

# Strategic Alliances: Finding the Hidden Leverage for Success

*Jennifer M. Kemeny and Joel Yanowitz*



Jennifer M. Kemeny  
Principal, Innovation Associates  
an Arthur D. Little company



Joel Yanowitz  
Vice President, Arthur D. Little and Director,  
Organizational Change and Learning Practice

Mergers . . . joint ventures . . . strategic alliances . . . businesses are increasingly relying on these activities for strategic advantage. All too frequently, however, the potential benefits fail to materialize. While much attention is focused on the financial and contractual aspects of an alliance, we believe that the key to organizational partnerships lies in a different arena. Increasingly we are convinced that the success of such alliances depends on the “human factors”—the ways that people think and interact. And we have gained practical insight into both the hurdles that impede cross-organizational alliances and the processes necessary for their success. But first, let’s step back and take a “big picture” look at how alliances work.

## A Systemic View of Alliances

Ironically, the degree to which human issues can undermine an alliance is directly proportional to the potential benefit of the partnership. This relationship makes sense if we consider why cross-organizational endeavors are attractive. Despite the important differences among mergers, joint ventures, partnerships, and alliances, all four are based on the assumption that there are benefits to closer working relationships with other organizations.

In a young business, performance may be directly related to the company’s ability to perform core tasks, such as manufacturing a chip with a low percentage of rejects. However, once the product can be reliably constructed, the company can achieve greater benefits by improving the manufacturing function as a whole than by pursuing further production efficiencies. Imagine, for example, a highly efficient production line that nonetheless operates at a loss because poor production scheduling leads to shortages of raw materials and excessive personnel costs. Imagine a sales organization in which the salesforce has developed superb selling skills, but where orders are routinely mishandled. In these and other examples, improving the coordination of tasks in a function will yield greater benefits than fine-tuning each task separately.

Analogously, as functional effectiveness increases, the greatest opportunity for corporate performance improvement will come from cross-functional integration. Organizations worldwide are recognizing how departments that strive for their own optimal performance can combine to produce sub-optimal results for the business. A marketing function that achieves record-breaking revenues through customer promotions can nonetheless drive down overall profits through the extra manufacturing and distribution costs required to support those promotions. Similarly, marketing groups can inadvertently damage a company’s image by making promises to customers that the R&D group cannot meet. Finance departments that institute hiring freezes to reduce costs can cause greater expenditures through the use of outside contractors.

In each case, the opportunity lies in coordinating and optimizing a larger system. Interestingly enough, the focus of management improvement trends in this century follows a similar pattern, from task efficiency to functional excellence to cross-functional integration. The logical next step is to conquer cross-organizational boundaries, that is, to align independent companies in the pursuit of joint goals.

While these alliances are a relatively new phenomenon, they can benefit considerably from the experience companies have had learning to work cross-functionally. It is fair to say that the issues experienced in moving from functional to cross-functional excellence apply to cross-organizational efforts—except that the difficulties are exponentially larger. Why so? *The fundamental challenge in integrating parts of a system is creating alignment among individuals and groups who see the world differently—who have different goals, norms, perceptions, and priorities.* The farther apart the groups, the more different their perspectives, and thus the greater the challenge in bringing them together.

The significance of these varied perspectives depends on the degree of innovation to which the alliance aspires. The simplest kind of alliance creates cost reductions through increased scale; an example might be a group of clinics that join together for purchasing discounts. This kind of alliance requires minimal change on the part of the participating organizations, and thus organizational differences aren't a critical issue.

A more ambitious aim is to improve operational effectiveness through closer coordination between businesses. For example, a consumer-products manufacturer that integrates its systems with its distributors can optimize loading and shipping operations. This kind of integration creates some challenges for the participating organizations, but since the innovations occur within established functions, there usually exist processes and expertise to manage the changes.

The greatest difficulty occurs when alliances attempt to develop significantly new ways of conducting business. Simply put, the greater the strategic benefit of an alliance, the greater the challenge of cross-organizational integration and the more critical the attention to human factors.

To understand the role human factors play in strategic alliances, let's look at the key obstacles to cross-organizational relationships.

## Key Obstacles

Cross-organizational relationships must overcome three principal kinds of hurdles: coping with increased complexity, aligning contrasting orientations, and combining cultures.

### *Coping with Increased Complexity*

The newly combined organizational system is by definition significantly more complex than either of its component entities were alone. Furthermore, no individual or group has experience working with the combined entity. Many organizations whose greatest skill is at the functional level find it difficult enough to manage the cross-functional repercussions of their own activities. These groups have not learned to think systemically and are thus beset by the unforeseen consequences of actions in other parts of the organization. Even organizations that have mastered cross-functional thinking will find it challenging to manage cross-organizational “ripple effects.” The strong tendency to focus on maximizing gain for one's own organization can seriously undermine the broader effort.

### *Aligning Contrasting Orientations*

Organizations' orientations can vary in terms of focal length (short-term vs. long-term), philosophical emphasis (strategic vs. operational), and integration of goals.



© Emily Sper



Anil Paranjpe  
Senior Consultant, Center of Excellence for Learning  
Mahindra British Telecom Ltd.

### Commentary by Anil Paranjpe

That we are thinking about what is good about what could be thought of as the "soft side" of alliance-making is a sign of our times. It appears as if the world over, a quest for economic wealth is giving way to a deeper wealth that first and foremost acknowledges the centrality of the individual and the community. A lot has been written on the "new age." Maybe too little is being practiced.

This article is a good, deep look at what will make organizational alliances really work for everyone concerned. I have tried to compare it with a marriage. I do believe that most of us get married for a mix of reasons—some right and some wrong. The trick in marriage and all relationships actually lies in:

- Arriving at genuine understanding of why we are taking this step (getting married). Clarity of vision leads to deep-seated commitment.
- Acceptance of the fact that all of us evolve at different paces and in different areas, that life evolves and so must the relationship. What got us together may not keep us together. The key here is trust.
- Being vulnerable to hurt. Marriage is not about building a fortress around self, and making sure the partner doesn't take more than what he or she gives. In marriage, you are both willing to go repeatedly through the "crisis of emptiness," so that you both grow. We need time to discover our true nature, and the partner really plays (or could play) a vital role in showing us our true colors.

In marriage, the longer we stay together in the full sense of the word, the deeper and wider we grow—together. If we believe that love is about taking responsibility for others' growth, then we see our "fights" and "disagreements" differently. We keep the "system" in full view, and don't dwell on its parts for too long.

Some marriages last a lifetime. Some alliances do, too. But longevity is not the purpose—growth is. Growth in the fullest sense of the word.

### Short-Term vs. Long-Term Focus

The delicate balancing act of addressing short-term needs while investing in the long term is never easy. However, through experience most businesses learn to walk that tightrope. Unfortunately, in an alliance each partner must consider how its short-term actions will affect the other's long-term success. The greater the potential benefit in an alliance, the more the participants' short-term and long-term fortunes are coupled. Often actions that make perfect sense in the short term end up producing the unintended consequence of undermining the long-term value of the relationship.

For example, a Fortune 500 office products manufacturer sought to have greater influence and merchandise share with its independent dealers without incurring the cost of an owned dealer network. It developed a potentially powerful alliance concept. Selected dealers, while maintaining financial independence, would make a commitment to represent this manufacturer's products exclusively. In addition, these dealers would upgrade their facilities and services to complement the manufacturer's high-end image. In return, the manufacturer would offer sophisticated business advice and services to the dealers, including attractively priced credit. The net cost to the manufacturer was much less than acquiring the dealerships, and the dealers stood to benefit from the business expertise and financing of a major corporation.

At the time, Innovation Associates, a unit of Arthur D. Little, was consulting to the senior management team of the manufacturer. Among other work, we were exploring the implications of the alliance through computer simulations of future operations. We developed a simulation that allowed independent decision making by the manufacturer and the dealers. The management team divided into the two roles. All went well when the business environment in our scenario was friendly. But when the teams were faced with a simulated market downturn, the results were sharply different. The immediate reaction of the "manufacturer team" was to protect its current margins by raising prices to the dealerships and cutting back on dealer support programs. The "dealer-ship team," faced with declining profits, reduced investment in their facilities and in local marketing programs. In the simulation, the long-term effects of these actions hurt both groups—and generated significant ill will. Despite this preview of possibly negative consequences, the manufacturer chose to proceed with the alliance as planned. Unfortunately, the simulation results were mirrored in the real world, and the alliance concept fell far short of its potential.

### Strategy vs. Operations

Individual organizations can sometimes function effectively despite having divergent operational and strategic goals. However, the success of an alliance may depend on the degree to which these very different orientations are integrated. Alliances frequently form because of the theoretical strategic advantage of envisioned joint capabilities. However, once the alliance is in place, those theoretical capabilities must quickly become real—and successful. Otherwise, the alliance is likely to fall apart.

Why are human factors such a critical element in integrating strategy and operations? Because in most organizations different groups are responsible for these two perspectives, and these groups do not combine their respective knowledge when making decisions. The strategic thinkers may have a clear picture of the long-term business opportunities, but will tend to underemphasize the difficulties of actually implementing new capabilities and the ways that alliance activities might hurt the existing organization. On the other hand, the operational team, motivated by incentives to improve current performance, will focus on the implementation challenges and will be less aware of or interested in the strategic possibilities. Thus an all-too-frequent scenario for an alliance is that senior managers enthusiastically create a grand vision while "leaving the details to be worked out by others." The subsequent operational decisions cause tactical improvements that don't add up to the strategic potential.

## Differing Goals

A prevailing management paradigm is to “divide and conquer.” We expect to reach high-level goals by achieving multiple, parallel subgoals, for example, by independently maximizing revenues and minimizing costs to generate maximum profits. This is a major cause of the phenomenon described earlier—locally optimized performance with sub-optimal results overall. In addition to problematic business results, this approach causes an increasingly myopic orientation—each group concerned with its own goals, which are viewed as the key to organizational success. Gradually these subgoals stop being the means to an end and become the end itself. Once a group unconsciously assumes that its goals are paramount, several undesirable tendencies may develop. At best, the group will make choices with little thought to the impact on other areas. At worst, there may be significant conflict between groups. (This is so common that newly appointed managers routinely inquire whether they are faced with “warring tribes!”) Clearly, warring tribes cannot achieve the seamless integration needed to create strategically significant innovations.

Exacerbating the difficulty is the real likelihood that the alliance partners will have different goals—and that neither partner will appreciate the implications of the differences. In one alliance we helped facilitate, between a manufacturer and its key distributor, each organization’s profits were driven by fundamentally different factors and measured in different ways: one by volume and the other by return on capital. This difference had never been understood and appreciated, causing years of tension and conflict between the parties.

Remember: The difficulties in a strategic alliance are the same as those within individual organizations, only exponentially more complex. It is advisable for all organizations—and essential for cross-organizational alliances—to replace the paradigm “divide and conquer” with “connect and comprehend.”

*It is advisable for all organizations—and essential for cross-organizational alliances—to replace the paradigm “divide and conquer” with “connect and comprehend.”*

## Combining Cultures

Companies that come together with a clean slate (i.e., with no negative preconceptions), but have different cultures, may quickly find that the variations in their behavioral norms will create a breeding ground for mutual misunderstanding, poor follow-through, and eventual distrust.

In one joint venture between a major consumer-products manufacturer and a small, innovative drug developer, cultural differences quickly caused conflict between the participants. The manufacturer had a well-established hierarchical culture. There were strict behavioral norms, appearances counted, and promotions depended on being the prime mover behind successful endeavors. The drug developer was a young company whose independent-minded staff was accustomed to working in an informal, nonhierarchical fashion. One immediate problem was lack of mutual respect. The consumer-product representatives, experienced in market issues, were appalled at the scientists’ business naiveté, while the researchers were reluctant to be directed by scientific “neophytes.” The problem was compounded by the need of each group’s representatives in the venture to prove their contribution to the parent company, which made them aggressive in competing for leadership positions.

Consider the additional challenge of combining companies that have a prior working relationship. In this case preconceptions invariably exist. And as the two companies rarely have a common mechanism for airing and untangling grievances, these preconceptions may well be negative. Unfortunately, the significance of this issue rarely becomes apparent until the alliance is well under way, because the senior managers who have met with their equivalents for semi-annual discussions don’t have the same awareness of intercompany problems as do the operating managers who have daily interaction.

The significance of historical baggage is most evident when the alliance partners have had a prior customer-supplier relationship. Such relationships, unfortunately, provide ample opportunities for each organization to confuse and disappoint the other. It is much less problematic when two companies with similar roles join together. Even prior competitors, such as British Petroleum (BP) and Mobil in their European joint venture, are likely to have less initial ill will than did alliance partners such as Procter & Gamble and Wal-Mart. The latter example is particularly instructive.

With more than \$30 billion in annual sales, Procter & Gamble (P&G) is a global leader in consumer products. One of P&G's largest customers is the North American retailing giant, Wal-Mart. In the mid-eighties, relationships between the two companies were at an all-time low. The two companies were unintentionally locked in an adversarial cycle of deteriorating relations, as was typical of the relationships between consumer-products manufacturers and distributors at that time. P&G came to market with an array of promotions. Power-buying Wal-Mart, with its policy of everyday low prices, used the advantageous pricing of P&G's promotions to stock up at discount. Wal-Mart's buying skewed P&G's production schedules, cash flow, and, ultimately, bottom line. P&G responded with more promotions. Wal-Mart and its distributors countered with more forward buying, with the associated warehousing costs. Each entity chose the response that foreclosed the other's possibility of succeeding. Faced with an intolerable level of rising costs, P&G decided to meet the challenge head-on—and turn an “enemy” into an ally—by forging a strategic alliance with Wal-Mart.

Innovation Associates was invited to help reforge the relationship to one of trust and mutual benefit. The initial challenge was to align the operating team, composed of managers from both organizations, who openly expressed doubt about the integrity and competence of their opposites. In a workshop lasting several days, the team used systems thinking tools to build a shared understanding of the mutual consequences of their combined business activities. Managers from both P&G and Wal-Mart saw how each other's actions could be understood as reasonable, rather than as self-interested maneuvers. Aligned around a new definition of “win/win” strategy for both companies, the team made the commitment to implement a powerful strategic alliance. The alliance they forged has since become a much-imitated model for the industry.

This partnership was an excellent example of piloting strategy through an alliance and “organically” creating company-wide commitment. During the year after the initial workshop, the strategic alliance team worked with each brand group to arrange an unprecedented nonpromotion arrangement for P&G products to Wal-Mart. The results were so favorable that the policy spread—until P&G broke with the industry by discontinuing almost all its promotions. As a result, P&G reported significant increases in profitability.

## Putting It All Together: A Roadmap for Action

You can dramatically improve your company's success with strategic alliances by paying attention to seven principles we find particularly critical.

### *Clearly Articulate Goals*

Begin by clarifying your own goals and motivations. Although it may sound absurd, we have seen companies enter into alliances with little or no articulation of their long-term intent and with only vaguely defined measures of success. Every alliance needs a thoughtful and explicit rationale to guide its ongoing effort. The fundamental question is, “What existing or new opportunities could we realize more effectively by combining our capabilities with those of an appropriate partner?” A compelling answer to this question requires a deep understanding of your own company's strategic orientation, markets, and products, as well as those of your partner.

It is critical to think through the potential gains thoroughly, that is, to carefully examine the “business case” for the alliance. One alliance went exactly as envisioned—the supplier tested out new systems that significantly improved service to its customer—but at a cost that was prohibitive to the supplier. In the original conversations, the supplier had never stated that it needed a significant increase in business from its customer for the arrangement to be profitable.

Define both the long-term and short-term goals for each alliance. Successful alliances establish ambitious long-term goals with shorter-term milestones. They use the accomplishment of those goals to generate trust and confidence in creating longer-term opportunities that may require significant investments.

### *Select Appropriate Partners*

One key criterion for partner selection is often taken for granted: Your partner must also be able to derive long-term advantage through the relationship. A critical early step in the selection process is to define an alliance that will be a “win” for both parties. Ideally, the win will become more significant over time. Alliances that aren’t mutually beneficial may fall apart or focus solely on incremental, transactional opportunities, missing possible strategic gain. In contrast, when two potential partners work together to ensure that each understands precisely how the alliance can help the other partner be more successful, it builds trust and establishes a longer-term relationship to sustain the alliance through its inevitable ups and downs.

Other criteria may also be important in selecting a partner. Having an existing working relationship may be a good starting point, but it is not sufficient. Will your partner understand the far-reaching impacts of an alliance and be willing to work through systemic issues? Is your partner likely to be effective at cross-organizational issues (as evidenced by its cross-functional effectiveness)? Is the company able to learn from its own unsuccessful projects? Would you be comfortable revealing your business activities to this company and vice versa? Knowing the characteristics of a potential partner will steer you away from false starts.

### *Work at Both Strategic and Operational Levels*

The ability to work simultaneously at the strategic and operational levels is critical to an alliance’s success. An alliance must move quickly from defining high-level strategic intent to successfully implementing new services and activities, and from performing operational tests to reformulating strategy and tactics.

While an alliance may be championed by an individual, the management of an alliance cannot be delegated to one person in the organization. As pointed out earlier, successful alliances often require the active knowledge, expertise, and involvement of people from multiple functions, geographies, and levels in both organizations. Each alliance needs a representational team composed of players from both organizations to guide the effort and navigate the challenges of working in new and unfamiliar territory. The team should include people who are senior enough to have decision-making authority, as well as others tactical enough to be “hands-on.”

Membership in the team may change over time as opportunities or projects progress. Great care should be taken to integrate new members of the team so that they understand how the goals and operating norms of this activity are different from those of their “home” organization. This does not happen in a 15-minute briefing; new members need to be given extensive opportunities to understand the alliance’s purpose, let go of old mental models, and assume personal ownership of success. Shortchanging these activities has sidetracked a number of efforts we’ve studied, as new team members took on significant roles without understanding the context, direction, and norms of the alliance activities.

*The ability to work simultaneously at the strategic and operational levels is critical to an alliance’s success.*

### *Create Organizational Alignment*

Clearly it is important to create conditions so that the direct alliance participants can operate as an integrated team. Less obvious, but equally critical, is for other groups to support the activities and the needs of the alliance team. For example, a sales-driven alliance will not succeed if the operations function considers it a low priority to modify systems to support the new activities.

How can one work toward organizational alignment? There are two critical tasks: generating widespread commitment to the alliance objectives and removing barriers to supporting the alliance.

Employees not on the team often have little or no exposure to what the alliance is trying to do. Therefore they are unlikely to keep the alliance in mind when they plan and execute their jobs—and can inadvertently take actions that will impede the efforts of the alliance team. Recognize that creating organization-wide commitment to a new direction requires skill and sensitivity. In the office products example, the CEO used the “tell them and tell them again” approach, responding to all his employees’ concerns with yet another explanation of why “his” strategy made sense and implying that they were lacking if they didn’t see the obvious rationale. Not only did he fail to generate commitment throughout the organization, some groups secretly hoped the alliance would fail. For example, the product development and marketing groups seemed indifferent to the impact on the allied dealers when they introduced a line of inexpensive recycled products that could erode the market for the high-end line carried by the dealers.

A misalignment between existing organizational goals and alliance activities will create barriers even for staff who support the alliance objectives. For alliance team members who also have “day jobs,” the tension is generally between current objectives, such as quarterly sales, and time spent on the longer-term alliance activities. Employees outside the alliance team may also be requested to support the alliance in ways that conflict with their normal objectives. Should a customer service representative who is requested to minimize his or her time per call take extra time for the nonstandard problems of an alliance customer? Should a researcher divulge highly confidential drug protocols to a joint developer?

In outlining the goals for an alliance, it’s important to think about how those goals mesh or conflict with existing operational goals. One approach: gather a team and have them “walk through” likely scenarios to identify potential conflicts. Once goal conflicts have been identified, adjustments can be made. The more the alliance team strives to create results that are outside the status quo, the more they may need special dispensation, revised goals, and self-sufficient capabilities. A classic approach is to make the alliance team a virtual organization with its own goals and rewards. Unfortunately, this can exacerbate the sense of difference from the rest of the organization and create pushback.

Often one company takes a more active role in initiating an alliance and is therefore more prepared to grapple with the internal issues. However, it is important for all partner companies to be willing to address organizational misalignment.

### *Deal Explicitly with Conflicts and Culture Clashes*

All great partnerships enjoy high levels of mutual trust. However, partnerships rarely begin with such high levels, and what trust they do have may even erode during their involvement.

Companies with different cultures (i.e., most partners) have different norms and expectations of how people should respond to each other. Behaviors that make perfect sense for people coming from a highly structured, hierarchical organization may seem ineffective or even irrational to people coming from an organization with an entrepreneurial, open culture, and vice versa. For example, a member of a company that expected its employees to return phone calls every two hours was taken aback at how infrequently his opposite in the alliance responded to his messages. From his perspective, this indicated a lack

of genuine commitment from the other company. His opposite, being part of a company that didn't depend much on voicemail, was astonished to find out that his trustworthiness had been questioned over such a "trivial" issue.

A common trap is to try to get off to a good start by avoiding or minimizing conflict and differences. Many people have an intuitive belief that the best way to solidify a partnership is to be very "nice" and keep the difficult issues buried, hoping the latter either won't emerge or can be dealt with more easily at a later date. *In fact, the opposite approach is critical to building trust.* As early as possible, hold frank discussions of past breakdowns and problems that may have created baggage or mistrust. A systems thinking approach can often help people see how they have unintentionally created difficulties for their partners in the pursuit of their own success. In addition to clearing the air, we have seen alliance teams use this technique to generate key insights into potential conflicts and breakdowns, which they were then able to address in advance.

Often the team will need to establish its own norms and practices as it begins to work together. This process can be frustrating and challenging, since these cultural mismatches may not be evident until they become visible through some clash or conflict in dealing with specific issues. This "culture gap" can be compounded by "business gaps"—different goals and perspectives among team members.

Invest time in building the team. Holding educational events early on in an alliance can bring people to develop a common understanding of the strategic and operational issues that drive success in each company, as well as some understanding of the unwritten rules that govern behavior. Establish ground rules for interacting with each other to create an environment in which conflicts and misunderstandings can lead to learning and problem solving, rather than blame and further breakdowns. Training in systems thinking, productive communication, and conflict management has been shown to be a good investment.

### *Maintain Strong Executive Sponsorship*

Alliances often take on lives of their own as success breeds new opportunities. Acting on these opportunities may require capital investments, modifications to company strategies, or actions that are outside the bounds of current corporate policy. These factors all call for strong executive sponsorship of the alliance. Maintain continuous communication with your executive sponsors, with a particular focus on sharing insights about new opportunities and company practices that may be impeding your ability to proceed. Executives should also ensure that the organization has effective knowledge-sharing mechanisms to gain the maximum benefit from the insights about products, customers, and market opportunities generated by the alliance.

To the extent that the alliance team is required to pursue strategies and tactics that are outside what is considered "normal" or "acceptable," executives will play a critical role in establishing different feedback, measurement, and reward structures for team members. This has been particularly important at the beginning of efforts, when team members may feel exposed or vulnerable, being part of a new activity that is unproved and may be regarded with skepticism by other parts of the organization.

*A systems thinking approach can often help people see how they have unintentionally created difficulties for their partners in the pursuit of their own success.*



*A third, less obvious, benefit comes from the opportunity an alliance gives you to see your company as others see you.*

### *Be Willing to Experiment and to Be Committed to Learning*

Alliances create the opportunity for learning that can fuel future success. The first and most obvious area for insights is the viability of the business strategy that the alliance represents. Alliances are a golden opportunity to run controlled pilots of new products, services, and activities. However, a learning approach is essential. The only guaranteed result of a cross-organizational alliance is that it will not roll out as planned! The capacity to continually document, reflect on, and modify activities is a critical element in a successful alliance.

A second area for learning is the process of building and maintaining successful alliances. Design into your alliance-building activities a method for documenting and sharing key insights into process, structure, roles, and resources that can be applied to future efforts. In this way, successes can be reliably replicated, and setbacks and disappointments in a single effort can still create great value for your company.

A third, less obvious, benefit comes from the opportunity an alliance gives you to see your company as others see you. Practices and assumptions that you have taken for granted may get challenged. This can yield learnings applicable to the whole organization, not just its alliance efforts. In one recent alliance effort, a supplier's tendency to overcommit without follow-through—a tendency that was well understood and compensated for in the supplier organization—was seen in a much more critical light because of its negative impact on the alliance partner. Members of the supplier organization were motivated to understand and begin to address the underlying causes of this behavior throughout their organization.

As cross-organizational alliances become increasingly important elements of corporate strategy, mastering the ability to create and sustain these alliances may become a critical success factor for your organization.

## Commentary by Linda Pierce



Linda Pierce  
Executive Director to the Executive Leadership Team  
Shell Oil Company

If you are a leader in the business world, chances are you are planning, implementing, or reacting to an alliance, merger, joint venture, or acquisition. This article by Kemeny and Yanowitz provides a framework for grappling with the challenging human dynamics that will either enable or undermine the success of your venture. In this commentary, I use my experience with a variety of ventures involving Shell Oil Company to illustrate how you can use this framework to plan your own venture and keep it on track.

For decades, the world of business has been designing and installing innovative structures to increase value. Over time, business goals have become more ambitious, and implementation challenges have become close to overwhelming. Earlier efforts at building interdisciplinary teams, cross-functional business processes, and structural consolidations can now be seen as "practice" for the "big games" of mergers, joint ventures, and strategic alliances. As the challenges in the business game, with its mega-global mergers and alliances, continue to increase, the advantaged players will be the players who learn from each successive level of experience. This article adds to our collective learning by highlighting best and worst practices from real business endeavors.

Kemeny and Yanowitz have reflected on their consulting experience, and offer valuable insights to those whom, by choice or otherwise, enter the game of alliances at any level of their organization. Whether an organization is in the planning stage or the midst of a messy implementation, the authors' insights are relevant. Their systemic point of view focuses on critical human factors by articulating key obstacles in the areas of increased complexity, aligning contrasting orientations, and combining cultures. They bring their story alive by drawing on their own experience of what has and has not worked. After articulating the challenges, they offer seven principles that business lead-

ers and practitioners can use to create their own framework for deriving benefit or value—from their ventures.

Read their article with head, heart, and spirit. Often when we are facing complex challenges and seeking our way clear of difficulty, we fall into the trap of seeing the problem as a purely intellectual head exercise. The rewards of any alliance will not be won without heart and spirit. The messy reality of organizational change has to do with real people in real day-to-day struggles doing the best they know how to do. Kemeny and Yanowitz consistently acknowledge the influence of pre-venture assumptions, mental models, and implicit values. From my experience with ventures involving Shell Oil Company, the success of a venture depends on a critical mass of people who choose to embrace a set of assumptions, mental models, and values in support of the venture's objectives. This involves a degree of personal transformation—sometimes minor, but often major. Personal transformation is a process that must engage our heads, our hearts, and our spirits.

The following are examples of how you can use the authors' framework of key obstacles and their roadmap of seven principles from several related perspectives:

- A guide in the early planning of a venture. Kemeny and Yanowitz give a heads-up preview of what will likely happen. Given your own specific context and objectives, what processes, structures, and systems anticipate and deal with the key obstacles? How will you recognize, and deal with, "the unforeseen consequences of actions in other parts of the organization?" How will you reorient the "strong tendency to focus on maximizing gain for one's own organization?" When short-term crises emerge (as they inevitably do), how will leadership maintain its resolve for the success of the venture?
- A resource for community building among key stakeholders, for example, in planning and conducting workshops with them. Kemeny and Yanowitz point out that successful alliances often require people from multiple functions, geographies, and levels in both organizations to work together. How will you achieve "alignment of contrasting orientations?" When organizational structures become complex, we tend to draw boundaries for clear accountability. How will you maintain accountability without encouraging a deadly "myopic orientation?" How can you "replace the paradigm 'divide and conquer' with 'connect and comprehend'?"
- A lens to anticipate the natural conflicts and culture clashes so that effective interventions can take place. The authors offer practical ideas for identifying potential conflicts. In my experience, this is more than half the battle. How will you recognize a clash when you are in the midst of one? What methods build trust and healthy conflict resolution?
- An ongoing, "sense-making" tool to guide the organizational learning process. As the authors so correctly admit, "the only guaranteed result of a cross-organizational alliance is that it will not roll out as planned." Creating ventures is an unfolding and organic process; a prescribed plan only lasts for a short time. Regularly using Kemeny and Yanowitz' seven principles to understand and make sense of the current reality at discrete points in time is a good diagnostic process. Venture partners who consciously build in the capacity for learning from experience will reap long-term benefits, even beyond their current venture. All too often, business leaders ignore this opportunity for organizational learning, or give it secondary attention. How will you focus your organization's learning? What do you want to learn? What structures and processes will you put in place to enable learning? How will you know what you are learning? In the first issue of *Reflections*, Russell Ackoff's article, "On Learning and the Systems That Facilitate It," and the commentary by William Altier, make a strong distinction between ventures that focus only on growth objectives and those that have primary developmental objectives as well. Ackoff's article is a good resource for this perspective.

Kemeny and Yanowitz offer some answers to critical questions about joint ventures and alliances. But more importantly, they encourage informed questions. In today's dynamic and complex business environment, leaders who stay present with the critical questions will be far more successful than those who operate as though they already have the answers.