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This thesis is about a specific structured systems approach to model conceptualisation, a way of ‘thinking’, about unstructured complex phenomena within the ambit and context of executive management. This way of ‘thinking’, according to Checkland [29], although broadly part of the science movement, uses some concepts, which are complementary to those of classical natural science. Model conceptualisation within the context of this thesis and graphically depicted below, refers to a specific sequence of events, which precedes ‘model construction’ and ‘model implementation’. These events include:

- The identification of unstructured complex phenomena.
- The analysis of the identified unstructured phenomena.
- The problem solving approach, which is to be followed to solve the identified complex phenomena.

![Diagram of Model Conceptualisation Process]

- Identification of complex phenomena
- Analysis phase
- Problem solving approach
- Model construction and implementation
- ‘Model conceptualisation’
- ‘Model building’
This *structured systems approach to model conceptualisation*, this way of ‘thinking’, implies thinking about the world outside ourselves, and doing so by means of a concept ‘system’, very much in the same way as envisaged by Einstein, in an extract cited by Schilpp [145]:

> “What, precisely, is ‘thinking’?” “When at the reception of sense impressions, memory pictures emerge, this is not yet ‘thinking’.”
>
> “And when such pictures form series, each member of which calls forth another, this is too not yet thinking”. “When, however, a certain picture turns up in many such series, then – precisely through such return – it becomes an ordering element for such series…” “Such an element becomes an instrument, a concept”. “I think that the transition from free association or ‘dreaming’ to thinking is characterised by the more or less dominating role which the ‘concept’ plays in it”.

For a number of valid business reasons, including the perceptual fact that ‘engineers are structured problem solvers’, engineers world-wide are drawn into professions other than engineering. This trend, which was evident from this research and contained in the research findings, is most prevalent in banks, the information technology industry, processing companies, financial institutions and consulting fields where engineers often form the core of the workforce at every level of the organisation hierarchy. A variety of reasons, can be attributed to this trend including the perceptual fact listed above. Furthermore, research shows that invariably, engineers employed in positions other than what they were trained for, rapidly climb the corporate hierarchy ladders, ultimately attaining the position of executive management. The negative side of this trend, is that the engineer who primarily has had training in the engineering profession, a discipline grounded in analytical and reductionist thinking, now finds himself in the position of executive management, hardly equipped with the multi-faceted management skills typically demanded from an executive, where the focus is on the handling of unstructured complex phenomena. Such unstructured complex phenomena are invariably societal and organisational based, viewed as ‘systems problems’ within a
particular worldview or ‘weltanschauung’ and require systems-integrated solutions to solve.

While this thesis has at its core the objective to introduce the concept of a structured systems approach to model conceptualisation into the realm of executive management within a broader context, it is in the view of the author the most suitable structured mechanism specifically aimed at the engineer in the emergent role of executive management dealing with unstructured complex phenomena.

A further consequence of this thesis, is that the author succeeds to bridge the gap between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ systems methodologies, by combining the two disciplines to form a ‘midway approach’ in solving unstructured complex phenomena. In addition, the research findings show that such an approach manifests as an essential mechanism for modern executives to facilitate the resolution of unstructured complex phenomena within their respective organisations in a structured way. Furthermore, the research findings show that management philosophies formulated by revered academics during the Twentieth Century can be applied with success to Twenty First Century unstructured complex phenomena, thus becoming an accepted alternative management mechanism for this purpose.

This thesis then, is about both a structured systems approach to model conceptualisation and systems practice and the relationship between the two entities, aimed at dealing with unstructured complex phenomena within the ambit of executive management. From this the conclusion can be drawn that the systems dynamics of the formulated structured systems approach to model conceptualisation specifically applied to the art of executive management, can be used to structure the outcomes of paradigm shifts introduced into organisations as a result of unstructured complex phenomena. Furthermore, the outcome of the research is not as much ‘an approach’, as it is a ‘set of principles to an approach’, which in any particular situation have to be reduced to a method uniquely suitable to the particular situation, hence the applicability of the
structured systems approach to model conceptualisation over a spectrum of disciplines.
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Hierdie proefskrif adresseer spesifiek 'n gestructureerde stelselsbenadering met betrekking tot modelkonseptualisering, 'n 'wyse van denke' tot die oplossing van ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene soos dit voorkom binne die konteks van uitvoerende bestuur. Hierdie 'wyse van denke' volgens Checkland [29], verwys na denke wat oorhoofs deel uitmaak van die wetenskaplike beweging en wat gebruikmaak van konsepte wat complementêr is tot die klassieke natuurwetenskappe. Modelkonseptualisering binne die konteks van hierdie proefskrif en grafies voorgestel hieronder, verwys na 'n spesifieke volgorde van gebeurtenisse wat 'modelkonstruksie' en 'modelimplementering' voorafgaan. Hierdie volgorde van gebeurtenisse sluit die volgende in:

➢ Die identifikasie van ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene.
➢ Die analise van sodanige ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene.
➢ Die probleemoplossingsbenadering wat gevolg sal word vir die oplossing van die geïdentificeerde ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene.
Hierdie gestructureerde stelselsbenadering met betrekking tot model konseptualisering, hierdie ‘wyse van denke’, verwys na denke buite die perseptuele raamwerk van die mens by wyse van die konsep ‘stelsel’, soos waargeneem deur Einstein en aangehaal deur Schilpp [145], (hier aangehaal in die oorspronklike teks):

“What, precisely, is ‘thinking’?” “When at the reception of sense impressions, memory pictures emerge, this is not yet ‘thinking’”. “And when such pictures form series, each member of which calls forth another, this is too not yet ‘thinking’”. “When, however, a certain picture turns up in many such series, then – precisely through such return – it becomes an ordering element for such series…” “Such an element becomes an instrument, a concept”. “I think that the transition from free association or ‘dreaming’ to thinking is characterised by the more or less dominating role which the ‘concept’ plays in it”.

As gevolg van geldige besigheidsredes, die vernaamste daarvan die aanvaarde feit dat ingenieurs wêreld-wyd waargeneem word as ‘gestructureerde probleemoplossers’, word ingenieurs gereeld in posisies binne organisasies aangestel vir doeleindes wat buite die bestek van hulle formele opleiding as profesionele ingenieurs val. Hierdie praktysk, wat ook duidelik blyk uit die navorsingsresultate, is veral waarneembaar by banke, inligtingstegnologie maatskappye, prosesmaatskappye, finansiële instellings en konsultasie maatskappye waar ingenieurs somtyds die kern van die personeelkorps vorm op elke vlak van die organisatoriese hiërargie. Hierdie tendens kan aan ’n legio aantal redes toegeskryf word, die belangrikste daarvan moontlik, die genoemde aanvaarde feit dat ingenieurs waargeneem word as ‘gestructureerde probleemoplossers’. Navorsing toon dat ingenieurs wat buite die bestek van hul formele opleiding aangewend word, gewoonlik vinniger binne ’n organisasiëhiërargie styg tot op die vlak van uitvoerende bestuur, as persone wat nie as ingenieurs oplei is nie. ’n Nadeel van hierdie tendens is dat ingenieurs, wat oorwegend vaardighede ontwikkel het binne die bestek van die ingenieursprofessie, ’n displine gefundeer in analitiese en afgeleide denke,
hulself nou in 'n uitvoerende bestuursposisie bevind sonder die spektrum van bestuursvaardighede soos vereis van die pos van die uitvoerende bestuurder met betrekking tot modelkonseptualisering, waar die aksent by uitstek gefokus word op die hantering van komplekse fenomene. Hierdie ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene het normaalweg 'n gemeenskaps- en organisatoriese basis, word waargeneem as 'stelselsprobleme' binne die bestek van 'n spesifieke waarneming van die wêreld of 'weltanschauung', en vereis stelsels-geïntegreerde oplossings.

Terwyl die doel van hierdie proefskrif die toepassing van 'n gestructureerde stelselbenadering met betrekking tot modelkonseptualisering binne die breë bestek van uitvoerende bestuur is, is die ouer van mening dat sodanige gestructureerde benadering 'n hoë toepaslikheidsgraad het op die ingenieur in die rol van uitvoerende bestuur, almal met betrekking tot die oplossing van ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene.

'N Verdere gevolg van hierdie proefskrif is dat die ouer met sukses die gaping tussen 'harde' en 'sagte' stelselsmetodologieë oorbrug, deur die twee uiteenlopende begrippe te combineer in 'n 'middeweg' benadering vir die oplossing van ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene. Die navorsingsresultate van hierdie proefskrif toon verder dat sodanige 'middeweg' benadering manifesteer as 'n noodsaaklike mecanisme vir uitvoerende bestuur in die gebruik daarvan vir die oplossing van ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene op 'n gestructureerde basis binne hul onderskeie organisasies. Verder toon die navorsingsresultate van hierdie proefskrif dat bestuursfilosofieë wat ge-formuleer is gedurende die Twintigste Eeu, met sukses toegepas kan word vir die oplossing van ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene van die Een-en-Twintigste Eeu, en ook aanvaar word as 'n alternatiewe bestuursmeganism vir hierdie doel.

Hierdie proefskrif, het dus ten doel die formulering van 'n gestructureerde stelselbenadering met betrekking tot model konseptualisering, en gepaardgaande 'stelselstopepassing', en die verhouding tussen die twee konsepte, gemik op die oplossing van ongestructureerde komplekse fenomene binne die bestek van uitvoerende bestuur. Vanuit hierdie samevatting, kan die afleiding gemaak word dat die stelselsdynamika van 'n die 'n gestructureerde stelselbenadering met
betrekking tot model konseptualisering wat spesifiek geformuleer is vir die
gebrauk deur uitvoerende bestuur, gebruik kan word om die uitkomste van
paradigmaverskuiwings te rig wat in organisasies plaasvind as gevolg van
ongestrukureerde komplekse fenomeene. Die resultaat van hierdie navorsing dui
meer op 'n ‘stel riglyne tot 'n benadering’, as op 'n ‘spesifieke benadering’ wat in
enige situasie gereduseer moet word tot 'n unieke metode, geformuleer vir 'n
spesiale toepassingsveld. Hierdie feit maak die gestrukureerde stelselsbenadering
met betrekking tot model konseptualisering, hoogs toepaslik vir die doeleindes
van model konseptualisering oor 'n spektrum van dissiplines.
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Chapter 1

THE SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

“\textit{The one real object of education is to leave a man in the condition of continually asking questions}” \footnote{Quoted in C.A. Alington: \textit{Things Ancient and Modern}}

Bishop Creighton