is just going to be used for the research and when I am finished it will be destroyed. Company confidentiality and all those things will be complied with.

• DH: [33:03] I don’t think I have told you anything. It was pretty generic stuff.

• CB: [33:16] Thank you very much for your time, I really appreciate it.

• DH: [33:21] Good luck with this.
23. APPENDIX N: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT MR R. KENNY

23.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- **Back Ground Klipspruit Colliery.** Klipspruit Colliery is situated in the Ogies district of the Mpumalanga province. Klipspruit is the first new coal mine to be established by BHP Billiton Energy Coal South Africa in more than 14 years. The Klipspruit Colliery started in October 2003. Coal is transported 34 km to the Rietspruit wash plant where the export coal is beneficiated and loaded into trains. On the 7 December 2007, BHP Billiton announced the approval of the Klipspruit project as part of its energy coal operations in South Africa. The Klipspruit project which involves an investment of approximately US $450 million, will include the development of a 16 Mtpa coal processing plant called the Phola Coal processing plant which is a 50-50 joint venture with Anglo coal. The plant, processing 8 Mtpa of coal from each of the joint venture partners, will be located on the Klipspruit surface area and constructed by Anglo coal.

- **Interviewee.** Mr Richard Kenny. The General Operations Manager Klipspruit Colliery and the project Director for Phola Coal processing plant.

- **The interview indicators.** CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. RK - Mr Richard Kenny the interviewee. Interview Location: Office of the GMM. [ ] Between these types of brackets the time sentiment of the recording will be indicated… { } between these bracket observed actions will be indicated. The pausing of the interviewer or interviewee will be indicated by …

23.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW:

- CB arrived 1120 at Klipspruit Colliery for the interview with Richard Kenny. Passed through security and taken to Richard Kenny’s office. We found him in the passage and the introductions are done and he led the way to his office. We settled around
his conference table. CB provides him with two documents, namely, the interview schedule and the ethical letter of consent. Firstly the schedule is discussed, with the aim of the research and the research question. Hereafter the ethical consent form is looked at.

- CB: [0:43] The first thing we would like to do is to confirm the ethical consent form. {RK reads through the document and then signs it} {CB responds to the action by RK}, Thank you for signing this form.
- CB: [0:56] The first question is to please provide a short synopsis of your career in the mining industry that led to your present appointment.
- RK: [01:03] Ok. I was in the Air Force. I left the Air Force and then joined the mining house on a student programme and have been here ever since and worked myself up through the ranks. I have moved between opencast, underground and projects, so I really have just zigzagged through the ranks to the top and the pinnacle of mine manager.
- CB: [1:25] Explain the structure of the SA BHP Billiton/Klipspruit in order to indicate your communication/reporting lines both upwards and downwards.
- RK: [1:39] Ok. BHP Billiton …I always do it better with sketches {RK: moves towards his table to fetch a pad of paper} (CB Responds sure, sure no problem) …I will draw it on a piece of paper then you can take it away with you. {CB response Yes, thanks that will be great)…RK Continues.. BHP Billiton is one of the biggest companies in the world so they have an Exco committee … ok, the Exco committee is then subdivided into what is called CSG’s … CSGs those are company sector groups and there are six or seven of them … ok … {RK draws on the page the structure}. The company sector group that I work for is called energy coal. They are based in Sidney - the top Exco is based in Melbourne {CB interjects and asks …is this where Mr Kloppers sits?} RK continues Yes, that is where he, the chairman, sits. We have
a newly appointed South African that has been appointed - Mr Jimmy Wilson. The CSG in energy coal is split up into, Hunter Valley energy coal, New Mexico coal, Senron in South America and a group called BECSA and we are BECSA. BECSA is split up into 3 mines, that is Middleburg mine service, Klipspruit and Khutula. At this moment I am sitting on Klipspruit and at Klipspriut at this moment there is a project which is my prime function and then there is the mine { hand over the drawing to me }. As you can see it is a hell of a layered thing - active Klipspruit project, at the moment we have on the mine, 2 GM’s. GM operations that’s me and GM Operations. I have responsibilities as the mine manager, the engineering manager … for the technical manager and the process manager. The other GM has a direct reporting line here. He has responsibility over financial management, the risk manager … ok I can’t see who I am missing here …HR manager, Financial Manager, Risk Manager … now the reason we got this structure …because this a man with little experience (pointing towards the other GM appointment based on BEE) this is a BEE appointment and a temporary appointment. I will eventually fall away here and he will be given the full responsibility.

- CB [06:34] What is your mandate, as received from SA BHP Billiton?
- RK [06:36] Our primary mandate is to deliver this project against a list of defined milestones and KPI's. In my role as project director, as operations manager, is to deliver the operations and safety cost budget {CB interject Can you elaborate on the cost budget?} Ok - on the cost budget there is a certain operating cost, that we have forecasted the amount of money we will spend to deliver X amount of coal. So it actually comes down to rand per run of mine ton.
- CB [07:16] Describe your understanding of the strategic planning process used within SA BHP Billiton.
• RK [07:20] BECSA has got a very well formulated strategic planning process that dovetails into the BHP Billiton planning process …so obviously I will not go into great detail … in general what happens is that the corporation puts out the key drivers for the year …but at very high level …those then get fed down to the mines who then in turn brings it down to more specific mine level interventions but still at a high level. A letter of intent then gets agreed upon between us and the corporation. We then take that and work out a life of mine plan for the remainder of the assets … which gets reduced down to a five year plan. The five year plan is more detailed and is now a more operating plan. Within that 5 year plan you have a 1 year plan which becomes your budget, so you budget a 1 year plan that talks to your 5 year plan which is the life of mine plan that talks to the company’s strategy. So that is the funnel that comes down. Every 2 years you supplement that by looking on the mine level and we put on an RDP resources development plan …to say what around …you can cast your eye on. If there’s a mine you would like to buy land from where you want to develop - is there a piece of land you want to sell? So every 2 years you look at your positioning in the local geography and that then is roughly the total process.

• CB [09:00] Describe Klipspruit’s strategic planning process.

• RK [09:02] Well on Klipspruit we get the direction from corporate. We will then have a get away session where we will go and say what the Issues are that drive us and we will then come out with our key KPI. Our KPI tree is one of the key things that is relevant to us. We will then take that down a bit more for example if it is on “tones” … and we will say what are the issues, is it different mining areas … different seams … different problems and we will take it down a level. Once we have understood it, we will then go and produce a detailed operation plan - which is the budget.

• CB [09:48] What is your role in Klipspruit’s strategic planning process?
• RK [09:53] It is a coordinating role at the moment between the mining, the engineering and technical processes. I coordinate those troops in the trenches… those are the guys I lead {CB interjects Can you elaborate on your coordinating role through planning?} In the mining process it all comes down to volumetric. It is earth moving. You have to move a certain amount of dirt. You have your geological model so you know what you are dealing with and you have the thing stratified and quantified. You know exactly what you have. You then decide what equipment is needed, for example, dozer, loaders etc … or how many you think you need. You apply those productivities to your volumetric model and you work out what you are going to liberate in coal. You take the particular machine hours at that particular resource you will then deliver so many tonnes of coal. Then you have an iterative process that runs around – that’s the primary thing. To make those machines work you obviously need certain engineering skills that come up. How fast can you take machines down and up? How long to replace machines? How many parts do you need to repair the brake lines? These are the backup processes. Then also on the technical side, these are actually running the schedule on the day …what week and what month he will address which piece of reserve. The keeping of a reserve and what will that deliver. Then it is how many litres of diesel, how many kg’s of explosives etc and all that detail will come from there. Once you have delivered certain tons of coal, what are you going to do with it? This is mainly raw coal, so you will have to put in a process facility plant - something like that … and then you got to say what is my market … because coal in not a piece of black coal it has got infinite range of qualities that you can deliver. So, what market am I servicing …and then match your market on what you can deliver. That is your process - you will take the raw product, the mine manager will deliver a raw product …a process manager will take that raw product and will transform it into a marketing product … so my role is
to get the mining guy to speak the technical guy …to speak to the engineering guy …to speak to the process guy and then deliver a sellable product!

- CB [12:24] What is your understanding of strategic intent?
- RK [12:28] Strategic intent - the way I understand it, would be for instance our strategic intent is to participate in the sea borne energy coal market, so that is a really high and over-arching strategic intent. We are not really here to go and make fuel from coal. That is not where we are - our strategic intent is that market but in order to do that within certain safety parameters and to position us on a certain spot on the cost curve, the international cost curve and with certain health parameters. So, say you want to be in that market if certain parameters can be met at high level then obviously that will then filter down to our budget but will our budget match that strategic intent. Well, if it does not then we will be sold, closed or something!

- CB [13:27] What would you do to align the intent of your superiors with your intent for Klipspruit?
- RK [13:33] Well, that is exactly that strategic planning process. Once we understand their intent, we will then say their intent is seaborne coal traded market. We won’t go and try to sell coal to Secunda. We will have a marketing department. We will operate accordingly …the marketing department will say if you want to live in this world, you got to produce this type of coal at this type of cost and this type of volume, and then we will take that and we know that we will take our resources up to our resource model and planning tool. We will find out if we can put those two together and can deliver what they need. That is how we will match it.

- CB [14:17] Explain how you will perform your environmental analysis for Klipspruit?
- RK [14:20] We do a baseline risk assessment on our environment. S we do have a baseline - we have an EMP model, obviously, on what we are going to do. All the impacts have been assessed and the impact analysis has been put in place and
then we will have a mitigation plan, so for instance if it is going to be dust - what is our mitigation… is it going to be a dusty suppression or is it dust management or what is it. So we will identify the key environmental risks. Obviously in our world dust, water and noise … are the 3 big risks… and then obviously the rehabilitation of the operation when we are finished mining. So we identify those big drives and then we have the mitigation management plan we go along.

- CB [15:11] What are the factors that you would use to conceptually analyse the internal and external situations impacting on Klipspruit in order to acquire a comprehensive situational awareness?

- RK [15:18] Those are the risk assessments. Once we have identified what the issues are we will do the risk assessments and in that risk assessment you will identify your impacts. Then your impact will be classified, both internally and externally. That classification is of less significance because an impact is an impact. Impacts are on different people within the organisations and you are classified to manage it accordingly.

- CB [15:48] How do you prepare yourself for participation in the Klipspruit planning cycle?

- RK [15:57] Well actually to be honest with you, we don’t prepare for the breakaway. The breakaway takes the form of a workshop so that when you are in that workshop or review your previous performance, you will then analyse what is expected of you or by reviewing your previous performance, the expectations of the future is nearly never vastly different from the past. So where we fall short - what we are going to do about those issues that we under-performed and what we might be doing different in our going forward. … {CB interjects … What do you as the leader of the team do to get yourself prepared for the workshop?} We would sometimes start off a session with a team dynamics presentation … understanding interactive dynamics and
maybe something personal … understanding of your personal styles - that’s what we do. On the last strategic work session we spend two days on that before we start working out the strategies for the year ahead.

- CB [17:17] Who, from your staff, participates and what are their roles within the Klipspruit planning process?
- RK [17:23] Obviously everyone participates… but it starts off at the HoD level where we address strategy. When you actually get down doing the mine planning scheduling, it obviously drops right down throughout the organisation, so top down cascades top down from the intent and what the grand plans are. Then it gets built from the bottom up. You need so many of those, … some of these… you then build up your operating model for the year from the bottom up. Then what happens, you cascade down to the bottom again. If you don’t do it like that, it will always come out over inflated, everyone wants everything this year, so put a little fat in here and so you build it all up. Then you evaluate its feasibility … then you go back down again and you build it up again …and that process can happen quite a few times this pulsing in and out - spiralling process …until you finally settle on something you can live with! {CB interjects What is the period this spiral will take –is it related to the financial year?} No. It works maybe over a period of two months … so you build up your model for the year, and then it gets approved. So you have a process of two to three months where you are doing all this work … and then you say “alright that is the budget” and you present the budget! If it’s accepted, then that is it and you run, or, if it’s rejected it means you go back to the drawing board and chopping block. This then gets reworked. Once you get your budget approved, you get a monthly budget and every month you will review progress and you will produce a plan for the coming month so that would be in a 3 month cycle. Every month you prepare a three month plan … and obviously that tires back to the one year plan - the budget…
which tires back to the 5 year plan... which tires back to the life of the mine plan... and tires back to the company strategic plan!

- CB [19:18] How and when do you provide guidance to your staff for planning?

- RK [19:24] We have a formal weekly meeting as we had right now. Once we have the budget approved, we go and list our Key Performance Indicators. At the weekly meeting, we monitor the performance. Some of the milestone are weekly traceable, others are monthly traceable. We have a metric. We list them all. They are either in the green, in which case we say cool and if in the red then we drill down to see what are in the red right down to departmental level.

- CB [19:57] To what extent does gut feel/intuition play a role in establishing a holistic picture of your environmental analysis?

- RK [20:04] I think it is very important. I know a lot of people say if you can manage a mine, you can manager a bank and vice verse. I think that experience is very important and various experiences, not necessarily 15-20 years, but the more you have been around, the more you have seen and the more you will have a gut feel and I suppose the lower the limits to error are. So, if you have an inexperienced manager, he might be a good manager but he has limits, the thresholds of his limits will be stretched and be further apart - so experience must close that gap. Gut feel equals experience. I think there is a degree of common cents that underpins gut feel, but experience is also a key factor.

- CB [21:15] How will you synthesise all the relevant environmental analysis information?

- RK [21:28] They are your KPI’s. There is so much stuff that has to be done on a mine. You can’t manage everything, so you need to understand which are the big bangers and which are actually the leading indicators. If I do that, by necessity someone else will have to do that and that and that. So, if that one is wrong, I can
drill down to see which one of these is not happening. So, it is KPI’s that are the critical key performance indicators that you need to be worried about and then cascade that down. For instance, if I am worried about the annual tonnage, somebody must be worried about the tonnage on this morning’s shift. I am not going to worry about how many tonnes were mined today or this morning as I will know tomorrow morning what we mined today. You have to accept that there is a pyramid structure and there is a cascading structure, which are the one’s that you need to track. So I just look at those bases on an exception process - if they are in the green, fine; if it is in the red, then drill down into it!

- CB [22:38] What are the most difficult aspects of implementing your strategic intent?
- RK [22:55] I guess in a mining environment which might be similar to military environment, the world you live in, is never the world you planned to live in. So now when you plan something this month, in 14 months time when you are implementing, the world has changed and the circumstances have changed, but the budget has not - and that is what makes it difficult! People will still hold you at the same cost per tonne and they will still hold you to the same tonnage to mine but no one foresaw that you would have a torrential rain storm that went on for 3 weeks. I mean it happened to us on a project - the last two years was the wettest in the district for the last hundred years or something. When we planned the mine, we had very firm dry method conditions. The day we came to dig the first hole, it filled up to the collar and we have all this water and all these issues but the budget is the budget! That is what makes it difficult!
- CB [23:49] Thank you so much for your time, insight and willingness to help. It is greatly appreciated!
- RK [24:00] It was only a pleasure to help with your research.
24. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- **Background Talison Minerals Pty Ltd.** West Australian (WA) based mining company Talison Minerals Pty Ltd is one of the world’s largest suppliers of two key strategic minerals – tantalum concentrates and lithium minerals – from its mining operation at Greenbushes in the south west of Western Australia. Minerals produced at Talison Greenbushes can be found in many different applications including mobile phones, computers, surgical implants, electronic devices, the aerospace industry (tantalum) and glassware, ceramics and batteries (lithium). Tantalum deposits are very rare, with two of the operational Australian tantalum mines in WA – one at Greenbushes and the other at Wodgina in the Pilbara owned and operated by Talison. These are the largest and second largest hard rock tantalum mines in the world respectively. Tantalum, lithium minerals and tin are the three main products mined at Talison Minerals Pty Ltd Greenbushes Operations. The Greenbush mine is located in the south west of Western Australia approximately 250 km south of Perth and 80 km south east of the port of Bunbury. The site is comprised of a number of open-cut mining operations for tantalum, tin and spodumene (lithium). An underground tantalum operation has also been developed. The Greenbushes pegmatite is the world’s largest hard rock tantalum resource and the largest and highest grade lithium mineral resource in the world.

- **Interviewee.** Mr Pat Scalan. The General Manager Talison Minerals Pty Ltd.

- **The interview indicators.** CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. PS- Mr Patrick Scallan the interviewee. Interview Location: Office of the GM via Skype. [ ] between these types of brackets the time sentiment of the recording will be indicated { } between these bracket observed actions and memo’s will be indicated.
24.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW:

- CB: [0:00]: Established the link to Talison Minerals Pty Ltd via skype prior to the interview. CB provides him with two documents namely the interview schedule and the ethical letter of consent. Firstly the schedule, with the aim of the research and the research question, after which the ethical consent form, are discussed.

- CB: [2:17] The first thing we would like to do is to confirm the ethical consent form. {Please read it and send it via email prior to this discussion that the confirmation was done} Thank you for signing this form.

- PS: [2:20] I don’t have any problem signing.

- CB: [2:25] The first question - please provide a short synopsis of your career in the mining industry that led to your present appointment.

- PS: [02:44] Ok. I initially studied and became a cost management accountant and commenced work on the mines in South Africa. One thing led to another and I landed up working in the mine planning department, doing underground projects. I then had the opportunity to come across to Australia, where I started a job in the mine planning department and with my background in mine planning in Goldfields together with my cost management background, budgeting and all those types of things, I was able to fit in here quite nicely. The next thing, in that role was with a mineral sands company. I took on a number of other hats so to speak. I took over the drilling side of things, the financial side of things and eventually I took over running some of the production departments. We merged with a different company and one of the companies did in-house mining and one did contract mining, which is pretty prevalent in Australia. I used my experience to compare the one against the other and that really got me into production - I enjoyed the production side of things. Eventually, I was running the drudging operations, drilling operation and the processing and then they moved me down to another operation south west of
Western Australia, where I took over running the processes for a couple of years. I then took over the mineral treatment for a couple of years and I also looked after the mining operations, so basically I had a good suite of experience within the production area, within the current company and a production manager which I fitted in very well. The background to the mineral sand is similar to the processing for spodumene and with my experience and also with my financial background, quite quickly I was acting and took over the roll of the mine manager position. I was appointed the general manager basically due to my ‘jack of all trades’ type of background together with my ability to plan and with my people skills I managed to fit into the role quite nicely.

- CB: [5:41] Explain the structure of the mining company, in order to indicate your communication/reporting lines both upwards and downwards.

- PS: [5:51] Ok. Starting upwards which is fairly nice and formal? I have a period reporting - we have 12 periods per year. I will do my annual report against a forecast, a budget, which has been agreed upon by the board. I also have a weekly production catch-up with the executive, just to let everyone know that we are on track and to identify any aspects of the bigger pictures with regards to markets, company movement or any issues on site - a little less formal that my direct communication upwards. I also have the board visit maybe once a quarter and I will attend a board meeting once a quarter as well. We would also have some of the executive come down to site on and off on an adhoc basis depending if it is on projects or if it is just a visit. From a management meeting once a week basically to talk more strategic type things and work on any programme that we want to implement. On a daily basis, I talk to my direct report and to some of their reports getting on a daily base to review the last 24 hours production. Including in that 24 hours production would be any safety issues, production environment, occupational
health, mining, production, shipping and administration go through each of those areas. I have a monthly bulletin. Talking to the general work force is one of the bigger things, more for them so that they can get direct feedback from management, especially me, of what is happening with the company on an adhoc basis, most probably once a quarter, to talk to all the troops at their toolbox meeting. I also walk around the sight once a week and do a general catch-up with people I cross paths with. I also put out a monthly bulletin on the performance of operation and talk about other general issues about safety, quality, environment, public or issues that might be of interest for the company. I would then also give the same briefing to community committee that we have, to give them feedback on what the operations are doing. We also have a portal, electronic bulletin board, that we put general information on, whether it is adhoc or direct, production, safety, environment or just general. We use that as a way of general communicating as well as my internal emailing systems, where I will send out notes across the board or to specific people.

• CB [09:56] What is your mandate, as received from the board?

• PS [09:58] Ok. I suppose my job is to exploit the resources and to manage the company assets to the maximum with the return to the shareholders, I suppose, being on top of that. I need to manage the operations, check if we are meeting marketing, within cost constraints and at the same time doing this in an environmentally friendly manner, meeting all the statutory obligations and of course doing it safely.

• CB [10:48] Describe your understanding of the strategic planning process used within the mine.

• PS [11:00] Ok. Our production is all related to market off take, unlike only gold mines where you can really sell everything you can produce. Our sales are directly related to demand, so once we have determined the demand, I can get into place all
my processes to actually achieve that production and then to try and determine costs and any other implications with that production plan. So, basically once I have agreed with the board on what the market outcomes are going to be, I will then go and set my business plan. My business plan basically incorporates everything that we are going to achieve and how we are going to do it. This would include anything to with environment, occupation health, public relation and safety - so basically it all accumulates into a business plan. That business plan is made up of a number of different plans, basically each one of my reports. I will have an environmental plan, which should be based on a number of obligations that I have to meet in regard to statutory and legal requirements. It would also list the top ten risks that I would have and out of those top 10 risks we would set our strategy and how we actually mitigate it. I will do that the same with the occupation, health and safety plan. Identifying what we are trying to achieve; what our highest risks are for the year and what programme I would need to try and mitigate some of them. I will accumulate all of the risks together into my quality plan and public relations to come up with our overall strategic document. That tends to be more an internal document because I tend to do this more for myself, however it is part of the overall business plan that I send to the board. I eventually sign this, once they are happy that we are going to meet the outcome and that we get the right return for our shareholders. So there is two levels for strategic planning one is on site and there I would also do some strategic planning with our corporate people and the board discussing where we are going in the future, how are we going to expand, do we think that the market will expand, are we going to expand our applications and how do we get to expanding the market because our products can go into a number of application then into a number of markets. So, we would end up having a sort of strategic planning meeting around that and also how we are going to finance all our plans for the year as well.
That would be at a higher level with our senior executive team in our head office in Perth.

• CB [14:17] What is your role in your mine’s strategic planning process?

• PS [14:22] Basically my role would be to pass on the agreed target from board level and then be able to take that to the site where I will develop the more operational type targets within the various departments so that once those individual targets are met it will achieve the overall outcome as desired by the board. Basically it is my job then to set the business plan to meet those strategic objectives.

• CB [16:54] What is your understanding of strategic intent?

• PS [17:00] My basic understanding of strategic intent is the outcomes that we desire in the long-term. There can be a number of stepping stones or milestones that we want to achieve on the way, which is all part of a strategic process, however the strategic intent is the ultimate outcome that we are trying to achieve.

• CB [17:35] What would you do to align the intent of your superiors with your intent for Talison Mine?

• RK [17:38] Ultimately, once the board or my superiors have set a target that I agree to, I then take that really as gospel and I set my own target to achieve that. I don’t get any direction on how it’s done. Basically it is up to me and my team to develop our strategies to actually achieve that strategic outcome.

• CB [18:17] Explain how you will perform your environmental analysis for the Mine.

• PS [18:20] I talk about environment that includes all the aspects of the mine - not just in terms of environment in the pure sense of the word. As I have mentioned, we have a number of plans within the operations and ultimately I manage my operation through a quality management system. I also have an environmental management system, however the different aspects are all done through an impact and aspect statement. Basically, I will be determining what the risks of the operation are -
whether it is day to day or whether it is perceived as long-term or industry basis. We go through each of these various departments and identify where the high risks are. We do that on a number of ways. We have our own quality management system where we are intent to use that to identify all the risks and then out of that we determine what level those risks are on. We have a likelihood impact outcome on each of those and we rank them and based on that ranking is how we prioritize them and then we determine basic methods on how to mitigate those risks.

- CB [20:00] What are the factors that you would use to conceptually analyse the internal and external situations impacting on your mine in order to acquire a comprehensive situational awareness?

- PS [20:20] Well focusing on the factors - the external ones are reasonably simple. It is the high level ones that you naturally will work more with the executive team - things like global economy, exchange rates, markets and those types of things. However, from a site side of things, the external analysis we look at transport - shipping, we look at power and its supply, we look at public relations with regard to potential changes and their impacts, and we also look at the rest of the industry because with the potential of the unions and them having us in their sights. We also look at the impact of various governments, because as different governments come in, they change the industrial relations strategy. Those are the external type things that we look at. One of the other things we also look at, from an external side, is changes in legislative requirements with regard to environmental policy and intent. I suppose that would also imply our occupation, health and safety with intent that regard to possible changes to legislation - so that is also included in the external things we look at. We would analyse that and rank them based on a risk basis and then determine various strategies to mitigate them. On the internal side of things there are a number of things we look at. Starting at the coal face would be the all-
body - we do an optimisation on the all-body on a regular basis. We take a look at our mine plan, we look at our crushing schedules and our process schedules, we look at our assets themselves with regard to life and maintenance, whether we have actually got the ability to produce the desired outcomes, the right production at the right cost, we also look at other thing such as our quality management systems and our environmental management systems and our occupational health and safety systems, and then that together we will look at our financial performance again. That would be an internal thing. We would look at resources, in order to come up with an overall plan worth submitting to the board for their approval.

- CB [24:48] How do you prepare yourself for participation in the mine’s planning cycle?
- PS [23:10] I suppose there are a number of things that I use at various times of the year, which becomes part of the calendar of schedules. An analysis of our historical results would be reviewed on a monthly basis, and on a yearly basis and previous year’s trends would be looked at in order to prepare myself. That combined with where we would like to go with regard to our overall strategic intent, from production and especially if it becomes expansions and trying to expand production - put that together with the historical information. I need to put this all in my mind as to where I think the organisation should go or needs to go and what milestones or possible hurdles there will be in front of us that we need to address, so that we can actually come up with a plan that we can overcome them and ultimately met the strategic intent.

- CB [24:27] Who from your staff participates and what are their roles within the planning process?
- PS [24:30] Ok. We are pretty luck that we have a fairly low staff turnover so a lot of the people have worked for me for quite a while and in support we have very good
systems in place. Basically those systems are there for business continuity, so that if
one of us do leave or something happens to us (succession planning in place) the
operation does not have any risk. What those systems actually do is to have the
mine set up in a very systematic process. The people I involve are my managers,
some of their reports, some of them have direct responsibility for looking after some
of those systems. I would say that they in their own rights would have to go and
develop their own business plans for their own departments after I have given them
directions with regard to their tonnages and the outcomes we desire. We would then
sit down as the management team and possibly on a one on one discuss their plans
in order to ensure that they achieve the outcome. Naturally if something passes that
we are unable to overcome, I would need to find away for additional funding or I
would have to go back to the board (external requirements) to say there is a
problem with our ultimate goals. However, I think we do very well here with our
business planning and our systems are in place. Once we review those plans, we
are able to identify quite quickly when there is going to be an issue or when we will
be able to make those ultimate objectives. We also have a system in place which I
call the TOP programme. This actually stands for Talison Opportunities Programme,
which is a system we use to actually identify ways of improving production and
improving efficiencies and in any way improve the operations. This is a fairly formal
process where we get things from the shop floor right through to manage different
teams and actually use that to prioritise and to improve the systems which again
helps with our overall planning cycle.

- CB [26:49] How and when do you provide guidance to your staff for planning?
- PS [27:00] I seem to have lots of meetings. Basically all these meetings are a formal
  process of communication both up and down. Once I have a fairly good idea of what
  I would like to do and to achieve as far as what the board wants, we would have
what we call a budget planning meeting where we go through and try to determine
the production schedules required to meet our overall marketing outcomes. The
management team would then disappear into their own areas, in their various
functions, and actually work through those from a production side of things to see if
the plan is actually achievable. We would then also come to an agreement on what
to improve on, in order to efficiently perform. This would be worked on for the year,
so that again further increase of our productivity can take place. We then come back
on a number of occasions until we end up with a production plan or schedule which
will actually meet the marketing schedule. Once that is all done, we would work
through a number of other processes, namely costing meetings to determine our
financial budgets and ultimately we would end up with an overall business plan with
all the little individual business plans for each of the departments. That would be our
ultimate pinnacle in setting our target for the year, setting our objectives for the year
and also demonstrating what our outcomes would be.

- CB [28:56] To what extent does gut/intuition feel play a role in establishing a holistic
  picture of your environmental analysis?
- PS [29:00] I suppose as you work for an industry for quite a while, you do end up
  with using a lot of intuition or gut feel in making a lot of decisions. We get a lot of
  information and feedback from our market and we have to be able to work through
  that and analyse it and determine what the real potential market outcomes are going
to be for the year and for the next 5 years. We tend to do a 5 year detailed business
  plan and a 10 year overall business plan in a lot less detail. So, based on that
  feedback, the history and on the lessons learnt over the last 10 or so years, I do and
  I am sure that with all this information we have ample to establish what it is we will
  see as a realistic plan. One of the other things is that we all have a lot of experience.
  I am talk about nearly 30 years mining experience for myself and a lot of my
managers would have similar or close to 30 years and between us we have a lot of mining experience and so we do rely on a lot of that experience to determine how high we can set our targets and how far we can push the envelope on a number of occasions. So yes, we do rely on that and base decisions on experience linked with intuition to experience. Intuition gives you the platform. You can only have intuition if you can base it on fact combined with lot of assumptions and ‘guesstimation’ in the way you analyse markets concerning global commodities. Yes, I do believe that experience is a mental basis for that initiative - as I said, we are very much a system based operation.

- CB [31:15] How will you synthesise all the relevant environmental analysis information?
- PS [31:28] No, we are a very much systems based and we do have systems in place. We do thing like impact statements. That is where we identify all the potential impacts, risks and opportunities. We work through those, then we actually rank them based on our ranking system and prioritise them - so basically, once we have done that we analyse them and see whether there are risks and make assumptions. We use that as our way of analysing our risks are for the year and what the main objectives should be for the year and what are the main opportunities for the year.
- CB [32:28] What are the most difficult aspects of implementing your strategic intent?
- PS [32:35] Ok. I think that I mentioned a bit earlier in our discussion that we are not an operation like gold where everything we can mine and produce is sold. We are limited by a market. Unfortunately, we are in a global world market which changes things and impact on local markets, people and economy. Just as we had the global financial crisis last year and the previous year, there are things like that, that impact on implementing our strategic intent. So besides the financial side of things, there are also the applications. We apply our product mainly in industrial mineral type
application and a lot of it goes into IT and those kinds of applications where the
growth, the venture and the design seems to be very fluid and we have a number of
applications which we started-up with in this year and basically they are superseded
the year after. So our biggest thing is working with our strategies to try to determine
and find out how we can stay abreast with current market applications and also how we
work with our customers and actually further improve the use of our products
and future application. So I say that is one of the most difficult things beside the
financials as we also had a number of issues for the last couple of years where our
company went into administration in 2004. It has been pretty difficult working
through three years of administration and then to be taken over by a private equity
firm and then looking at doing IPO and the like. So our corporate direction has been
quite different, even though our overall intent has remained the same. We have had
different boards, we have had different CEO’s and different chairmen and it has
been a little fluid. There are therefore a number of things that impact on
implementing our strategic intent.

• CB [35:24] A point for clarification - being a systems based organisation has this
hampered innovation and creativity within your organisation?

• PS [35:40] I suppose systems is what I have implemented over the years. It is not
stuff that has been pushed by our head office or something like that. The systems
we have include things like people bringing up suggestions. We have a number of
those - role systems which can report incidents or accidents. It will report any misses
or hazards. It also reports any opportunities or if anybody from the shop floor come
up with a suggestion so we do have a formal process that does that. We also have a
number of sub-committees that work through the programme, like our environmental
management committee, made up by a cross-section of the operation and that’s
where they would come up with a number of ideas and initiatives. That would be the
same for the health and safety side of things and like-wise the same thing with our qualities. So I think there are a number of initiatives we have what we call environmental safety incentive schemes, where people benefit from improved production, better costs and safety performance and actually receive a bonus based on that system. Trying to get input from the shop floor ultimately improves all those areas and I hope that causes people to actually contribute and use their initiative to further both their and the company’s outcomes thus making the systems an enablement for delivery.

- CB [23:49] Thank you for your time, insight and willingness to help. It is really appreciated.
- PS [24: 00] It was only a pleasure to help in your research.
25. APPENDIX P: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT MAJ GEN J. JOOSTE

25.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

- General Johan Jooste (MMM, SM, SD). I spent 35 years in the SA Army, joining directly after school. I was a field officer for most my life. Handled various command appointments mostly in the operational area. Successfully attended the Military Academy and attained the academic sword. I successfully completed the Senior Command and Staff Course and the Joint Command and Staff Course. On return from the operational environment, appointed Director Infantry after which I was promoted to Director SANDF and later on Chief Director Army Force Structure, responsible for planning and resource management. My final appointment was the Deputy Chief of the Army. In preparation for civilian deployment, I attained a MBL (with distinction) from the Graduate School of Business Leadership. I have been in the industry for four years now where I worked for a small company for two years. I then joined BAE systems where I am now the Director International Business Development.

- The indicators. CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. JJ – General Johan Jooste the interviewee. Location: BAE Systems Boardroom route 21 Corporate Park.

25.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

- CB [00:00] Afternoon General Jooste. (Shake hands and sit down opposite to each other). In order for any contribution to the body of knowledge, work needs to be reviewed by peers. Your dual profile of military and civilian experience supports your suitability. I am very grateful for your willingness to participate in the assessment of my proposed model for conceptual strategic intent formulation. First order of business is the completion of the ethical consent form. Are there any objections?
• JJ [00:36] Colin, I have read through it and concur. Here is the signed copy.

• CB [00:50] Provide a synopsis of your career, within the military and civilian sectors.

• JJ [00:51] I spent 35 years in the army. I joined directly after school. I was a field officer for most my life. I went into the headquarters for the first time at the age of 44. I was appointed Director Infantry after which I was promoted to Director Projects and later on Director Army Force Structure responsible for planning and resource management and then later I became the Deputy Chief of the Army. I have been with industry for more than four years now where I worked for a small company for 2 years. I then joined BAE systems where I am now the Director International Business development.

• CB [01:36] Thank you Sir. What is your understanding of the concept ‘Strategy and its development’?

• JJ [01:43] I firmly believe that strategy is about achieving your aim, by means of the management of resources within a changing environment - it is ultimately to achieve your aim. Strategy development for me is not a continuum you move along, it is an iterative process. Sometimes the strategy will be clear and it will happen as you plan and all the dominos fall into the right places or at other times it goes all wrong. You need a strong leader. However, I also don’t see strategy necessarily as a long-term planning process, although it is the direction giving the macro strategy. It is emergent strategy (the day to day operations) that is used to realise the strategy in the short term. Therefore it is a mixture of long-term direction with short term realisation. The short term, built up of achievements, will unlock the long-term end-state. In order for this to take place, you need a CEO that is bright enough to see and hear opportunities knock and to use his intuition. Opportunity is about gaining
the initiative within a turbulent environment. As the set of facts are continually
ing changing, strategy development is like making sausage - it gets messy! Strategy
development using the clichéd analogy can be compared with the orchestra. Each
instrument on its own provides a musical capability. Only in an orchestra will this
capability be realised. With the introduction of the conductor, the orchestra will be
able to play a concerto. The quality of the concerto will be determined by the
conductor and not the instruments. Now, back to strategy development. It can be
linked to the orchestra, where each instrument can be linked to a functional
department on their own, only providing one sound, in this case human resources.
The strategy is only synthesis with the introduction of the CEO. Furthermore, the
CEO's mindset is the critical success factor - can the CEO think entrepreneurially
even though he might be in a bureaucratic organisation. Therefore the strategy
formulation is all about the CEO and the quality of the staff.

- CB [02:51] Explain your understanding of “Intended strategy and Realised strategy”.
- JJ [02:54] My first remark is that “failing to plan is planning to fail” even though it is
  also an old clichéd comment, it provides pivotal focus for any strategy. Strategy
  resides within an ever changing environment. Planning is a non-negotiable. The
  question is, how do you plan to land up with realising an intended strategy, not
  forgetting that there is also emergent actions that will either prevent you or assist
  you. Keep in mind that the more uncertain, insecure your environment, the more
detailed your plan should be. As a Military Officer we know that mobile operations
need more detailed planning and control measures and that this will lead to an
increase in contingency planning due to the uncertainty. This approach is in the
mind of the Officer and therefore should also be in the CEO. So, one must plan
properly, but one must avoid analysis paralysis because low and behold the
environment will change and you will have to react then and there. There is no time for planning or analysis. So have a target and monthly review alignment with it, as things can change dramatically on a daily basis. Intended strategy must be the end state while realised strategies are those small victories that drive us forward. Emergent actions will happen and I think the thing is not to engage in a blaming game as it is a pure waste of energy. This will hamper your focus as the CEO from the big picture to the micro-management aspect. If you can’t implement your strategy it will be your problem as the CEO. You will be invited to numerous decisions with the board and the word ‘performance’ will be thrown around. You will only get the value of strategy once it has been implemented as it will be tangible for the stake-holders to measure. There is the old thing of intended strategy development during “indabas” or “bosberaad” resulting in beautiful plans that we don’t implement for some or other reason. This strategy has not been realised and then you wonder why. It is on the flipcharts board of the “bosberaad” of three years ago. This is one of the most de-motivating aspects for staff, especially good and bright ones, as they were at that planning session, and most probably provided solutions which never made it out of the “indaba”. This then leads to asking the question why would they want to contribute to any intended strategy formulation again. Colin interjects {is there any other than turbulent environment} No …the business is competitive. I like the term “glo-cal” when you plan global and act local. Business must not at any stage be comfortable. If you don’t like a little discomfort you should not be in business and then you must go to the civil service. Therefore intended strategy contributes to the end-state the realised strategy is at micro-level and contributes to the end-state. The military devised a dashboard for the operations room from which this can be managed - it is called the lines of operation. All intended objections and contingences could be used for emergent actions.
• CB [05:13] What is your understanding of the concept “Strategic Intent”? 

• JJ [05:20] Colin, your suggestion of two types of strategic intent - the Company and CEO intent, got me thinking. I think you have something there. I have always seen intent as a personal embodiment of oneself as a projection of “will” and in this case the CEO’s “will”. You can link the CEO’s “will” to your CEO’s intent which must be so clear that even if you asked the secretary certain things, ok not to quote confidentially… they must be able to say the boss means this. The boss won’t mind you being late as the client comes first and his intent states that we go the extra mile. Strategic intent is the embodiment of the view, the focus, the dream and the vision of a person - that person being the CEO. Furthermore, strategic intent needs to be so repetitive, simple and providing enduring truths. I need to stress that there are enduring truths in strategic intent. the personal one. Like the late Anton Rupert, Christo Weiss and Sol Kersner, they each had a strategic intent. Colin Interjects {do you believe that somebody else can do the strategic intent within the Company?} No. Nobody can do the CEO’s strategic thinking for him. There is another side to that question and that is that we must limit the CEO’s involvement within the details and mechanics of the analysis and planning. If this involvement is not limited, his focus will be diverted from the macro picture to the micro operations resulting in a frustrated staff. It is important that the CEO is able to sit on an aircraft and scribble down things or do a word document or draw a mind map. He will often be supported in the development of options for those scribbles or mind maps. Unfortunately, his thinking will have to be done by himself. The analogy I like using is trading in stocks. When you want to buy stock, you will look at the company’s performance and track record, then you look at the leadership and you look at the boss. If that boss does not impress you, the chances are that you will not be buying shares as he does not inspire you and does not project credibility. Placing this into context of your question
you cannot inspire with the slogan of one of your staff, you have to have your own slogans.

- CB [07:45] Explain the role of the CEO, in the “Strategy Development” process.

- JJ [07:50] I always see it as a loose-tight approach. There will always be a set of non-negotiables. The boss has to stand-up early in the process and often has to say “Listen people, we are in the tyres business. We don’t sell wheels and I don’t do rims, I sell tyres”. That being so, he sometimes has to allow the development of strategy and this is normally done with the aid of his staff using his stated intent as the boundaries in which to operate. He’s got to allow options to be formulated of aspects that he would not necessarily have thought of. This contributes to the adage that staff make decisions in order to enable commanders to take decisions. This is especially evident when you are very successful as there is a great danger of complicity and group thinking of the staff. This is where the people almost parrot the boss. Therefore you as the boss need to be direct but in such a way that you cut people enough slack to really allow them to inform you and to challenge you. All leaders will say that …as their introduction to their planning session supported by the familiar saying of “gents there is no right answer”. But, as soon as somebody puts forward something, the boss’s body language will tell the story of either approval, disapproval or boredom. Building on my analogy, the suggestion is bicycle tyres and a quick snap from the boss “No, I am truck tyres!” This indicates even though the boss provides the intent and boundaries for planning his role it is also one of process facilitator. This eludes to the fact that the leader needs to be a strong leader but you must also be able to facilitate in the real sense of the word. I am of the opinion that the CEO’s role should be one of “descriptive from the CEO and prescriptive from the Staff”. Another way you can see it is that only the boss can
take decisions and other people make decisions. In the military we know that good staff make decisions so that the Commander can take decisions. Ultimately the boss will say “I will not pursue that opportunity in Iceland.” If it fails and tomorrow the board ask why we were not there. “Look, now your competitor is in Iceland”, the responsibility for that decision is at the door of the CEO for not exploiting the opportunity.

- CB [09:55] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view “That strategic Intent is made up of CEO Intent and Company Intent”.

- JJ [09:58] As I said before, I think you have something here which explains the quandary we find ourselves in. I believe it has to be both. I see it as a two pronged approach similar to what we use in the military campaign planning process. The Commander develops his intent and then the staff within those parameters develop the organisation intent, which consists of the mission, vision and strategic imperatives. Although you as a CEO will give line guidance and you will get line guidance from the board, there will be a functional facet and there will be specialist to assist you as part of your staff. You sometimes have champions with additional skills that will support your intent and sometimes you are just lucky that on your staff is a bright guy and he knows additional things or he did service in Singapore and he knows specific parts of Asia, or even all of those put together. Sharp staff officers will allow the boss to detach from the mechanics and allow him to be more dynamic as he will be able to concentrate on the strategic aspects by scribbling these things on little pieces of paper as he travels around the world or as he sits in the back of his car. The rest of his staff will probably be bound to the process and they definitely add to the development of his intent - that opening address, those non-negotiables,
those enduring truths will come from him but they need flesh. You can't have a strategy just based on that!

- CB [11:06] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view of the construct of Compliance versus Service delivery?

- JJ [11:12] I firmly believe in compliance and governance. The literature will tell you about Richard Branson approach. I see him as an exception. If you have an engineering company down the road and you have 60 engineers - that is beautiful. Everybody wears what they want and parks wherever they want, they work the hours they want but it is your own money so if someone loses a thousand rand you rap him over the knuckles. However, in a corporate world there has got to be compliance. I honestly don’t think as a rule that the mavericks are necessarily that successful that is why I support your optimal environment. It provides a practical understanding. I am however of the opinion that, ‘maverick thinking’ and moral courage on the other hand is important, very important. But once again this resonates within the leader – the CEO. You can be so good with ticking the boxes that you lose track of the world around you and miss the opportunities. I am not saying that they are not important but what I am saying is they must be appropriate. Take our organisation’s operational assurance statement. Every quarter you fill this diligently in and you must, but one has to check oneself that it does not become the ‘be all and end all’ of your job. If it does the chances are good that you won’t have the job much longer. Therefore reporting is a means to an end and must only ensure that things are running smoothly showing that you don’t cause reputation risk, and that there is no wastage that you are aware of. Yes, what emanates from this continuum is risk threshold, your ability and willingness as the CEO to assimilate risk and if you have a manoeuvrist mind set or an attritional one.
• CB [13:11] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view of the Construct of CEO and Staff Participation in Strategy?

• JJ [13:18] I referred earlier to functional areas and to specialist advisors. It is very important especially in a corporate environment to structure planning participation. Your construct places everything into context. Emphasis must be placed on the handover of the CEO’s concepts - your point six to the planning team. The plan’s success rides on the CEO’s ability to provide the team with scope to plan without getting into the mechanics. The military has what they call the Chief of Staff as the driver of the planning process on behalf of the Commander. Unfortunately, the business does not have a Chief of Staff to coordinate making this task the CEO’s responsibility. If he is not solid, this with lead to meddling. Placing the team into context is to know the CEO’s strategic intent so well that they don’t waste your time as you can sit for weeks and plan with no result. Successful planning is based on critical chemistry and the only way to make it work is through leadership.

• CB [15:12] What is you opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 1: Mandate?

• JJ [15:26] Well, what gripped me with your mandate step is that you have refrained from the old adage of the problem statement. This could have been anything and it was only one dimensional – that’s tangible. However, you have introduced the principle expectation and I see that this concept can combine the tangible and the intangible aspects of the board very well. Getting them to sign off could be challenging, however if you couple that to the King Three report, it will actually support the chairman’s duty. I believe that a mandate is important. It gives direction and it gives credibility not only to the company but also to the leadership of that company. A mandate must not be a commandment or a law but it bust be written correctly and be formal. As much as a mandate is empowering, it can be restrictive.
Thus the CEO needs to create his own awareness of the board’s expectations prior to any further analysis on his side. Keeping with my analogy this is where the CEO gets certainty and understanding of the board’s expectation of growing the business and increasing the shareholders value by 15%, therefore we need to move into smaller tyres, for example bicycle tyres and tricycle tyres and get into exporting to Asia. Now that you have linked the board’s expectations to your mandate they will sign off on it now. You have also created internal expectations that have to be mapped.

- CB [18:40] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 2: External?

- JJ [18:43] The external environment is very important and you need to have 360 degrees as it falls directly into your supply chain. You can do nothing without a good supply chain. Your structure and questions will most definitely provide the CEO with a departure point. The analysis will provide you with a footprint in the world where you can apply the mandate received. Yes competition is important but there is a big world when you talk external environment. Therefore it is imperative that you need a structured approach to ensuring relevant analysis. This is strategic thinking of the CEO as he anticipates making sense of all those variables without getting analysis paralysis. This factor has the ability to overwhelm any individual. Sometimes you have to close the door and go into a huddle and figure it out for yourself. Furthermore, without looking forward most of the time I can’t see how you will be on top of things - you know that you can work yourself ‘poor’ very easily. Colin Interjects {What is the focus of the CEO in the external environment?}. It is outward looking. If it is not then the company will not make it. He has his binoculars and will sit next to his radar and evaluate his areas of influence and areas of interests. It is sometimes difficult as CEO when you are taking a hammering from the board to
take the time to re-establish your awareness prior to taking action. This can be compounded by the internal activities such as when times are tough. In order to face all of those and the staff also plays a role. You don’t then go to the boss and say “I see so and so has a design”, and a little later there is the production manager saying “you know that test machine is also broken” and the marketing director informing him that the competition has just ‘wowed’ that contract. Those are small things and the guy can get overloaded and you have to sense that. This is where I think your model will be able to structure his awareness process. If you are the boss you must have the guts to look at things.

• CB [21:23] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 3: Internal?

• JJ [21:26] Things that come to mind with me are critical resources - well all the resources could be critical. The other night I flew back from London. I sat next to Vera Kriel, a 40 something strategic planner for SAA, and I mentioned to her that from the results I have read that SAA is doing well. I asked her what they have done differently. Without any hesitation she said to me that they don’t forget the zeros. When you are so big a hundred thousand, a million is what you normal focus on but we got control of those hundred rand and thousand rand with prospective measures, and you live within your means then you will has a good year. This is where I think your step 3 can be used to achieve just that. Things that don’t happen in our country include reaffirming critical resources, organic growth. I must know how big I can get especially if I have a board and shareholders. If you as the CEO can’t grow my business tell me and I will find somebody else. You can’t give me a forecast that will not support the growth as it will be that you are just working us poor. You will find small companies going down, as the marketing department can’t do their jobs properly as the company might just have grown too big too soon. The
underlining internal factor for the CEO is his ability to put teams together and not necessarily always project teams and to identify relevant skill sets. If you are a good leader, you will know how to manage culture as a large contingent of expectation. You need to use members of all cultural groups - this is imperative within this country. You will have an alternative meeting with a supplier that is American and consultant that is German as you move out into the market place. The hotel chain is a good example doing business. You meet a lot of different people and you must not underestimate cultural diversity. Colin interjects {Sir, in the military, we use the word combat potential and combat power can this be linked to business?} Yes, most definitely. As a matter of fact we have been thinking about this and we have come up with the following definition: “growth potential is to increase shareholder value”. If the business does not grow, you are becoming poorer - so inherent growth which is constituted from business acumen from the CEO’s ability to group resources.

• CB [24:56] What is you opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 4: CEO Strategic Intent?

• JJ [25: 01] I agree that the CEO is to be of superior cognitive ability and function on level 5 and 6 of Bloom’s taxonomy. Depending of cause on what level he may find himself within the organisation will determine his impact of the intent developed. There is however a common sense and intuition that is inherent in the CEO. How do you teach people that? Why do only a few people have? This brings us back to the clichéd argument of “are leaders born or developed”? What I do know is that without it the CEO is nothing more that a well educated individual.

• All I know apart from this cognitive thing is that the CEO must have the ability to grasp his environment. This is possible by the sharpness of an individual - his intellectual capacity and assimilating of many facts. Reading a lot really helps. There
is an old saying that “they lead so well as they read so well”. Even although they may be ardent readers, there is still something called intuition, gut feel! Ok, you can’t tell the board that you had a gut feeling as that could be the last thing you say - as your experience develops so does your gut feeling. I think the most important thing of strategic intent besides the formulation thereof is how you communicate it. Your staff will be able to derive the company vision. Eskom made a big mistake. They had a powerful message in their slogan “Power to all” and it back-fired on them badly. The message was powerful. I am not advocating that you make slogans as they will not run your business. I did a case study or 2 when I did my MBL with Rembrandt. Anton Rupert chairperson’s address stayed the same for almost a decade, only written slightly differently - those enduring truths stayed the same. When you get to his line managers you go to the boss of the Rembrandt division and he will open his drawer and he has a lamented page with the chairman’s address and his mission, vision and non-negotiables all addressing the chairman’s address and therefore bringing it to fruition. Just look at my company BAE system. This company is multi-national, the second largest of its kind in the world. We have offices in 44 countries with a staff complement over 100 000 people on the pay roll and yet the boss provides us with his intent - innovate, trusted and build. You will find it right throughout the company. The communication will lead to permeation of the CEO’s intent, which in turn contributes to it being lived throughout the company. I think strategic intent is crucial for a successful company and it must come from the CEO. You cannot calculate the CEO’s intent. However, you need calculations to assess feasibility in option building in your attempts to achieve strategic intent. You must keep in mind that passion and inspiration. Not everybody can sell a message. Contrary to this, when I studied, I was taught that it is a type A person - well spoken, who was in charge. Charisma was seen as something different, however today you
find more type E people and this therefore has changed. The reason being that they listen better. They are unassuming, they will stand up in the boardroom in the morning and not make the best speech, but they are genuine and real with a conviction. They lead by example. Charisma, I have learnt, is something of an inner strength. You look at a guy who is the CEO of a place. He was not the head boy at school, was not on the student’s council and did not play any sport but the minute he speaks, he makes sense. He is not absolutely articulate, well spoken or extraverted. You will find a lot of guys with inner strength are the ones that you need - thus making the old discussion of introvert and extrovert a moot argument. There is a new type of leader around. Yes you need charisma but the one that comes from inner strength. This will come in unique ways supported by years of practice, how you discipline yourself in your thinking, your track record and how credible you are within the eyes of people. People will not care to listen until you show them that you care. Colin interjects {Can this change be attributed to the introduction of technology?} I believe that people have come to the realisation that technology is no substitute for the face and voice of the boss. The boss has to walk the floor and the CEO has to attend those functions. The people need face to face communication. This has led to the acquisition of video conferencing - now the CEO as a package and he must be credible!

• CB [31:31] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view of Application Guidelines?

• JJ [31:38] You have touched on the entrepreneurial being and a corporate being which is where your model will have to move seamlessly. One could draw a 2 by 2 chart that says there is the proactive and reactive linked to the entrepreneurial and a corporate CEO. I am thinking of a cycle as for years we have been taught that structure follows strategy but later on we have seen that this is not true. It is like this
- first of all you will have a strategy which will lead to a structure and as you do that structure you realise that this structure influences strategy. However there comes a time that you just do things differently in order to convey some of the intangibles. It is not a linear thing, it is iterative process. Toyota used to plan on a monthly basis, however you still need a long-term view and a strategic intent but the application of it has to be within the flexibility of the mind of the CEO. Although the plans that have been developed might be static they are only a peg and not forged in concrete.

- CB [33:52] What is you opinion on the researcher’s view of the stretch–range of the CSIF Model?

- JJ [34:02] Definitely. In a small company you will do it differently. What is important is that you do something. Your people are entitled to guidance. If you don’t give them guidance or listen to them it is rolled up on a flipchart or it is on somebody’s C drive. You then have disentitled people and you will miss opportunities. I can see that the CEO’s use of a light vision of the model on the entrepreneurial side amounts to the Israeli map planning process as opposed to the corporate side using campaign planning.

- CB [35:56] Thank you very much for your time and insight General Jooste.

- JJ [36:02] It was only a pleasure. Knowledge that is not shared is no knowledge at all.
26. APPENDIX Q: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT MAJ GEN R. ANDERSEN

26.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION


- **My military career** amounted to Chief Defence Reserves, South African National Defence Force, Member of Defence Staff Council and Military Command Council,

- **The indicators.** CB- Colin Brand the interviewer. RA – Gen Roy Andersen the interviewee. Location: Spur, Rivonia Rd.

## 26.2 TRANSCRIPT INTERVIEW

- CB [00:00] Afternoon General Andersen (Shake hands and sit down opposite to each other). In order for any contribution to the body of knowledge, it needs to be reviewed by peers. Your dual profile of military and civilian experience supports your suitability. I am very grateful for your willingness to participate in the assessment of my proposed model for conceptual strategic intent formulation. First order of business is the completion of the ethical consent form. Are there any objections?

- RA [00:36] Colin, no problem. Here is the signed copy back.

- CB [00:40] Please provide a synopsis of your career, in the military and civilian sectors.

- RA [00:43] Ok. I started in 1966 as a trainee article clerk with Ernst and Young and qualified as a charted accountant in 1972 and as a CPA in Texas in 1974. I worked my way through Ernst and Young and finished off as the Executive Chairman of the company. After that I was head hunted to become the president of the JHB stock exchange, where I was responsible for the restructuring of the stock exchange. When I finished my 5 year contract there, I was head hunted as the CEO of Liberty which I did for 7 years and then on my 55 birthday I retired and took a year sabbatical to write a book and travelled. I came back in a non-executive roll and I have just completed 6 year term as chairman of Sanlam. I am currently the chairman of Murray and Roberts, on the board of Pharmacare and Nampack and I
am on the board of Virgin Active in the UK. At the moment I am focusing as a non-
executive director. As far as my Military career is concerned, I did my national
service in 1966 in the Artillery where I was commissioned. I was then allocated to
the Transvaal Horse Artillery. I served in operation from 1976 onwards, went on to
command the Transvaal Horse Artillery at a young age of 27. I then became the
SSO Artillery at 7 Division and then the SSO Artillery at Ops. Instead of doing the
MBA I did the SA Army staff course, and then went on to becoming a Brigadier. 8
years ago I was appointed and promoted to Maj General and appointed as Chief of
the SANDF Reserves - a post which I still hold. I sit on the Military Staff Council and
on the Defence Staff Council.

- CB [03:00] What is your understanding of the concept ‘Strategy and its
development’?

- RA [03:07] I have a different view on strategy. Strategy is a method on how to
achieve the vision in a company. In other words it is what you do to achieve the
vision that you have set yourself for the company or the entity and it is long-term in
nature. It is way above an operational level - what you need to do in a macro sense
to achieve your vision. The development of the strategy is how you actually get the
thought process to align everything you need to do and to get to that point. I am not
talking about the business plan to get there. I am talking about getting the thought
process aligned to achieve that strategy.

- CB [03:58] Explain your understanding of “Intended strategy and Realised strategy”.

- RA [04:04] Well it is not a terminology that I use commonly. My interpretation of
intended strategy is what you as CEO intended to achieve and the realised strategy
is what you actually achieved. These are not always the same as events transpire to make them different.

- CB [04:27] What is your understanding of the concept “Strategic Intent”?

- RA [04:29] Strategic intent is where the commander spells out to his planning staff what he wants to achieve strategically, so he gives them a broad intent around which to plan. Now in the military that is a clearly defined concept. In business it is not a clearly defined concept. This type of Strategic intent concept in my experience does not exist in business and that is a challenge. This is where I think your model could address this shortcoming in business.

- CB [04:55] Explain the role of the CEO in the “Strategy Development” process.

- RA [05:00] Here my views differ from the textbooks as I base my views on what you actually see. They always say that strategy can be developed from the top down or bottom up. I have never seen a strategy effectively developed from the bottom up. A strategy is typically developed by the CEO with input from his team. The board becomes the sounding board to help develop the strategy. Typically the CEO is put in the position because of his ability to develop a clear strategy of course to get two types of strategies for CEO. You get the entrepreneurial CEO who clearly drives the strategy all the time because it is him developing the business and then you get the professional manager CEO who might in fact get more input from his management team and from the board. Essentially the CEO leads the process of developing the strategy and it is the job of the chairman to ensure that there is alignment between the CEO and the Board. Colin Interjects {That alignment could you please expand on it?} It is somewhere in the middle of being prescriptive and descriptive. I see my role as the chairman of a company to ensure that the board understands where the
CEO wants to take the company and let the CEO understand what the board supports and does not support and the two have to be aligned, so its neither you must to do this or you can’t do that - it is a case of continual dialogue so that there is absolute clarity, so that the two are absolutely aligned. Sometimes there is tension in the process - a classic example you come across where the CEO wants to expand internationally and maybe the board does not think it is the right strategy, then you have a misalignment. That alignment process is vital so let me continue one step further - in order to place it into perspective, it is not only the alignment of the thought processes but also the alignment of the resources that are allocated. Both capital and human resources have to be aligned. If you don’t give the CEO the right resources to achieve it in the form of assets, capital and people - you are not going to get there anyway.

- CB [08:52] That strategic intent is made up of CEO Intent and Company Intent.

- RA [08: 53] Well at the end of the day the CEO intent and the Company intent has to be aligned - I would extend that as there is an important component here - the board intent which you could bring into the CEO intent. You have to align all three. You have to take the CEO’s intent and the board’s intent that has to be the same. This means that sometimes either both or the CEO might have to shift views and then the trick is to ensure that the company’s intent is that same intent. I don’t think the company takes on a life of its own - it is steered from the CEO intent and the board’s understanding of it, but all those ducks have got to be in a row. The board mandates the CEO. In other words the board has got to approve the strategy. So the CEO and his team come up with a concept obviously with some input from the board but at the end there has got to be a session where the CEO says “this is the strategy” and the board has to say “we agree. We mandate you to implement that
strategy and we give you the resources to implement that strategy”. Those have to be aligned. The key to it is the resources and often you don’t get those resources aligned with the intent.


- RA [11:29] Every company has this continuum and the balance varies from company to company. If the CEO is highly entrepreneurial then he has to have people around him to take care of the compliance in order to be successful. This is the point - the team has to be balanced. There is a bottom line of how limited the compliance has to be. Obviously if you only focus on compliance then there will be no performance, so what you have to do is to get the right team. If the CEO is very entrepreneurial then he must be backed up by a compliance team, if the CEO is very compliant then his team around him must have more vision than him. It is to get that balance right and I think to succeed the team must be balanced between those components. Colin interjects {Sir, will a Compliant CEO allow an entrepreneurial team?} It will be challenging, but you see what the risk we run right now is with the introduction of King III. I chaired the directors and board workgroup. This is pushing us towards the compliance side and now what boards are doing to manage those processes is to try and structure their agenda so that the compliance issues don’t block the performance issues. What we try and do is to put the compliance issue at the end of the agenda and the strategy, business plan issues and delivery issues at the beginning of the agenda so that you get that balance right or else we are going to spend our day complying. Sybanes-Oxley is far more rigid than King III and it is far more a tick box approach, in other words, it is far more ‘you got to do this and this’ and then tell the auditors to confirm that you have done it. King III works on a different basis. With King III it is apply or explain whereas Sybanes-Oxley is to
comply - these are different philosophies. When King III says you must apply - it is more principles based, whereas Oxley is more rules based - you have to comply. The view we took in King is that it is far better to comply with the spirit and the principles rather than just tick a box, and this a different approach. Colin interjects {Will the approach support the entrepreneurial thought process?} Indeed it will. We do not want to stifle and ingenuity.


- RA [14:57] The key step here is your point 6 - the sale of the strategy. You have to get the buy-in - that is the critical thing. To generalise, we in South Africa have been very good in the development of the strategy, but we have been very poor in the implementation. That is because we have not been able to sell it and we have not been able to chew it. In other words, you have to chew the strategy and by chewing it I mean that you have to continually work it, reminding the people all the time this is what we have to do and if you don’t get buy in, the strategy doesn’t happen. In the course of business this split between the intent and the strategy is not as clear as it is the Defence Force. The Defence Force is based more on the Chief of Staff approach, where the commander gives his intent then withdraws from the detail for a while. That was designed in the Defence Force to give the commander the ability to keep away from the stress of developing the details and to give the commander the opportunity to be fresh at all times so that he can react to what is generally bad news. So in the Defence Force, you have the Commander and you have the Chief of Staff who pulls everything together. This is a very sensible model whereas in business the CEO tends to be the Commander and the Chief of Staff and there is a weakness in that model. You really need the CEO to be able to withdraw - to take this helicopter view and take the vision. Let us recap - the CEO clearly drives the
strategy process, starting off with his intent and communicating his intent, he tries to get the staff to support him but typically you will find that the CEO plays the major role in the actual development of the strategy. The Chief Operating Officer comments on the feasibility of it and the implementations of it, whereas the Company Secretary’s role is on the compliance issues, can you do that in terms of law. The CEO really has the job, A to sell it to the board and B to sell it to his team. In this process he must not ignore the Chairman. The chairman has an increasingly important role, in other words don’t see the board as amorphous mass. You have the CEO and the board - you actually have the CEO, the chairman and the Board. The chairman’s job is to facilitate the interface between the CEO and the board. I have just come out of a meeting with the CEO of a company because we have a board meeting next week, to get our ducks in a row between the CEO and myself, so that I can tell this is where I will support you and this where I will not be able to support you but he will try and say I need you to support me here - so don’t take the board as an amorphous mass the chairman has a role to play increasingly now it terms of that!

- CB [18:52] What is you opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 1: Mandate?

- RA [18:57] Ok, let us just pause at the CEO’s mandate. How do you see the mandate, is the question. Now where does the CEO get his mandate? First of all, he gets his mandate from the letter of appointment where it said we are appointing you as the CEO; the second place he gets his mandate from King III who spells out what is the role and thirdly in larger companies he gets an authority, a delegation authority, which says ‘this is the things you may do and these are the things you will have to bring back to the board’. So he gets mandated from his letter of appointment, King and his delegated authority. Now that mandate will typically be far
lower than the strategy - in other words his powers are less than the full implementation of his authority. It is important to define what you mean by the mandate. This is where your principle expectation will suffice.

- CB [19:49] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 2: External?

- RA [20:01] In addition to what you have stated, there is another external environment - the expectation of shareholders, because he will know from his engagement with investment analysis exactly what is doable and what is not doable. This does not mean that he has to manage the company on the instruction of the investment analysis, but he needs to understand the shareholder’s expectations and what they will and won’t support; so it is not only the environment and business environment but also their expectations of the external shareholder. Bear in mind that this guy (CEO) has to balance and maintain the balance between short term profitably and long-term strategy for survival. He has to manage the process of developing profit in South Africa every 6 months, in America every 3 months as well as developing the company for the future - that is a tricky one. There is another party society and governments expectations. You have to understand what their expectations are.

- CB [21:12] What is you opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 3: Internal?

- RA [21:36] The resources are made up of financial capital – does he have the financial capital? Secondly does he have the physical assets to achieve and the most important one is does he have the human capital with the right skills? He can’t achieve the strategy without the right skill therefore he has to build the right skill. The trick is to make them all work together!
• CB [21:56] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view Model Step 4: CEO Strategic Intent?

• RA [22:07] Just remember when the CEO gets to his intent formulation, he needs an iterative process with the board. In other words he can’t go through the whole planning process and present the board with a final strategy that the board will not buy. He has to keep sounding off the board therefore he has to use the board, facilitated by the chairman in order to be able to say “I think we need to bring a Chinese partner who will introduce capital and we will go into Africa together.” There is no need for him to take the whole strategy and meet with the Chinese and the board doesn’t want it. So, as he develops his intent he must bounce it off the board. He can’t go straight to strategy development as he will get burnt by the board. He has to bounce it off the board - bear in mind there has to be board involvement and outside investment analyst and shareholders - Remember the CEO can’t do this in a vacuum!

• CB [23:44] What is your opinion on the researcher’s view of the stretch–range of the CSIF Model?

• RA [25:42] Positioning A has often limited analysis support by a lot of instinct and gut feel for the CEO whereas the corporate tends to be more analysing the floating indicator which is well structured to show A in accordance with the company life cycle. As you move towards B, from one generation to the next generation of company which is why family companies often don’t survive the second generation because they don’t have the ability. In other words the first generation has this entrepreneurial flair whereas the second generation should have more of a corporate style and they don’t know how to get there and that is why the companies fail as they will fail to move up your continuum. Colin interjects {Sir, as this indicator
Yes. Most definitely - then your trick is while you are running a well governed company, how to maintain entrepreneurial flair which is also driven in part, by the incentive schemes. You can see what went wrong with the banks. Banks were trying to enforce entrepreneurial executives but they forgot to measure the risk, so during this process there has to be risk management overlay to indicate what risks you are running. The trick in business is to try and maintain good corporate governance, while promoting entrepreneurial flair while measuring the risks. That's the balance you have to get. You need risk management and how you get this entrepreneurial flair is by attracting the right people and ‘incentivising’ them for the right behaviour. With the banks, they were incentivised for the wrong behaviour - they were incentivised to take short term decisions, to generate quick profits, which was not the long-term interest of the bank and there was no risk management. In other words people sitting on top of the company did not understand the risks being run by the derivatives at the bottom and that is what brought the banks into disrepute. They want to be entrepreneurial without the right governance and risk management so I think there are three dimensions, including risk measurement and that is spelt out in King.

• CB[28:34] Any closing comment, Sir?

• RA [28:37] Well the difficulty that you are going to have writing this up is that there is no split between the CEO intent and the strategy in business. They tend to interflow. It tends to be continuous process and perhaps the bottom line is maybe in business the CEO does not have the luxury of a Chief of Staff and staff to do the work for him. He tends to conduct the process himself which may be better of if he could elevate some that. Now, if he can’t, the chairman of the board could play that role.
So, the chairman of the board could be an option to sit above this process and act as the sounding board. I have seen that model work too, which is what I try and do as chairman, is to act as the sounding board and try and take the helicopter view and say why do we do that? Why do you want to go into Africa? Why do you want to bring the Chinese in? Why do we want to open in South America? To act as a sounding board - keep in mind it is typically the CEO that drives the strategy. I will give you an example. I have a strategy session with a company next week - a big company. I, as chairman, will be making the opening statement and then the CEO will make his speech and therefore I as chairman will provide a macro view of the issues so what I am saying is that it is not only the CEO that can provide the intent, it is the chairman that can contribute to that. It varies from company to company and individual to individual.

- CB [30:50] Thank you Sir, for your time and insight.

- RA [30:53] Sorry, it took four attempts to get together. It is a pleasure.
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Thanking you in anticipation for your co-operation, assistance and support.

(Colin G. Brand)
DBL UNISA STUDENT
27.3 CONFIRMING ACCESS TO BECSA MINES (KHUTALA AND KLIPSPRUIT)

Letter from the Vice President BECSA PDA Mr Mc George

24 July 2009

Mr Colin Brand

Dear Colin

Reference your letter dated 17 July 2009 as discussed with me through Ms Jacqui Bruwer.

I would like to take this opportunity to confirm your access to BECSA facilities which include the Khutala and Klipspruit collieries for the purpose of primary evidence collection for your research.

Keep in mind that we are a going concern and that all research activities are not to disrupt any processes. You must comply with all safety regulations prior to entrance to any of the BHP Billiton facilities. Information collected is to be used only for contribution to your research.

Yours sincerely,

NJ McGEORGE

ACTING VP - PROJECT SERVICES
Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, ................................., agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed on the ..............................................
(Mr Dean Hoare)
General Mine Manager: Khutala Colliery

Signed on the ..............................................
(Mr Colin G. Brand)
Researcher
27.5 ETHICAL LETTER OF CONSENT GENERAL MANAGER KLIPSPRUIT COLLIERS

Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, Richard Kenny, agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) on the 29/1/07

Richard Kenny
General Mine Manager: Klipspruit Colliery

Signed on the 29/1/07

Colin G. Brand
Researcher
Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

N.J. McGeorge

I, ........................................, agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) ........................................

on the ........................................

Signed on the ........................................

(Mr N McGeorge)

Acting Vice President BECSA PDA

(Mr Colin G. Brand)

Researcher
Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, (Mrs Serfontein), agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) ........................................ on the ....17/12/09...........

(Colonel Chris Serfontein)

Signed on the ....17/12/09...........

(Mr Colin G. Brand)
27.8 ETHICAL LETTER OF CONSENT COLONEL (RET) P FRANKEN

Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, Pierre Franken, agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place)........................................... on the ..........................................................

Signed on the ..................................................

(President (ret) Pierre Franken) (Mr Colin G. Brand)
27.9 ETHICAL LETTER OF CONSENT MR W. MEYER

Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, [NAME], agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) Centurion on the 14th of September 2010.

(Mr Werner Meyer)

Signed on the 1st of October 2010.

(Mr Colin G. Brand)
27.10 ETHICAL LETTER OF CONSENT MR T. VAN DER WALT

Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, Tjaart van der Walt, agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the published research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) Pretoria on the 15/02/10

(Mr Tjaart van der Walt)

Signed on the 15/02/10

(Mr Colin G. Brand)
27.11 ETHICAL LETTER OF CONSENT GENERAL MANAGER TALISON MINERALS

Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, Patrick Scallon, agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) on the 23/1/10

(Signed)

(Mr Patrick Scallon)
Mine Manager

Signed on the 25/1/10

(Signed)

(Mr Colin G. Brand)
Researcher
Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, ..., agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) ........................................ on the ....... 05-10

Maj Gen (Ret) Johan Jooste

Signed on the 10-05-10

Mr Colin Brand
27.13 ETHICAL LETTER OF CONSENT MAJOR GENERAL R. ANDERSEN

Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, [Name], agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) [Place] on the [Date] by [Name]

Maj Gen Roy Andersen

Signed on the [Date] by [Name]

Mr Colin Brand
Graduate School of Business Leadership: Contributors Ethical Letter of Consent

I, ________________________________, agree voluntarily to take part in the research project being conducted by Colin Brand as part of the requirements for his Doctorate degree at the Graduate School of Business Leadership.

- I have read the research participation information document and I understand the contents thereof.
- Any queries that I had have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that the information I will supply will be treated confidentially, that it will be used anonymously and that it will only be used in the findings for this research.
- I understand that I do not have to answer all the questions which may be put to me.
- The information which I provide will be held securely until the research has been completed (published) after which it will be destroyed.
- I understand that I am entitled to ask for a debriefing session or a copy of the research at the end of the project.

Signed at (Place) ___________________________ on the _______ ______, 2009

Signed on the _______ ______ 2009

(Colonel (ret) John Brooks) (Mr Colin G. Brand)