

**The development of an internal  
technology strategy assessment  
framework within the services sector  
utilising total quality management  
(TQM) principles**

by

Eduan Pieterse

submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree  
Master of Engineering (Technology Management)

in the

Faculty of Engineering, Built Environment and Information Technology  
Department of Engineering and Technology Management

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

**Abstract:**

**The development of an internal technology strategy assessment framework within the services sector utilising total quality management (TQM) principles**

by

Eduan Pieterse

*Supervisor* - Prof. M.W. Pretorius

*Department* - Department of Engineering and Technology Management,  
University of Pretoria

*Degree* - M.Eng (Technology Management)

*Keywords* - Strategy, technology strategy, management of technology, architecture, architecture frameworks, total quality management, total quality management frameworks, excellence models, strategic performance measurement

---

Technology is accepted as one of the key aspects that influence society and business in an unmistakable manner. Current literature is however not singular in its views and methods of technology strategy, its interface with business strategy, and how technology strategy is executed and assessed internally.

The text adopts a 3-tiered domain approach at the outset, focussing on the integration of (i) strategy, (ii) measurement and (iii) architecture. The literature assessment was carried out on the hand of the three domains and ultimately resulted in the proposed internal technology strategy assessment framework for the services sector. At the heart of the framework is the merging of the disciplines and current models of (i) technology management (MOT), (ii) business architecture, (iii) strategic performance measurement and (iv) total quality management. The model aims to indicate that specific modelling techniques coupled with an excellence scorecard, can facilitate the mathematical assessment of strategic contribution of individual technology artefacts to a specific business strategy.

The proposed model is represented in the text in flowchart form and is supplemented by the derivation of the required research approach, namely case study protocol. Three case studies were conducted, each of which is resident in the services sector, and the tabulated results are presented in the text and its appendixes.

The results obtained indicate that strategic artefact differentiation on a procedural level can indeed be obtained. These results are consistent throughout the three case studies and valuable future benefit could be extrapolated for (i) continuing investigation on the hand of the model, as well as (ii) cross-pollination to the disciplines of (a) enterprise modelling and design and (b) project management.

**Samevatting:**

**The development of an internal technology strategy assessment framework within the services sector utilising total quality management (TQM) principles**

deur

Eduan Pieterse

- Studieleier* - Prof. M.W. Pretorius
- Departement* - Departement Ingenieurs- en Tegnologiebestuur,  
Universiteit van Pretoria
- Graad* - M.Ing (Tegnologiebestuur)
- Sleutelwoorde* - Strategie, tegnologiesstrategie, tegnologiebestuur, argitektuur, argitektuur-raamwerke, totale kwaliteitsbestuur, totale kwaliteitsbestuur-raamwerke, uitnemendheidsmodelle, strategiese prestasiemeeting

---

Tegnologie word algemeen aanvaar as een van die mees deurslaggewende drywers wat besigheid en die samelewing onomkeerbaar verander. Hedendaagse literatuur is egter nie eensgesind in sy opinie en metodes van tegnologiesstrategie, die raakvlak wat dit maak met besigheidstrategie, en hoe tegnologiesstrategie uitgevoer en geassesseer word nie.

Aan die hand van 'n drie-ledige benadering, fokus die teks gevolglik op die integrasie van (i) strategie, (ii) meting / assessering, en (iii) argitektuur. Die literatuurstudie was uitgevoer in lyn met die eersgenoemde benadering en het uiteidelik gemanifesteer in die voorstelling van 'n interne tegnologiesstrategie assesseringsmodel, spesifiek gefokus op die dienste sektor. Die kern van hierdie model is die vereniging van die dissiplines en modelle van (i) tegnologiebestuur, (ii) besigheidsargitektuur, (iii) strategiese prestasiemeeting en (iv) totale kwaliteitsbestuur. Die model poog om te wys dat spesifieke modelleringstegnieke gekoppel met 'n uitnemendheids-gebaseerde telkaart die wiskundige assessering van individuele tegnologiese artefakte se strategiese bydrae kan fasiliteer. Die model word in die teks voorgestel deur middel van 'n vloediagram en die nodige data vir die model was ingesamel deur gebruik te maak van gevallestudie protokol. Drie gevallestudies was uitgevoer, elk in die dienste sektor, en die getabuleerde resultate is gelys in die teks en die aanhangsels.

Die studieresultate dui daarop dat strategiese tegnologie artefak differensiëring inderdaad op 'n proses vlak kan plaasvind. Hierdie uitkoms was konsekwent waargeneem regdeur al drie die gevallestudies en tot gevolg kon waardevolle gevolgtrekkings en antisipasies ge-ekstrapoleer word. Hierdie ekstrapolasies is voordelig tot (i) die voortsetting van navorsing in die model op sig self, maar ook (ii) toekomstige voordeel vir die dissiplines van (a) industriële integrasie en –modellering en (b) projekbestuur.

**Note:**

An unusual vast amount of data is attached in the appendixes to the text. This is contrary to academic protocol and customary practice. However in this instance this is done purposefully with the express goal to (i) support the text, (ii) enhance the proposed model and research design, and (iii) illustrate the practical enactment and implications of the research model. This has however been limited to Case Study Candidate #1's results only.

**Acknowledgements**

This dissertation is dedicated to Bert Engelbrecht:  
A mentor and a great businessman.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Chapter 1 - Introduction..... 1**

1.1 - *Motivation* ..... 1

1.1.1 - Technology and society ..... 1

1.1.2 - Technology and business..... 3

1.1.3 - Management of technology..... 4

1.1.4 - MOT resources ..... 6

1.2 - *Problem statement*..... 7

1.3 - *Objective*..... 8

1.4 - *Goal*..... 8

1.5 - *Scope*..... 8

1.6 - *Contribution of research* ..... 9

1.7 - *Dissertation structure* ..... 9

**Chapter 2 - Theoretical background and literature study.. 12**

2.1 - *Towards an understanding of technology strategy* ..... 15

2.1.1 - What is technology?..... 16

2.1.2 - A framework for classifying technological artefacts ..... 19

2.1.3 - Towards a definition of technology management..... 19

2.1.4 - Technology strategy defined..... 28

2.1.5 - Linking and integrating technology strategy with business strategy ..... 45

2.1.6 - The concept of the implied technology strategy ..... 51

2.1.7 - The strategy domain – a summary ..... 52

2.2 - *Understanding business architecture*..... 54

2.2.1 - In defence of architecture ..... 55

2.2.2 - Key concepts defined ..... 56

2.2.3 - Why business architecture frameworks? ..... 61

2.2.4 - Benefits from utilising and exploiting business architecture..... 66

2.2.5 - Architecture classification taxonomy ..... 66

2.2.6 - Selected architecture frameworks evaluated..... 68

2.2.7 - The architecture domain – a summary..... 82

2.3 - *Understanding strategic performance measurement*..... 83

2.3.1 - Towards an understanding of 'performance measurement' ..... 84

2.3.2 - Strategic performance measurement: the linking of strategy with measurement.....	89
2.3.3 - Measurement systems.....	94
2.3.4 - Two business improvement models / measurement systems .....	99
2.3.5 - Choosing between the balanced scorecard and the EFQM excellence model .....	104
2.3.6 - The South African excellence model .....	107
2.3.7 - The measurement and assessment domain – a summary .....	108

**Chapter 3 - The development of an internal technology strategy assessment model ..... 109**

3.1 - Core reference models.....	109
3.1.1 - DISCON architectural framework.....	109
3.1.2 - Arasti and Vernet's BPR-based model .....	110
3.1.3 - SA excellence model .....	113
3.2 - An internal technology strategy assessment framework utilising total quality management (TQM) principles.....	115
3.2.1 - Input required outside the scope of the research model.....	118
3.2.2 - Step 1 – Execute a functional analysis .....	120
3.2.3 - Step 2 – Assess the excellence of each function's execution .....	122
3.2.4 - Step 3 – Execute a CSF to function mapping .....	124
3.2.5 - Step 4 – Determine the function criticality.....	126
3.2.6 - Step 5 – Model the processes of each function .....	128
3.2.7 - Step 6 - Execute a function to process mapping .....	130
3.2.8 - Step 7 – Identify the technology building blocks / artefacts per modelled process.....	131
3.2.9 - Step 8 – Determine the total excellence score per each function.....	134
3.2.10 - Step 9 - Classify the technology artefacts according to the nine cell artefact matrix .....	136
3.2.11 - Step 10 – Determine the strategically critical technology artefacts.....	137
3.2.12 - Step 11 - Determine the excellence prioritised technology artefacts .....	139
3.2.13 - Step 12 - Determine the technology artefact vector length.....	140
3.2.14 - Step 13 – Determine the technology artefact strategic vector ranking ...	141

**Chapter 4 - Research design..... 143**



4.1 -	<i>The case for qualitative research methods - the case study research methodology.....</i>	143
4.1.1 -	Background to case study methodology.....	143
4.1.2 -	Case study types .....	146
4.1.3 -	Sources of evidence.....	146
4.1.4 -	Unit of analysis.....	147
4.1.5 -	Triangulation.....	148
4.1.6 -	Case study protocols.....	148
4.1.7 -	Designing case studies and the components of research design.....	149
4.1.8 -	Validity .....	151
4.1.9 -	Analytic strategy.....	151
4.2 -	<i>A qualitative research design.....</i>	152
4.2.1 -	Case study design.....	153
4.2.2 -	Case study protocol .....	156
<b>Chapter 5 - Research findings and analysis .....</b>		<b>157</b>
5.1 -	<i>Case study candidates – an overview.....</i>	157
5.1.1 -	Case study candidate #1 .....	157
5.1.2 -	Case study candidate #2 .....	158
5.1.3 -	Case study candidate #3 .....	159
5.2 -	<i>Key findings – a stepwise discussion.....</i>	160
5.2.1 -	Case study protocol results #1&2 / Input required outside the scope of the research model.....	160
5.2.2 -	Case study protocol results #3 / Step 1 – Execute a functional analysis.	160
5.2.3 -	Case study protocol results #4 / Step 3 – Execute a CSF to function mapping .....	161
5.2.4 -	Case study protocol results #5 / Step 5 – Model the processes of each function .....	161
5.2.5 -	Case study protocol results #6 / Step 2 – Assess the excellence of each function’s execution .....	162
5.2.6 -	Case study protocol results #7 – General questions and information .....	164
5.2.7 -	Step 4 – Determine the function criticality.....	164
5.2.8 -	Step 6 - Execute a function to process mapping .....	166
5.2.9 -	Step 7 – Identify the technology building blocks / artefacts per modelled process.....	166

5.2.10 - Step 8 – Determine the total excellence score per each function.....	167
5.2.11 - Step 9 - Classify the technology artefacts according to the nine cell artefact matrix .....	167
5.2.12 - Step 10 – Determine the strategically critical technology artefacts.....	169
5.2.13 - Step 11 - Determine the excellence prioritised technology artefacts .....	171
5.2.14 - Step 12 - Determine the technology artefact vector length.....	173
5.2.15 - Step 13 – Determine the technology artefact strategic vector ranking ...	176
<b>Chapter 6 - Conclusion and recommendation.....</b>	<b>180</b>
6.1 - Research objectives and goals revisited.....	180
6.2 - Discussion.....	181
6.2.1 - Modelling of strategy and technology strategy.....	181
6.2.2 - Business architecture in the field of MOT .....	182
6.2.3 - Excellence models / TQM in the field of MOT.....	183
6.3 - Benefits to other disciplines.....	183
6.3.1 - Research benefits to enterprise modelling and -design.....	183
6.3.2 - Research benefits to project management .....	184
6.4 - Recommendations.....	185
6.4.1 - Industry scope of the model .....	185
6.4.2 - Organisational scope of the model .....	185
6.4.3 - Quality model sensitivity.....	186
<b>Appendix A - Core Knowledge of MOT .....</b>	<b>193</b>
<b>Appendix B - Flowchart legend .....</b>	<b>194</b>
<b>Appendix C - Function structure diagram symbol description .</b> <b>.....</b>	<b>195</b>
<b>Appendix D - Case Study Results #1: Critical Success Factors</b> <b>.....</b>	<b>196</b>
Case study candidate 1 <International footwear and apparel manufacturer>.....	196
<b>Appendix E - Case Study Results #2: Functional structure decomposition.....</b>	<b>197</b>
Case study candidate 1 <International footwear and apparel manufacturer>.....	197
<b>Appendix F - Case Study Results #3: Function criticality rating</b> <b>.....</b>	<b>202</b>

*Case study candidate 1 <International footwear and apparel manufacturer>..... 202*

***Appendix G - Case Study Results #4: Function excellence ratings .....205***

*Case study candidate 1 <International footwear and apparel manufacturer>..... 205*

***Appendix H - Case Study Results #5: Strategic critical technology artefacts .....211***

*Case study candidate 1 <International footwear and apparel manufacturer>..... 211*

***Appendix I - Case Study Results #6: Excellence prioritised technology artefact.....222***

*Case study candidate 1 <International footwear and apparel manufacturer>..... 222*

***Appendix J - Case Study Results #7: Technology artefact vector length.....233***

*Case study candidate 1 <International footwear and apparel manufacturer>..... 233*

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: Forces driving industry competition.....2

Figure 2: The relationship between R&D management, MOT and technological management .....5

Figure 3: Graphical depiction of a generic dissertation structure ..... 10

Figure 4: 3-Tier Graphical depiction ..... 13

Figure 5: Domain 1 – The strategy domain..... 15

Figure 6: A Diagrammatic Definition of Technology (The technology triangle)..... 17

Figure 7: Nine cell technology classification framework..... 19

Figure 8: The functions of management ..... 20

Figure 9: The interdisciplinary nature of MOT ..... 21

Figure 10: The elements of management of technology..... 22

Figure 11: Technology management domains..... 25

Figure 12: Generic goal oriented functional definition of MOT ..... 27

Figure 13: Determinants of technology strategy..... 34

Figure 14: A capabilities-based organisational learning framework of technology strategy ..... 36

Figure 15: Structured approach to develop and implement a technology strategy ..... 37

Figure 16: Technology strategy in the business context ..... 39

Figure 17: Technology strategy model ..... 41

Figure 18: Hierarchy of strategies ..... 42

Figure 19: The technology balance sheet ..... 43

Figure 20: Framework for formulation of business and technology strategies..... 44

Figure 21: Two directions in bridging technology and business strategy ..... 46

Figure 22: Business alignment framework ..... 47

Figure 23: Breakthrough objectives, CSF's and key processes ..... 49

Figure 24: The five stage BPR model ..... 50

Figure 25: Five steps of technology strategy elaboration regarding the firm overall strategy ..... 51

Figure 26: Domain 2 – The architecture domain..... 54

Figure 27: Classification of architectures ..... 67

Figure 28: CIMOSA's relationship between system and product life-cycle ..... 70

Figure 29: The CIMOSA modelling architecture ..... 71

Figure 30: The ARIS Architecture..... 75

Figure 31: The Zachman architecture..... 78

Figure 32: A 3D information architecture framework .....	79
Figure 33: The DISCON business engineering architectural framework.....	81
Figure 34: Domain 3 – The measurement/assessment domain .....	83
Figure 35: Do you get what you measured? .....	86
Figure 36: The value of measurement.....	87
Figure 37: The three management levels of the organisation .....	88
Figure 38: Mission, objectives, strategy and performance measures .....	90
Figure 39: Integrated framework for TQM.....	93
Figure 40: Time delay between performance and financial measures.....	95
Figure 41: The segments of the balanced scorecard.....	100
Figure 42: The EFQM Excellence model.....	103
Figure 43: Structure of the criteria, criterion parts and the areas to address.....	103
Figure 44: The South African excellence model.....	107
Figure 45: Mapping the DISCON business engineering model into the five stage BPR model .....	111
Figure 46: A framework for strategic management of technology through BPR.....	112
Figure 47: Mapping the SA excellence model into the DISCON five stage BPR model....	114
Figure 48: A technology strategy assessment framework utilising TQM principles .....	117
Figure 49: Out of scope model input.....	118
Figure 50: Research model – steps 1, 2 and 5 .....	120
Figure 51: Research model – steps 3 through to 8 .....	124
Figure 52: Research model – step 4.....	126
Figure 53: Research model – step 5.....	128
Figure 54: Research model – step 6.....	130
Figure 55: Research model – step 7.....	132
Figure 56: Research model – step 8.....	134
Figure 57: Research model – steps 9 through to 13 .....	136
Figure 58: True vector length.....	140
Figure 59: Vector length as a combination of criticality and excellence.....	141
Figure 60: Basic types of design for case studies.....	150
Figure 61: Multiple case study method .....	151

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Changing trends in industry.....3

Table 2: Function comparison between Stacey and Ashton's structured approach and the technology strategy model..... 40

Table 3: Traditional versus TQM performance measurement systems ..... 98

Table 4: Generic measures of the balanced scorecard ..... 101

Table 5: Comparison of the balanced scorecard and EFQM's excellence model's views . 105

Table 6: Example of function criticality..... 126

Table 7: Example of functions ranked according to criticality..... 127

Table 8: Example of technology artefact interfaces per modelled process..... 133

Table 9: Example of functions rated according to the EFQM excellence criteria..... 135

Table 10: Example of functions ranked according to their lack of excellence scores..... 135

Table 11: Example of strategically critical technology artefacts..... 138

Table 12: Example of strategic ranked technology artefacts (non-duplicated) ..... 139

Table 13: Example of excellence ranked technology artefacts ..... 140

Table 14: Example of strategic critical technology artefacts according to vector length. 142

Table 15: Example of strategic ranked technology artefacts according to vector length (non-duplicated ..... 142

Table 16: Case study candidate #1 excellence mapping breakdown ..... 163

Table 17: Case study candidate #1's top ten strategic critical functions ..... 165

Table 18: Case study candidate #2's top ten strategic critical functions ..... 165

Table 19: Case study candidate #3's top ten strategic critical functions ..... 166

Table 20: Case study candidate #1's rationalised technology classes ..... 168

Table 21: Case study candidate #2's rationalised technology classes ..... 168

Table 22: Case study candidate #3's rationalised technology classes ..... 169

Table 23: Case study candidate #1's top ten strategic technology artefact ranking ..... 170

Table 24: Case study candidate #2's top ten strategic technology artefact ranking ..... 170

Table 25: Case study candidate #3's top ten strategic technology artefact ranking ..... 171

Table 26: Case study candidate #1's top ten excellence prioritised technology artefact ranking ..... 172

Table 27: Case study candidate #2's top ten excellence prioritised technology artefact ranking ..... 173

Table 28: Case study candidate #3's top ten excellence prioritised technology artefact ranking ..... 173

Table 29: Case study candidate #1's top ten technology artefact vector length ranking 175

Table 30: Case study candidate #2's top ten technology artefact vector length ranking	175
Table 31: Case study candidate #3's top ten technology artefact vector length ranking	176
Table 32: A comparison of case study candidate #1's top 20 vector length ranked technology artefact .....	177
Table 33: A comparison of case study candidate #2's top 20 vector length ranked technology artefacts.....	178
Table 34: A comparison of case study candidate #3's 18 vector length ranked technology artefacts.....	179

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

AMICE	-	European Computer Integrated Manufacturing Architecture
ARIS	-	Architecture of Integrated Information Systems
BEE	-	Black economic empowerment
BPR	-	Business process re-engineering
CASE	-	Computer aided software engineering
CEO	-	Chief executive officer
CIM	-	Computer Integrated Manufacturing
CIMOSA	-	Computer Integrated Manufacturing Open Systems Architecture
CIO	-	Chief information officer
CSF	-	Critical success factor
CTO	-	Chief technology officer
EFQM	-	European foundation for quality management
EU	-	European Union
HR	-	Human resources
IFAC	-	International Federation of Automatic Control
IFIP	-	International Federation for Information Processing
IS	-	Information system(s)
ISA	-	Information Systems Architecture
IT	-	Information technology
JIT	-	Just in time
MIS	-	Management information system(s)
MOT	-	Management of technology
NRC	-	National research council
OID	-	Object interface diagram
PENST	-	Political, economical, natural, social and technological
PERA	-	Perdue Enterprise Reference Architecture
POS	-	Point of sale
R&D	-	Research and development
ROA	-	Return on assets
ROI	-	Return on investment
ROIC	-	Return on invested capital
ROS	-	Return on sales



SAEF	-	South African excellence foundation
STA	-	Strategic technology areas
SWOT	-	Strength, weakness, opportunity, threat
TQM	-	Total quality management
UK	-	United Kingdom
US	-	United States of America
USA	-	United States of America
WIP	-	Work-in-progress

*Let no man say that I have said nothing new,  
the arrangement of the material is new.*

*Just as the same words differently arranged  
form different thoughts.*

*- Blaise Pascal*