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IS THE ORGANISATION ENCODED WITH A 'DNA'
A Theoretical Model which Describes the Process of Growth of an Organisation through a similar process to the Metamorphosis of an 'Egg to a Butterfly'

Nigel Sykes
IS THE ORGANISATION ENCODED WITH A “DNA” WHICH DETERMINES ITS DEVELOPMENT?

A THEORETICAL MODEL WHICH DESCRIBES THE PROCESS OF GROWTH OF AN ORGANISATION THROUGH A SIMILAR PROCESS TO THE METAMORPHOSIS OF AN “EGG TO A BUTTERFLY.”

By Nigel Sykes, Senior Teaching Fellow, Warwick Business School.
Introduction

Growth of small enterprises has been a subject of research and practical interest for decades.

It still remains unclear:

i) why some firms grow and others do not
ii) the role of motivation
iii) how firms grow
iv) whether only some firms are capable of growing
v) how the concepts of constraints and motivation interact with one another

This paper takes as its theme that firms, which grow, evolve and that the nature of the team skills to facilitate that growth changes, often fundamentally.

It takes the well-known Edith Penrose analogy of the caterpillar and the butterfly and describes the metamorphosis.

It begins by reviewing the start up team and isolates three “character” types, the 3Es.

- Envisioners
- Enablers
- Enactors

It argues that the truly successful start up blends these characteristics together.

As the business moves through the developmental stages, there are several changes:

i) The “original” 3Es need to modify
ii) More individuals need to come on board
iii) The skill base needs to widen to include others: Gatherers, Promisers etc.
iv) The skill base widens, diversifies and changes character
v) Inclusion of new product development phases: Concept testing, qualitative screen, viability testing, product testing, test marketing and full launch.

In principle the paper describes the full range of skills that would be present at the butterfly stage.

The model is not prescriptive, but may be helpful as a “measuring rod” to encourage an organisation to recognise where it is on the change continuum and enable it to become more relaxed about the conditions it is experiencing. It may be possible to become better equipped to anticipate and as a result gain more confidence in the planning process.

The model could be applied to the non-profit sector. It has already been used in the value led sector, to describe the development of the Butterwick Hospice, a case study developed by Dr Martin Johnson.
Certain conditions will facilitate team cohesion, for example, inter alia:

- A shared vision.
- An environment which seeks to encourage individuals to apply their unique gifts.
- An openness which recognises and accepts weakness. To illustrate, training would seek to help people cope in their area of weakness rather than being seen as a means of making them enjoy or become proficient at it.
- Matching of an individual’s skills and attributes to the changing demands of the growing organisation and to appropriate stages of continuous product/service development.

The model encourages organisations to accept the inevitability of change; the metamorphosis process is uncomfortable but necessary to achieve sustainable growth and improve the chances of long term, success.

With this model, individuals’ differences need to be recognised and embraced to maximise their personal development, and change is seen as a positive learning experience. Thorough pruning is traumatic for a vine, but enables it to live longer and bear more and improved fruit.

**Background**

The process of growth and phased transition is well established, Edith Penrose in her book “Growth of the Firm” (1959) describes:

"The differences in administrative structure of very small firms and very large are so great that in many ways it is hard to see that the two species are of the same genus..."

"We cannot define a caterpillar and use the same definition for a butterfly."
This metaphor has been extensively quoted in the small business literature and will form the framework for this model. The diagram (Fig 1) shows the stages of metamorphosis of a butterfly. Penrose differentiates between caterpillar and butterfly but I believe it is necessary to extend this in order to understand each stage from Egg (Inception and convergence), Caterpillar (emergence and team enlargement), Chrysalis (Consolidation and product development stages) to Butterfly (release to fragmentation).

Fig 1, Egg to Butterfly

Organisations need to be encouraged to change when resources and confidence are positive. It is during growth phases that firms wanting to expand should plan to change. A phase transition period precedes a new operational level. It is preferable to anticipate, rather than react beyond the maturity stage of the growth cycle. The team needs to be reassured and encouraged to continue through to the end of each period of transition or ride out the inevitable turbulence. Political stability, unity and strong leadership are necessary conditions in order to achieve completion and enjoy subsequent growth. The diagram draws from Prof. Charles Handy’s book the Empty Raincoat, which describes the necessity to move from one Sigmoid curve to another. As well as the need for political stability, Handy states that it is important for managers to be prepared to implement change, perhaps knowing that they may no longer have skills appropriate to match the needs of the enlarged operation. It is equally important to be able to recognise the duration and the characteristics of each transition phase. A firm, which changes course, will need to persevere although it may be tempted to prematurely birth or leave a transition phase. The characteristic phases are described as follows:
Egg - Firm has decided on its growth trajectory. It is planted in position with a start up team and sufficient resources to sustain it through “pre-emergence”. The casing represents the boundary of the specialist niche in which it has chosen to operate. The egg stage is, at least initially, unattractive to predators and to an extent therefore the firm is protected from competitors. Confidence must be maintained in order to fulfil this initial phase rather than being tempted to “step out” into the “high risk box” of the Ansoff Matrix. (i.e. New Product and/or New Market options)

Caterpillar – the firm emerges from its protective market segment and forages for resources and perhaps adopts a market penetration strategy. The firm is more vulnerable when it is both hungry for resources and becoming attractive to predators. At this stage the business is attractive to bigger firms who may be seeking to expand through market penetration or acquisition. Some owners, wanting to capitalise on their early success, could choose to adopt a deliberate strategy of seeking to exit and be taken over at this stage. The reverse strategy would be adopted and the highest price being achieved as a result of appearing attractive to take-over. The deliberate exit strategy option is discussed in the Churchill and Lewis model.

Chrysalis – the organisation retrenches and deliberately settles for a time of reformation. This is a time when pressure for harvest by stakeholders may be most extreme. New product development and an inward investment policy of stored resources adopted. The business becomes like a chrysalis in order to prepare to become a “butterfly”. The waiting and utilisation of resources is important and premature emergence or even extraction of resources needs to be avoided. This will be represented diagrammatically and in more detail later. Typically, new people join the organisation and are collectively, responsible for product development and testing. These 6 subordinate phases are called, Concept testing, the Qualitative screening, Viability, and Product testing, Test marketing and ultimately Full launch.

Butterfly – this is a time of release and the full impact realised, of having patiently waited through to maturity of the Chrysalis. The firm has now developed and may choose to launch a new product. It enjoys the potential of further developments emerging from the now established, product development and testing process. The core business may have reached full maturity and be gradually phased out. Subsequent product developments would be available to facilitate further expansion and the possibility exists to develop spin off companies. (See fragmentation above). The metaphor of the butterfly, being now relatively short lived and whose objective is to establish a new generation seems appropriate. In a subsequent paper I will demonstrate the post butterfly structure which resembles Chaos Theory.

Growth models, (e.g. Greiner, Scott and Bruce, Churchill and Lewis) partially reflect this transitional development, without defining the stages in this way. I anticipate being able to demonstrate for each theoretical stage level, a description to help inform management and assist in the decision making process. The stages of development are different and management must understand the unique characteristics of each phase and adapt their management approach accordingly.

There is a temptation to prematurely emerge from each transition stage. Pre-birthing from the Chrysalis stage will surely result in the failure of the firm. The model
depends on each phase of transition being anticipated, planned for and completed, despite environmental, peer or stakeholder pressure.

**Existing World Order and current understanding**

Before describing the new “Egg to Butterfly” model it would be useful to reflect on some existing theory and to establish a basis of comparison.

David Storey in Understanding the Small Firm Sector, develops the idea that there are three areas which may impact on the growth and success of a firm. These dimensions relate to decisions taken prior to start up, which have particular significance on the entrepreneur or founding team. The second dimension relates to decisions taken at the time of start up, which may relate to legal form and here it may be appropriate to add “trajectory of start up”. Finally after start up, consideration is given to the importance of strategic decisions. Under these headings, subsidiary factors are identified and significance to firm success attributed to whether coverage is, or is not given in the literature and whether identified as positively or negatively correlated with success.

Storey represents this approach using three overlapping circles and describes a possible DNA of the firm, in that each firm may have an identifiable characteristic, which could help us to better understand the performance of a firm.

**ALL SEEING EYE OF HORUS**

- **SELFISH VISION**
  WHICH IS FUELED
  BY A NEGATIVE
  MOTIVATIONAL
  FORCE.

  i.e. Fear of failure, I will prove myself, “cash is king”, insecurity, hiding childhood hurts.
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Fig 2, Dollar note – Eye of Horus
The Egg to Butterfly model also seeks to develop an understanding of the environment and culture which is most appropriate to facilitate the development of the firm. Indeed some characteristics of the founder or founders may be significant in terms of arresting progress. Before demonstrating the new model it is necessary to reflect upon what currently happens. Fig 2 shows a section of a Dollar note. I have chosen this because it is a powerful representation of an unsatisfactory growing environment, certainly in terms of achieving sustained and intergenerational stability and success.

As described by Storey, the environment or encoding before start up sets the “culture” in which the organisation can develop. A firm, formed around a founder’s selfish expectations, may see this spirit pervade and indeed become the character of the organisation. The founder may see the business as purely a vehicle to achieve the fulfilment of future life style expectations or to compensate for low self-esteem. As a “cash is king” motive may exist, the Dollar note is a powerful reference to this but also carries an unusual picture of a pyramid. So many firms develop into this hierarchical structure. The picture is disturbing because so many organisations seek to achieve their objectives by so controlling the resources that conditioned destruction may be inevitable. It seems, so fixed in their ways, do these organisations become, that they are destroyed in the very area of gifting which initially made them successful. Danny Miller in the Icarus Paradox describes this phenomenon. Firms are described as having characteristics termed Builder, Pioneer, Craftsman or Salesmen, and at a time of trouble they over compensate, or “fly too near the sun” in their area of gifting and die. I believe this picture of a pyramidal structure is a warning and to illustrate this I will demonstrate a sigmoid curve or product life cycle. (Fig 3.)

![Hierarchical Growth - c.f. New World Order](image)

**Fig 3, The life cycle of the firm**
The Diagram demonstrates the business cycle, developed in the Strategic Marketing literature as the Product Life Cycle. Indicated are crisis points, which reflect the evolution to revolution phases described by Larry Greiner’s model 1988. An essential prerequisite of the Egg to Butterfly model, are three founder characteristics referred to as the 3Es, (Fig 4) Seen as a requirement for effective start up and a necessary condition for effective growth potential, these attributes will be incorporated in this comparative scenario. The Eye of Horus represents a negative start up environment and is not conducive to cultivating trust, cohesion, sharing.

The most likely project initiators in the team are Envisioners, who tend to pioneer new ideas and Enablers who bring more coherence and form.

THE START UP TEAM

- ENVISIONER

- ENABLER

- ENACTOR
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Fig 4, The core characters types

It would be desirable to incorporate the following attributes or gifts at start up. Described in this model as the Envisioner, the Enabler and the Enactor or 3 Es. These attributes are the basis for all representative types characterised by Belbin, Magarison and Myers Briggs and other management development commentators. To understand these I have characterised them as follows. (Fig 5)
ENVISIONER

TENDENCY TOWARDS
EXPANSIVE THINKING.
BREAKS THE MOULD,
TERMED "CREATIVE
DESTRUCTION"

Nickname: Tigger
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Fig 5, Envisioner

ENABLER

SAFE PAIR OF HANDS,
GOOD ORGANISER,
AND MOTIVATOR.
INTERPRETER OF THE
VISION.
AN INFORMATION
GATHERER.

Nickname "Pastor"
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Fig 6, Enabler
ENACTOR

DETAIL PERSON, WHO CAN CONCENTRATE ON ONE PARTICULAR TASK. SOMETIMES REFERED TO AS A COMPLETER/FINISHER. PENS NEATLY LAYED OUT ON THEIR DESK. Nickname "KING"
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Fig 7, Enactor

It is unlikely that these disparate skills would be attracted to each other and even if this was the case, described below as the "chance encounter", (Fig 8), one person may eventually dominate and three further sequences are described, where a combination of team outcome could occur. (Fig 9, 10 & 11).

THE CHANCE ENCOUNTER

IT IS UNLIKELY THAT THESE DIFFERENT TYPES WILL STAY UNIFIED OVER LONG TERM
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Fig 8, "The chance encounter"
IDEAS AND NO ACTION

- WITH ENABLERS AND ENVISIONERS, THERE IS GREAT ENTHUSIASM AND CLEAR DIRECTION BUT NO SETTLERS TO COMPLETE THE WORK.
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Fig 9, Option 1 – “Ideas and no action”

ANALYSIS AND NO HOPE

WHEN ENACTORS AND ENABLERS COMBINE, ANALYSIS PARALYSIS MAY RESULT. CERTAINLY THERE IS A LIKELIHOOD OF LESS CREATIVITY AND UPDATING OF VISION
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Fig 10, Option 2 – “Analysis and no hope”
STEAM AND CONFUSION

- ENVISIONERS AND ENACTORS COMBINE TO FORM A VOLATILE MIXTURE OF REJECTION AND DENIAL.
  “We can see but they don’t understand!”
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Fig 11, Option 3 - “Steam and confusion”

A character bias will pervade the organisation reflecting the dominant leader type. Envisioners tend to be achievement motivated people but can be creatively destructive and enjoy defending principles. Enablers are consummate networkers and resource gatherers and bring things together. They can have a tendency toward control and may become a “gatekeeper”, using information to control and possibly impede communication flow. They are also likely to be more interested in the process and will bring the vision into focus. Enactors will tend toward fear of failure and concentrate on practice and seek definition. These attributes are vital to success, but unless mutual trust and recognition of individual talent are established, the vision will be stifled and not achieve completion. The concept of a relay race is useful to illustrate this further. An envisioner starts the race but must be prepared to pass the baton (idea) to the enabler who runs, unhindered, the next leg of the race. The enabler makes sense of the vision and translates it and makes it palatable to the enactor or finisher of the race. The process is only complete when each has understood the task and their role and is prepared to release to others, i.e. to unselfishly pass on the idea (baton). The only way this sequence can be maintained is in an atmosphere of mutual trust, understanding, unselfishness, and a shared objective.

The three characteristic types are uniquely qualified and essential for carrying out the phases necessary, for successful process development. Rarely does this team stay together because they are so different and naturally prefer to work with people like themselves. Agreement is easily establish between similar character types and in a time of crisis, our greatest strength can become a weakness. Envisioners may tend to fantasy, Enablers to control and Enactors to denial. The release at this stage is so often not free and open and a dominant “strain” or characteristic takes over and a hierarchy develops and is enforced to carry out the task.
The resultant culture will tend toward control and there may be limited space for people to develop. There is a strong possibility that people will be recruited to fit organisational roles rather than jobs being designed to maximise individual team member effectiveness, development and self-fulfilment.

The Dollar bill (figs 2 & 3) depicts a hierarchical, New World Order pyramid, (Novus Ordo Seclorum), so typical of many larger administrative organisational structures. By contrast I will now move to describe the Egg to Butterfly model, central to the theme of this paper.

**EGG TO BUTTERFLY MODEL**

Again, the Egg to Butterfly Model presents the Envisioner, Enabler and Enactor, coming together around a shared vision.

**SHARED VISION – The environment for the model**

The ‘I’ in Fig 12, represents an alternative vision to that illustrated by the eye on the Dollar note. This “I” for idea or shared vision is typically unselfish. A hospice, which draws people together around a calling, could serve as a good illustration of this. The team is more outwardly focussed and attaches more significance to group goals than to individual self-interest. It is around this that our characters, the Envisioner, the Enabler and Enactor are more likely to exchange a trusting and sharing relationship. This phase is called convergence and sharing (Fig 13). In terms of our egg to butterfly model, we are now at the “egg or resource formation stage”.

**THE IDEA OR VISION**

A SHARED VISION TO WHICH THE TEAM IS COMMITTED AND CONSIDERS MORE IMPORTANT THAN SELF INTEREST AND ASPIRATIONS.
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Fig 12, Cohesive idea or shared vision
CONVERGENCE AND SHARING

- THE COMING TOGETHER OF THE TEAM AROUND A COMMON VISION.

- RECOGNITION OF ATTRIBUTES AND INDIVIDUAL WEAKNESSES
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Fig 13, Convergence and sharing

The team begins to trust each other and to recognise key roles and each other’s unique attributes. The “baton passing process”, enables the team to move out and enlarge the boundaries of the vision. Three people who are frightened and don’t trust each other will react differently from three people who are open and can rely on each other’s skills and competence. The former group may reject each other, as previously described or huddle closely together for protection. In this latter scenario there would be no chance of enlargement occurring, but where there is trust, separation can occur and room made for new members to join. (See Fig 14). The picture, called Bud Burst and Enlarging is the crucial stage necessary for an organisation to demonstrate that mutual trust exists between members of the organisation.

BUD BURST AND ENLARGING

AS THE MEMBERS OF THE TEAM DEVELOP TRUST, EXPANSION IS ENABLED ... THROUGH RELEASE, RATHER THAN CONTROL.
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Fig 14, Bud burst and enlarging

14
Fig 15, Egg to emergence

The team and the organisation enlarge and space is created for intermediary and complementary skills, between the founders. The Caterpillar stage of the model is characterised by the firm being vulnerable and being hungry for new resources. The team is joined by the sales, resource gathering and business development functions. These attributes are extensions and intermediary giftings to complement the founders. They enhance the effectiveness of the growing organisation and the Star of David shape is strong (Fig 16) and it is at the point that the firm may consider a period of consolidation. Figures 17, 18 and 19 demonstrate these interim characters called "fruits". The analogy is chosen not simply to reflect the interim colours in the spectrum but the fruits reflect the different individual characteristics. Evangelists or the selling function represented by figs, (fig 17) which have numerous seeds reflects their abundant ideas and enthusiasm. They are compatible with Envisioners and enjoy sharing ideas. Typically they tend to bounce back from rejection and will be a key strength within new product development, particularly concept testing.

The "Pomegranate" has plentiful seeds which, whilst less in number, following the fig analogy, are more succulent and better formed. This reflects the importance of the "Provider" function and as formers and gatherers, they complement the Enabler function and assist at the qualitative screening and viability stages of product development. "Grapes", following on with the metaphor, suggest a completely formed seed package and mirror the finishing function in the team and sit comfortably alongside the Enactor.
ENLARGING OF TEAM

- NEW MEMBERS ARE INTRODUCED.
- INTERMEDIARY SKILLS OR FRUITS FORM IN THE GAPS.
- CONSOLIDATION

Fig 16, Enlarging the team

EVANGELIST - FIGS

- MULTIPLE SEEDS - IDEAS "SPRAYED" & ONLY SOME WILL BE ALLOWED TO GERMINATE.
- ABUNDANT ENTHUSIASM

Nickname "Catalyst"

Fig 17, Evangelist or selling function
PROVIDER - POMEGRANATE

- ABUNDANCE
- GEARS UP
- RESOURCES
- ENTREPRENEUR
- MOTIVATOR
- LEADER

Nickname “Gatherer”
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Fig 18, Provider – “Gatherer”

DEVELOPER - GRAPES

AS ORGANISATION
ENLARGES A
DEVELOPMENT
MANAGER OR OVER-
SEER IS APPOINTED.

Nickname “PROMISER”
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Fig 19, Developer – Promiser
The Chrysalis stage is perhaps, the most significant phase of the model and is a time when the new product development process is implemented. The firm will enlarge the team to at least a further six members and not emerge to committing to a full launch of a new product until the full six phase process of new product development has been undertaken. The metaphor of a Chrysalis is also powerful because to not go through this vital stage and pre birth could cause, as has been said previously, a mutant rather than the fully developed organisational butterfly. The stages or necessary sequence of product development can be considered as:

- Concept test
- Qualitative screen
- Viability assessment
- Product test
- Test Market
- Full launch

In the following sequence the various stages of Chrysalis, phases 1 to 6, are described. The organisation sets out to develop a new product development process. The firm will be ready to release to full emergence, as a butterfly. When this has occurred, metamorphosis is considered complete. The new associates or team members who join or who are developed from within the organisation have skills or attributes which are needed for the various stages of new product development.

Concept test

Figure 20 illustrates the Concept test phase and the extension of the creative team to include a further two key members (Fig 21 Verifier & 22 Encourager)

CONCEPT TEST

- NEW ASSOCIATES OR EMPLOYEES JOIN THE TEAM TO DEVELOP NEW IDEAS.
- LOW INVESTMENT AND LOW RISK.
- MANY SEEDS AND DISPOSABLE.
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Fig 20 Concept Test
VERIFIER OF CONCEPT

- BOUNDARY PUT AROUND VISION (CONTAINED)
- CONFIRMS TRUTH
- CREDIBILITY ESTABLISHED
- DISCERNMENT
Nickname "Container"
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Fig 21, Verifier

ENCOURAGER - FAITH

- RESEARCH
- DEVELOPS CLARITY OF VISION THROUGH RESEARCH
- CONCEPT GUIDE
- VISION INTERPRETER
Nickname "Shield"
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Fig 22, Encourager

Figure 23, shows early growth, consolidation and concept test stages. As release has been established in the original bud burst or enlargement stages of the model, it is likely, that sufficient trust and understanding exists, to reach consensus. To be able to reject unsuitable ideas at each stage and maintaining team unity is essential. The
group must be equally able to pass on ideas showing promise, to other uniquely qualified group members within the business. The verifier and encourager roles for example are essential to put boundaries and substance around the new vision or concept. It needs to be effectively communicated and hopefully accepted not rejected by the qualitative screening team.

CONSOLIDATION TO CONCEPT

- CONCEPT TEST
- CONSOLIDATION
- EARLY GROWTH

Figure 23, Early Growth, Consolidation and Concept test.

Figure 24 demonstrates the movement through the ongoing phases. This will require fuller description in a subsequent paper. At this stage it is sufficient to recognise the process of moving the idea to each subsequent phase and increasing the team competence and hence enlarging the firm and equipping for subsequent development phases. The new concept has been moved through qualitative screening, viability assessment to product testing. It is assumed that it has passed successfully through these stages and that the opportunity exists for products in development to be rejected at any time.
ENLARGING OF PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT TEAM

- NOW WITH EXPANDING TEAM A PRODUCT OR IDEA HAS MOVED TO PRODUCT TEST.
- ALSO INCLUDES QUALITATIVE SCREEN AND VIABILITY PHASES
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Fig 24, Enlarging of product development team

Figure 25 shows the New product development and team development sequence and Figure 26 the butterfly or seven facets. This is now "ripe for emergence to lay new eggs or ideas.

NEW PRODUCT AND TEAM DEVELOPMENT

Fig 25, Sequence of New Product and Team Development
BUTTERFLY

SEVEN FACETS:
- Original core business
- Concept test
- Qualitative screen
- Viability test
- Product test
- Test market
- Full launch

Fig 26, Butterfly – seven faceted model

As the commissioner (Fig 27), Instructor (Fig 28), Finisher (Fig 29) and the Elder in the Gate (Fig 30), join the ascending sequence to full launch is achieved.

COMMISSIONER

- BRINGS THE FACETS OR TASKS TOGETHER.
- REFERENCE POINT
- ORGANISER AND PLANNER

Nickname “Sweetener”

Fig 27, Commissioner
INSTRUCTOR/SPECIALIST

- TENDS TO BE HAPPIEST WHEN FOCUSED ON A SPECIFIC TASK WHICH THEY CAN COMPLETE AND PASS ON TO OTHERS.

Nickname "Guide"
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Fig 28, Instructor

COMPLETE FINISHER

- TEND TO BE TASK DRIVEN AND ENJOY BEING TEAM MEMBER WHO IS INVOLVED IN BRINGING THE PROJECT TOWARDS SUCCESSFUL LAUNCH

Nickname "Polisher"
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Fig 29, Complete finisher
ELDER IN THE GATE

- TEND TO SEE THE WHOLE PICTURE AND ARE TRUSTED BY THE TEAM IN A NON EXECUTIVE CAPACITY AS CHAIRPERSON AND ARBITRATOR

Nickname “Overseer”
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Fig 30, Elder in the Gate

Finally the Egg to Butterfly Model is complete and this growth phase described as “emergent butterfly”. The organisation recognises individual team attributes and area of gifting, continuous product development and are unified around a shared vision and a dynamic continuous change culture is established. The team member attributes are represented in organisational format in figure 31 and sequentially in figure 32.

BUTTERFLY

- ENVISIONER
- ENABLER
- ENACTOR
- EVANGELIST
- PROVIDER
- DEVELOPER
- VERIFIER
- ENCOURAGER
- COMMISSIONER
- INSTRUCTOR
- POLISHER
- ARBITRATOR
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Fig 31, Complete Butterfly and Team
FOUNDATIONS/JEWELS

- OVER-SEER/ELDER IN THE GATE
- POLISHER/COMPLETER FINISHER
- GUIDE/INSTRUCTOR
- SWEETENER/COMMISSIONER
- SHIELD/ENCOURAGER
- CONTAINER/VERIFIER
- EMPEROR/DEVELOPER
- ENACTOR
- GATHERER/PROVIDER
- ENABLER
- CATALYST/SALESMAN/EVANGELIST
- ENVISIONER
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Fig 32, Sequential team line-up

What next?

I intend to write a book describing each team attribute and give an informed description based on qualitative research, of each stage of development of the organisation. Stake holders, owners and managers need the confidence to identify each stage, what its likely duration is and to understand how to manage and be encouraged through each phase transition.

A predictive statistical model will be developed enabling firms to assess the duration of each change phase and thereby encourage the organisation to develop "naturally", giving more confidence to decision making and helping them to avoid enforced errors resulting in organisation and participant potential being enhanced. If, as I suspect, there may well be an organisational potential, perhaps expressed as a type of DNA then we must enable the "true genus" to emerge. How exciting, that this may be made possible by unifying and developing individuals around a shared corporate vision.

A further possibility is to consider assessing firm success in terms of commercial, social fulfilment and ethical dimensions. Perhaps relating team cohesion, successful intergenerational transfer and individual fulfilment as success criteria.
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