24 Sep 2015

Why 11 ‘values’?

In my previous post “Could ‘benefits’ be the DNA of ‘goals’?”, I mentioned that as there were 4 DNA molecules, therefore, by inference, there could be 4 benefits (plus 4 mirror images which I call hardships).

If every benefit can provide a value, then how many values would one expect to find?

As there are 4 ‘benefits’, each would have to have at least 1 ‘value’ which makes 4 in total. This number is insufficient and anyway, when considering how to use ‘values’ later on to calculates ones ‘needs’ and ‘wants’, 4 ‘values’ will not suffice.

Five, six and seven ‘values’ will also fail as one ‘benefit’ will always end up with only 1 ‘value’.

Eight, nine or ten ‘values’ will also fail as at least one ‘benefit’ will end up with having 2 ‘values’ and it will be impossible to choose which of the 2 was a ‘need’ and which was a ‘want’.

How about 11? Well eleven is a prime number and so it may very well work. Three ‘benefits’ would end up having 3 ‘values’ each and one having 2. So if one was to rank the four quadrants equally, they should all total a maximum of 10. Hence three of the quadrants would have 1 ‘need’ (ranked out of 4) and 2 ‘wants’ (each ranked of 3) and the remaining quadrant would have the remaining 2 ‘values’ and each would be a ‘need’ that would rank out of 5. If one assessed themselves as having everything they ‘needed’, the total would be 22/40 which equals 55% (a useful survival rate).

Twelve ‘values’ would not produce ones ‘needs’ as having a 55% survival rate. The best one could come up with having all ‘needs’ satisfied is 40%, hardly worth while, plus the fact that 12 is not a prime number, and somehow a prime number seems to have some mystique about it.

Thirteen is a prime number but in order for all quadrants to equal ranking, one of the quadrants would have to have 4 ‘values’ with three of the four being the ‘wants’ and would have to ranked out of 2, making the process of trying to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats by using the ‘values’ almost unworkable. Again the 4 needs would total a maximum of 16/40 which is the same as having 12.

Any more than thirteen values will soon become unmanageable and would in my humble opinion be a waste of valuable time.

I undertook an analysis of the 11 ‘values’ over 27 years ago (I used to call them ‘critical success factors’) and found that a lot of the ‘values’ that I was considering were in fact synonyms and could therefore be eliminated. I published an article on my findings so if anyone is interested in reading it, please send me an email and I will provide you with the pdf of it.

Charles Meyer Richter
Principal information architect
Ripose Pty Limited