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Abstract

Examination of human civilization reveals that cultures have continually evolved through social and economic forms (Drucker, 2000). Several authors have argued that society is again reaching a turning point where the current mindsets and approaches no longer meet the challenges being faced (Senge, 1990; Veltrop, 2006; Wheatley, 1999). Senge’s perspective is that what is required now is a shift from mechanistic viewpoints to wholistic systems approaches. The new paradigm is reflected in the notion of generative change, which refers to change that builds upon itself; calls forth imagination, creativity, and courage; and originates in the interdependence and interconnectedness of people. This study examined the factors and conditions that lead to generative change in the case of nine individuals in organizations and by using practitioners in the field. The research questions examined the personal characteristics, group characteristics, and systemic conditions necessary for generative change to occur as well as the outcomes that result from generative change.

This study used a qualitative research interview design to gather data from nine men and women who attended the 2009 Connecting for Change Dialogue. Participants were interviewed about their experiences of generative change along with the catalysts, obstacles, and outcomes of those experiences. Content analysis was used to identify the themes in the data.

Facilitators of change were found to occur at the individual, community, and structural levels. A final critical ingredient to support generative change is time. Participants similarly described personal, group, and systemwide outcomes of generative change.

While limitations of the sample, bias, and method affected the results and additional research is needed to examine the long-term outcomes of generativity and how this might become a practical and credible change approach, the findings of this study emphasized that generative change is an approach worthy of exploring. Organization development practitioners, as a result, are advised to enhance their knowledge and skills sets related to this powerful form of change.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Examination of human civilization reveals that cultures have continually evolved through social and economic forms (Drucker, 2000). Each form offers certain benefits and limitations and, as the society reaches a critical point of development and need, society evolves to a new form. For example, the Neolithic Age featured important developments in tools that made hunting more effective (Barker, 2009). Continued developments eventually led to the Agrarian Age, which brought with it farming and more output per worker. Civilization continued to develop, from the Agrarian Age to the Industrial Age and later to the Information Age and the Knowledge Age (Drucker, 2000). Several authors have been observing that change has become increasingly common. Events such as the recent global economic crisis signal that society is again reaching a turning point where the current mindsets and approaches no longer meet the challenges being faced (Senge, 1990; Veltrop, 2006; Wheatley, 1999).

Senge (1990) argued that what is required now among individuals, organizations, and communities is a shift from a mechanistic viewpoint to a wholistic systems approach. This shift has been described as a move from a Newtonian view to one that embraces the connectedness and synchronicities of humans and organizations—concepts reflected in the new sciences of quantum physics, chaos theory, complexity theory, and self-organizing systems (Watkins & Mohr, 2001; Wheatley, 1999).

These concepts also have been reflected in the notion of generative change, which refers to change that builds upon itself and calls forth imagination,
creativity, and courage. In contrast to planned changed, which is typically episodic and focused on “fixing” a prescribed issue, generative change is recursive, designed to achieve multiple and multiplying benefits, and is grounded in an appreciative mindset (Veltrop, 2006). Adopting a generative mindset results in significant shifts in one’s basic beliefs about oneself, others, and the world (see Table 1). Generative change as planned organizational change adopts these core beliefs. This research more deeply examines this concept of a generative paradigm and, more specifically, generative change.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Assumptions of Generative Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Generative Assumptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and their relationships to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s view of problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of social structures and systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the conditions and outcomes of generative change. The research questions were:

1. What personal, group, and systemic characteristics are necessary for generative change to occur?
2. What outcomes tend to occur as a result of generative change?

Study Setting

The sample for the study was drawn from the attendees of the Connecting for Change Dialogue (C4C) sponsored by the Dalai Lama Centre for Peace and Education in Vancouver, Canada. The first session was held September 9 and 10, 2006, as part of the 2006 Vancouver Dialogues. Its goal was to bring together prominent national and international business leaders (e.g., Charles Holmes, facilitator and program manager for C4C; Peter Senge; Peter Block; and Peter Koestenbaum), social innovators, and the Dalai Lama to build relationships and solutions through dialogue for the betterment of the world. This event spawned three smaller C4C Dialogues in San Francisco (November 2007), Vancouver (May 2008), and Los Angeles (November 2008). These smaller events featured gatherings of roughly 60 to 70 business, academic, and community leaders designed to foster dialogue focused on inner peace, personal passion, and leadership.

The second large C4C gathering was held September 26-28, 2009. Building upon the previous C4C Dialogues, the intention was to connect people across sectors through meaningful dialogues that would help catalyze positive changes within individuals, organizations, and ultimately the world. The focus
centered on themes of compassion, community, and creating a means by which new connections with others could be nurtured to build a deeper understanding of humans’ interdependence and interconnectedness. A total of 119 leaders from the corporate, social, and philanthropic sectors attended the sessions that were facilitated by Peter Block, Peter Senge, Margaret Wheatley, Dawna Markova, and Juanita Brown. Attendees of the 2009 Dialogue were a suitable population for this study, as the Dialogue was founded on principles of generative change.

**Significance of Study**

Literature on generative change has slowly been developed over the last two decades; yet, the body of knowledge is still relatively sparse. This research sought to develop this body of work by further clarifying the factors that lead to generative change and what outcomes might be expected from it. The findings that have resulted from this study point to important directions for continued research and offer considerations for change practice that hold promise for enhancing the productivity, profitability, and well-being of individuals, groups, and their organizations.

**Organization of the Study**

This chapter reviewed the background, purpose, setting, and importance of the study. Chapter 2 provides a review of relevant literature. Chapter 3 presents the methods used in this study. Specifically, the research design, sampling, interview procedures, and data analysis procedures are discussed.

Chapter 4 presents the study results. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results, including conclusions, practical recommendations, limitations of the study, and suggestions for additional research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to examine the conditions and outcomes of generative change. Perhaps Einstein’s oft quoted “No problem can be solved from the same consciousness that created it” is a cornerstone for the paradigm shift that is needed to address the level of change we now face (“Albert Einstein Quotes,” 2010, para. 1).

This chapter reviews literature related to generative change, including activities involved in generativity, factors leading to generative change, generative interventions, and outcomes of generative change. These sections draw primarily from the social sciences, including the fields of education studies, organization learning, literature, and psychology.

Generative Change

Three concepts appear in the literature to characterize generative change. First, generative change is based on the systemic notion of wholes, which suggests that systems consist of interconnected parts and that a change to any one part has an impact on the entire system. This concept of wholes gives rise to the argument that “small changes create or facilitate larger changes” (Carich & Spilman, 2004, p. 408). This has been called the butterfly effect, referring to Lorenz’s (1972) landmark work “Does the flap of a butterfly’s wings in Brazil set off a tornado in Texas?” and to the proverbial ripple caused by a pebble dropped in a pond.

Within the context of organizations, an example of this concept would be when workers examine their personal mental models and how these ways of
being affect their interactions with others. Simply the act of reflection can catalyze shifts in behavior. In turn, one individual’s behavioral shifts—for example, deciding to warmly greet each person he or she encounters in the hallway—can affect the greater whole. In this example, the warm greeting can instill positive feelings in another, enhancing their positive thoughts, and possibly culminating in friendly behavior in the other. In turn, conversations between individuals may move to a deeper level, decisions may be made faster, relationships may improve, and greater collaboration could transpire as individuals begin to gain a better understanding of themselves and each other. Thus, small changes within a few individuals can affect the work group, which can affect the division, and so on, until shifts in the culture even begin to manifest.

The benefit of the butterfly effect for organizational change is that focus can then be placed on creating small but significant changes in one area, rather than having to facilitate full-scale change efforts. This is because small changes can have significant bearing on other aspects of the organization. This can be evidenced through a change in leadership approach, introduction of new performance measures, new systems integration, or simply a shift in one’s mental models. The drawback to this is that seemingly small shifts can send an organization into a state of chaos, depending on the nature of the shift.

A second concept of generative change is that it is transformational. This means that it results in changes to the system’s identity, which is comprised of what makes the organization unique—such as its culture (Bushe & Kassam, 2005). In this case, change becomes both generative and transformational when
the organization’s core values shift, which affect its behavioral norms, which manifest in different observable artifacts.

To understand the concept of identity change, consider the example of an organization that operates as compartmentalized divisions that do not communicate or collaborate. If new work forms were introduced (e.g., cross-departmental task forces), dialogue may be promoted across departments and the barriers may be reduced between the silos. Simply having individuals work on a project together who normally would not interact could give each other perspective of each other’s roles. In turn, beliefs and behaviors may start to shift among organization members and the top-down, command-and-control system may shift toward a climate of collaboration and empowerment. The structural change by creating cross-departmental teams may precipitate changes in beliefs among individuals and teams, thus allowing for collaboration to be possible. While the present researcher has observed these kinds of changes occur in organizations, these observed results are purely anecdotal and need to be further researched to understand whether the changes were sustained and what ripple effects they had on future initiatives.

A final concept related to generative change is that it ignites a process of self-perpetuating change, which means that change builds upon itself and creates a positive feedback loop (Ball, 2009). This means, for example, that the individual has an impact on the team, the team has an impact on that individual, the individual again impacts the team, and so on. Thus, both the individuals and their systems are in a continual process of activity and evolution, also referred to as constant adaptive change. In the case of individual generative change, one’s
awareness may expand, shifting one’s mental models, and presenting new possibilities. In this manner, individuals can engage in double- or triple-loop learning (Argyris, 1977). At an organizational level, this can be ignited using large-scale change techniques such as Open Space, World Café, and Appreciative Inquiry (Alban & Bunker, 1997). Having the whole system in the room engaged in a process of dialogue and focusing on a desired future state shifts the dynamics within individuals and the organization at large.

Activities Involved in Generativity

The key to generativity is continuous circumspection about one’s mental models. At its heart, generatively requires discontinuity, meaning breaking from one’s past, creating space for new possibilities to emerge, and shifting one’s paradigms (mental models). Together, these activities spark fundamental strategic innovation by creating new competencies and business models that help organizations break away from the rules and traditions of their industry (Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005).

The literature on generative change is currently quite sparse and a defined theory of generative change has yet to be established. Gergen (1978) suggested that central to generative change is generative capacity, which consists of four activities:

1. Asking questions about behaviors (how and why the organization does things).

2. Surfacing information about guiding beliefs and values (achieved by asking and answering questions).
3. Reevaluating whether the organization wants to continue practicing these behaviors and operating by the underlying beliefs and values.

4. Making the decision to operate in a new way. This invokes exploration and progressive adoption of new beliefs, values, and behaviors. During this stage, barriers can be broken down and new possibilities can emerge. This activity creates more room for innovation and new ways of doing things.

In developing a generative theory, Gergen’s suggested activities may result in “new alternatives for social action” (1978, p. 1346) or new ways of doing things. By examining and challenging the cultural assumptions, and shifting of one’s mental models, we are able to look at new possibilities and new alternatives. Barriers that may normally exist between divisions within organizations or across organizations may be broken down so that groups can effectively work together to create a desired future rather than being at odds with one another. If the current paradigm effectively rules out collaboration and a paradigm shift does not occur in individuals or groups, the opportunity for generative change may be lost. Jacobs and Heracleous (2005) created a model that depicts how individuals and a system as a whole can achieve generativity (see Figure 1). The process begins with critically reviewing the members’ existing mental models. These models could relate to a personal situation the individual is facing (such as finding a new position) or a business situation a group is facing (such as solving productivity issues). During the step of critical review, people engage in dialogue about the situation and actively question the assumptions, arguments, and interpretations that underlie what is being shared. Engaging in
this dialogue enhances members’ understanding of their own and others’ mental models about the situation.

What distinguishes critical review of mental models from the generative moment is the members’ willingness to be changed by what is shared (Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005). When members voice but do not attach to their own assumptions, arguments, and interpretations, shared meanings related to the situation begin to form. These shared meanings, in turn, give rise to shared mental models of the situation.

A final integral aspect of the model is that generative change is ongoing (Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005). That is, even as shared mental models emerge, it is critical to continue examining and questioning the emerging model. This launches the individual or system into a diagnostic moment and a successive round of examination, generativity, and shared meaning and mental modeling.


Figure 1

A Model of Achieving Generativity
An important bias to note in the literature on generative change is the idea that new choices of beliefs, values, and action always follow examination. In contrast, it is entirely possible that the individual or the system decides that the beliefs, values, and behaviors in use are fully acceptable at the present time. Therefore, there may be no change following examination. In this event, a question remains: Is this generative because examination of one's mental models is occurring, or does generativity require shifts in beliefs, values, and behaviors?

A second assumption in the literature is that generativity results in an enhanced sense of social responsibility that compels people to act in novel ways that benefit themselves and others (Bushe, 2007). However, it is possible that one’s shifting mental models may not always focus strongly on the common good. Further research is needed in examining case studies of organizations that have employed generative activities when implementing new initiatives.

**Factors Leading to Generative Change**

Analysis of the literature on generative change reveals that six factors are at the heart of generative change: a heart-centered, appreciative mindset; shared vision; shifting mental models, listening; narrative or storytelling; and a systems perspective. These six factors are described in the sections below.

*Adopting a Heart-Centered, Appreciative Mindset*

A heart-centered, appreciative mindset is one that focuses on exploring and realizing potential, creating new possibilities, valuing wholeness, and giving credence to emotions such as caring and compassion. This is opposed to a head-centered, deficit-based mindset that tends to focus on overcoming
limitations, fixing problems, and giving special attention to performance, results, and metrics (Bushe, 2007; Veltrop, 2006).

Developing an appreciative mindset is not about looking at the world from a “Pollyanna” perspective. Rather it is about being intentional about seeing and acting in ways that value individuals, that value wholeness and that focus on creating what one wants more of rather than what one wants less of. It requires a paradigm shift from problem solving to focusing on potential and possibility (Veltrop, 2006).

A positive or appreciative mindset can be applied in several ways: by choosing to focus on the positive and “catch people doing things right,” thereby increasing the frequency of positive feedback and decreasing negative feedback; by recognizing and appreciating each person’s unique contribution and strengths; by asking questions that invoke positive stories of hope and possibility; and by focusing on what the desired future state is (Bushe, 2007; Bushe & Kassam 2005; Veltrop, 2006).

When one is able create an environment that allows individuals to share their stories and aspirations, rapport is built through the recognition that commonality often exists. Further, through gaining a sense of appreciation of one another (struggle, fears, and hope), collective aspirations are surfaced and the possibility for new actions can occur. While the current literature focuses primarily on positivity, the negative should be entirely overlooked. In doing so, one would fail to value the wholeness of an individual. Rather, it is important to make room to appreciate the “shadow” side that may exist. By doing so, we value the whole person (Bushe, 2007).
An appreciative positive mindset feels good. Additionally, it can make people more resilient to change and setbacks; help improve their relationships; and increase their openness to new ideas and possibilities in others, in themselves, and in their organizations (Bushe, 2007; Fredrickson, 2009; Veltrop, 2006).

**Developing Shared Vision**

A shared vision is an idea for the future that inspires people to work together in cooperative action. An example is Wal-mart’s vision to create a zero-waste business, use 100% renewable energy, and offer customers more environmentally preferable products. These aims culminated in the company creating its sustainability program through collaboration with the David Suzuki Foundation, a major Canadian environmental organization (Groh & Curran, 2007).

Shared vision can be developed first by surfacing personal visions, where each person visualizes his or her own specific role in bringing the shared vision to life. This will, in turn, serve as the unifying force for change within and across an organization. Personal vision can be cultivated through a dialogue process that allows for individuals to talk about what they most desire, hope for, and dream of having in an organization. Bohm (2007) explained that through dialogue,

>a new kind of mind begins to come into being which is based on the development of common meaning . . . . People are no longer primarily in opposition, nor can they said to be interacting; rather they are participating in this pool of common meaning, which is capable of constant development and change. (p. 4).
What can be inferred from this perspective is that shared vision cannot come “from the top” as other change approaches suggest. For vision to be shared, it must integrate the members of the whole rather than indoctrinate the members according to a mandate from above. In the process of sharing their own visions and listening to others, new insights and beliefs into what is possible can begin to surface. This takes both courage and risk-taking on the part of individuals, and the willingness to let go of control on the part of leaders (Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005).

Once a shared vision is developed, it gives individuals and teams something to strive for. The goal that the shared vision establishes is to bring about new ways of thinking and acting together. Shared vision creates a commonality that helps to bring people together around a sense of identity and purpose. It enables individuals to move from an “I-centric” position to a “we-centric” cause, giving focus and energy to creating new actions and a sense of commitment to shared future (Appelbaum & Goransson, 1997; Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005).

**Shifting Mental Models**

Through the shifting of one’s mental models (thoughts that govern the way we make sense of the world and how we take action in it), one can begin to gain new perspectives on the way others think and act and also broaden their own way of being (Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005; Senge, 1990). A new perspective or viewpoint helps to open up new possibilities for new ways of being. By maintaining a learner’s perspective being open to other’s perspectives, we are able to gain new knowledge that can then be applied to behaviors or situations.
Developing new perspectives and new knowledge is a non-linear two-fold process. Individuals must maintain a learner’s perspective, and they need to have openness to exploring and shifting their mental models and understanding others. Both introspection and ongoing personal and professional development help to develop this. In separate studies on developing generativity within the education system, it was found that when teachers see themselves as ongoing learners and connect their personal and professional knowledge with that of their students, they were able to create generative change within their classrooms and students (Ball, 2009; Franke, Carpenter, Levi, & Fennema, 2001).

By creating an environment that supports ongoing learning and willingness to question and explore new perspectives, new knowledge can be sought after and continually applied. This takes place in part by being curious and letting go of the “expert” stance and being willing to “access your ignorance” (Schein, 1999).

When we are able to shift mental models and open up to new perspectives and new knowledge we make room for new possibilities to occur. According to Franke et al. (2001),

> when individuals learn with understanding, they can apply their knowledge to learn new topics and solve new and unfamiliar problems . . . Knowledge becomes generative when the learner sees the need to integrate new knowledge with existing knowledge and continually reconsiders existing knowledge in light of new knowledge that they are learning. (pp. 655-656)

**Listening**

The Merriam Webster online dictionary describes listening as (a) to pay attention to sound and (b) to hear something with thoughtful attention. It is the concept of “thoughtful attention” that is important to generativity. Sometimes
referred to as “active listening”, true listening involves the suspension of filtering through our own biases, and employing a sense of curiosity and inquiry. Most often in conversations, individuals are simply formulating their response to what the other person is saying, rather than being curious about the person’s perspective. As Fran Lebowitz stated, "The opposite of talking isn't listening. The opposite of talking is waiting" ("Fran Lebowitz Quotes," 2010, para. 1).

Listening skills can be developed through consciously becoming curious about what the other person is talking about. When we are curious, we are more inclined to ask questions, to seek clarification and understanding, to pay thoughtful attention to not only what is being said, but also what the underlying meaning may be. Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, and Smith (1994) described this as generative listening, “You not only listen for what someone knows, but for who he or she is” (p. 377). When we really listen to someone, we can begin to gain a better idea of who they are, what contribution they bring, what fears they may have, and how we can best work together.

Listening skills can be applied on an individual basis, through the choice to hone and develop one’s own skills, or on a group basis. This is done most effectively by honoring the space for individuals to voice their thoughts without interruption, by seeking clarification, and by paraphrasing what the individual has said to confirm understanding. The Talking Stick is a tool used in many First Nations Traditions when a council is called. It allows all council members to present their Sacred Point of View. The Talking Stick is passed from person to person as they speak and only the person holding the stick is allowed to talk during that time period. This method slows the process down so that others
cannot interrupt. While is it not foolproof in making people listen, it changes the nature of how conversation traditionally transpires and encourages one to listen more attentively. This is a method that can be equally effective applied in large group meetings or the boardroom.

Listening can help to build relationships through gaining understanding of others. When we are able to truly listen to others, particularly those we see as adversaries, we often discover that they value similar things. This helps to humanize them and breakdown the concept of “us” versus “them” (Bushe, 2007). When we discover that we do not have the same values and in fact are very different, we can then gain a better understanding of each other to see if a common platform can be reached from which to move. In their study on generative change in teachers, Franke et al. (2001) found that a teachers’ learning became generative when they focused on their student’s thinking—this happened when teachers listened to their students and sought to understand what they had heard.

Engaging in Narrative or Storytelling

Storytelling is the sharing of experiences. We use stories to pass on accumulated wisdom, beliefs, and values. Through stories we explain how things are, why they are, and our role and purpose. Stories are the building blocks of knowledge, the foundation of memory and learning. It is often said that narrative is the framework through which we comprehend life (Ball, 2009). Our stories help us to understand others and ourselves more by creating a collective framework from which to draw from.
Narrative and storytelling can be developed through integration into personal and professional development. Integrating journaling or reflections of experiences and then sharing those reflections through our stories facilitates a broader understanding of ourselves and others (Ball, 2009; Cule & Robey, 2004).

The use of storytelling is a key component within Appreciative Inquiry. The poetic principle in Appreciative Inquiry states that “organizations are more like a book than a living organism, that organizational life is expressed in the stories people tell each other everyday, and that story of the organization is constantly being coauthored” (Bushe & Kassam, 2005, p. 166). Storytelling can be incorporated both by listening to the story that is being told about the organization as well as encouraging storytelling within an organization.

We learn, grow, and connect through the collective power of storytelling. Stories connect us with our humanness and link past, present, and future by teaching us to anticipate the possible consequences of our actions and, through imagination, create the space to dream. Further to this, the sharing of narratives with others can assist in both defining problems and potential resolutions through expanded understanding (Ball, 2009).

*Developing a Systems Perspective*

Systems perspective is a conceptual framework for understanding complex patterns and interrelationships. It is a discipline for seeing the whole of something, rather then viewing things as separate, independent parts. Since the industrial age, we have tended to see things from a mechanistic, Newtonian viewpoint, treating human systems as machines, and people as replaceable parts. The Newtonian perspective assumes that the more we know about the
workings of each part, the more we will learn about the whole (Wheatley, 1999). Systems perspective views systems as a whole with the attention given to relationships within the network. With the increased sophistication and speed of technology over the last several decades, our world has become increasingly smaller and yet more fragmented. We are beginning to understand that in order to address the current issues of the day, we need to develop a collective understanding and approach and begin to view things from a systems perspective. Senge (1990) described it as “an antidote to this sense of helplessness that many feel as we enter the ‘age of interdependence’” (p. 69).

When viewed from a systems perspective, we begin to see how change in one part of the system impacts the other part of the whole, much like the proverbial pebble in the pond generating repercussions throughout the pond.

A shift in mindset from Newtonian cause-and-effect thinking must take place in order to develop systems thinking. When we begin to understand how systems work, we gain a better understanding of how small changes can impact the greater whole and, thereby, are able to see the impact of our individual choices.

Systems thinking can be applied by seeing and emphasizing the interconnectedness that exists between individuals, organizations, and across sectors. By creating an environment that that focuses on accountability and cooperation, we can begin to move toward systems thinking.

Systems thinking helps us to the see the interrelationships that occur rather than seeing events as linear cause-effect chains. Systems thinking also allows us to see processes of change rather than viewing change as episodic
snapshots. In adopting a systems perspective, we begin to understand that everyone shares responsibility for what is happening within a given system, rather than responsibility or blame falling on a given individual or agency (Senge, 1990).

**Generative Interventions**

Carich and Spilman (2004) distilled generic principles from across the field of therapeutic models within psychotherapy for the purpose of identifying practices and principles that could be applied to almost any therapeutic technique or situation. Although Carich and Spilman described generative change as a generic principle of therapeutic intervention, this can also be applied to interventions within organizations.

Many large-scale change interventions (such as Future Search, The World Café, Appreciative Inquiry, and the Conference Model) utilize the generative activities of questioning, evaluating, and shifting mental models to initiate change and move toward a desired future. Integral to many of these large-scale change interventions is bringing together individuals from across boundaries (cultural, governmental, cross-sector, generational) that would not ordinarily meet. The resulting diversity of perspectives often enriches the dialogue and also enables whole-scale change. This is an ideal situation, of course, and might not always happen. In his book, *The Necessary Revolution*, Senge, Smith, Kruschwitz, Laur, and Schley (2008) argued, for example, that a more sustainable world could result if organizations from across sectors and industries would work together to deal with the global environmental crisis. For instance, the World Wild Fund and
the Coca-Cola Company have formed an alliance to address issues of water sustainability.

Gergen’s work is considered one of the central sources that influenced the creation of Appreciative Inquiry. In Appreciative Inquiry, generativity is seen as both an input and an outcome. Appreciative Inquiry is generative in a number of ways: it seeks to find new ideas and alter mental models that lead us to an emerging future, alters the social construction of reality and, in the process, creates alternatives for organizational actions (Bushe, 2007). Veltrop (2006) stated that in order to design for generative initiatives, organizations must appreciate that which they want to multiply. The area that Gergen does not examine is the ability for small changes to create a larger impact on the system as outlined by Carich and Spilman (2004).

Bushe (2007) suggested that perhaps Appreciative Inquiry should be called *Generative Inquiry*. While he did not offer a direct definition of generative change per se, Bushe described Appreciative Inquiry being generative as “a quest for new ideas, images, theories, and models that liberate our collective aspirations, alter the social construction or reality, and in the process, make available decisions and actions that weren’t available or didn’t occur to us before” (p. 30).

**Outcomes of Generative Change**

Literature on generative change consistently points to outcomes that suggest enhanced capacity at individual, group, and organizational levels. Further, the enhanced capacity refers to expanded capacity for learning, for change, and for performance (Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005; Veltrop, 2006). For
example, one organizational impact of generative change is increased competitive advantage, according to work by Jacobs and Heracleous (2005).

Regarding an enhanced capability for learning, Franke et al. (2001) explained that following generative change, individuals tended to continue to add to their understanding. They explained that knowledge becomes generative when the learner sees the need to integrate new knowledge with existing knowledge and continually reconsiders existing knowledge in light of the new knowledge. As a result, people tend to engage in higher levels of learning and creativity. In Ball’s (2009) study of generative change in schools, he found that educators become change agents within schools as both students and teachers developed a sense of voice. Students learned to become more generative thinkers, which was critical when dealing with marginalized populations. Simultaneously, generative change gives rise to new and better ways of teaching, continued learning, development of learning communities, as well as ongoing growth and professional development (Franke et al., 2001). Ultimately, this could be considered the creation of a learning organization—namely, one that is inventive, supple, and responsive to change (Appelbaum & Goransson, 1997).

Another notable outcome of generative change is the creation of novel forms and approaches. Van de Ven and Poole (1995) elaborated, “A constructive mode of change generates unprecedented, novel forms that, in retrospect, often are discontinuous and unpredictable departures from the past” (p. 522). On an individual level, generative change can “be dramatic to the extent that pervasive personality factors are also affected, and the dynamics or operation of the presented symptoms take on new meaning” (Carich & Spilman, 2004, p. 408). In
Cule and Robey’s (2004) research on generative change in organizations, the organization’s goal to create a new profitable service business was met; however, the organization form and business model were different from those originally envisaged. Outcomes continued, although they were unpredictable and emergent. These novel forms also can manifest simply as novel ways of thinking and problem solving. Some examples are the establishment of a representative United Religions organization or a new social architecture created by employee initiatives (Busche & Kassam, 2005). The result of these novel forms is transformational change, as individuals, groups, and organizations move toward a desired or better future (Busche, 2007).

Veltrop (2006) summarized that the ultimate outcomes of generativity are aliveness, creativity, and the enhancement of the human spirit. He added that generative outcomes tend to be recursive and are designed to achieve multiple and multiplying benefits.

**Summary of the Literature**

Review of the literature has suggested that three concepts characterize generative change: small changes facilitate larger changes, generative change is fundamentally transformational, and generative change ignites a process of self-perpetuating change (Ball, 2009).

Generative change relies upon activities such as continuous circumspection about one’s mental models, breaking from one’s past, creating space for new possibilities to emerge, and shifting one’s paradigms. These activities result in new alternatives for social action. Gergen (1978) called this generative capacity. Jacobs and Heracleous (2005) stressed that this form of
change relies upon the generative moment, which means members’ willingness to be changed by what is shared. When this occurs, shared meanings that give rise to shared mental models of the situation can emerge.

Factors that are believed to lead to generative change include adopting a heart-centered, appreciative mindset; developing shared vision; shifting mental models, listening; engaging in narrative or storytelling; and developing a systems perspective. These factors have been built into interventions such as Future Search, The World Café, Appreciative Inquiry, and the Conference Model, as these rely on generative activities such as questioning, evaluating, and shifting mental models to initiate change and move toward a desired future. Importantly, these interventions bring together individuals from across boundaries (cultural, governmental, cross-sector, generational) that would not ordinarily meet. The resulting diversity of perspectives often enriches the dialogue and also enables whole-scale change.

The outcomes of generative change named in the literature include enhanced capacity at the individual, group, and organizational levels; expanded capacity for learning; shared responsibility for change; creation of learning organizations; the creation of novel forms and approaches; and aliveness, creativity, and the enhancement of the human spirit (Veltrop, 2006).

The bias that seems evident in the literature is that the examination of mental models always leads to shifts in those models. Another bias is that generativity results in an enhanced sense of social responsibility that compels people to act in novel ways that benefit themselves and others (Bushe, 2007). However, it is possible that one’s shifting mental models may not always focus
strongly on the common good. Based on these collected findings, further research is needed to examine case studies of organizations that have employed generative activities. Specifically, it is important to validate whether the conditions named in this chapter truly are necessary for change to be generative. The present study aimed to examine these factors. The next chapter describes the methods used in this study.
Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this study was to examine the conditions and outcomes of generative change. The research questions were:

1. What personal, group, and systemic characteristics are necessary for generative change to occur?

2. What outcomes tend to occur as a result of generative change?

This chapter describes the methods used in this study. The research paradigm and design is described first, followed by the procedures related to sampling, interviewing, and analyzing the data.

Research Paradigm and Design

This exploratory study aimed to build upon the existing literature on generative change and to identify additional directions for research on the topic. This study utilized a qualitative approach, which is situated in post-positivism. Post-positivism holds that knowledge is subjective rather than objective and constructed by humans in interaction, rather than discovered through impersonal scientific examination (Miles & Huberman, 2004).

As a result, it takes place in the natural world, uses multiple methods that are both interactive and humanistic, and focuses on the context within which the examined phenomena occurs (Miles & Huberman, 2004). Another distinguishing characteristic is that qualitative approaches are emergent, developing with the nuances of the inquiry, rather than pre-figured (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Punch, 2005).
Due to the interactive and inherently personal nature of qualitative studies, the researcher plays a unique role in these forms of inquiry. Unlike quantitative studies, where the researcher is viewed as an external, impersonal observer, in qualitative studies, the researcher is seen as inextricably linked to the researcher and participants— influencing and being influenced by the unfolding investigation (Punch, 2005). In this study, the researcher participated in the C4C Dialogue. As a result, the researcher knew the participants and the program. She also acknowledged her own biases about generative change.

The data gathered in qualitative studies primarily are words, which often are organized into stories. Thus, the qualitative approach allows the researcher to capture a breadth and depth of human experience and is more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and integrations. This allows for the researcher to generate or revise his or her own conceptual frameworks (Miles & Huberman, 2004). Analysis in qualitative studies is fundamentally interpretive (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Punch 2005).

The specific qualitative design used in this study was one-on-one in-depth research interviewing. Interviews allow researchers to gather participants’ experiences, thoughts, motivations, and other information that does not lend itself to observation, survey, or other forms of data collection. Interviews also are particularly helpful in providing a way for the researcher to understand the meaning of participants’ behaviors (Dilley, 2004). As a result, interviews hold the potential for revealing deep complexity (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 2004).
Interviewing has both strengths and limitations. As interviews seek to understand the world from the participant’s point of view, they give voice to the participants, capture their stories in their own words, and create level of intimacy between the researcher and his or her participants (Dilley, 2004; Kvale, 2006). At the same time, the intimacy created through the interview setting may result in the participant sharing more than he or she intended, which can result in emotional risk for the participant. Additionally, there is an increased chance of the researcher leading the participant in this kind of design. Another challenge of interviewing is that it can result in an enormous volume of information that can be difficult to analyze. During analysis, the researcher’s values, biases, and beliefs will inevitably influence interpretation. While qualitative data can appear simple, Miles and Huberman (2004) warned that “the apparent simplicity of qualitative data masks a good deal of complexity, requiring plenty of care and self-awareness on the part of the researcher” (p. 10).

A qualitative interview approach was deemed appropriate for this study, as the study was exploratory and its aim was to capture a deep understanding of the facilitators and outcomes of generative change.

Sampling

Sampling concerns issues of sampling strategy, selection criteria, selection procedures. These considerations are described below, along with a description of the participants and the confidentiality and consent procedures.

Sampling Strategy

Within the qualitative framework, all sampling activities are said to be theoretically driven and, as such, concepts derived from the literature review and
the research questions should inform the sampling strategy (Marshall &
Rossman, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 2004). It was important to define appropriate
selection criteria, as interviews were the primary method used for data collection
and this approach generates a vast amount of data.

Due to the depth of the inquiry, qualitative research tends to utilize small
samples of people set within the context of the phenomenon. Rather than
determining a statistically appropriate sample size, sampling in qualitative
research should continue until theoretical saturation occurs, meaning that the
researcher starts hearing the same material and uncovers no new themes with
each successive interview (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006; Miles & Huberman,
2004). In Guest et al.’s (2006) meta-analysis of qualitative studies, saturation
tended to occur within the first 12 interviews, with the basic elements for meta-
themes presenting in as early as six interviews. The sample size for the present
study was set at 10 participants to allow for in-depth insights to be collected and
to accommodate time and resource constraints.

Sampling strategies define a specific approach for identifying study
candidates. Purposive sampling, where participants have certain characteristics
or meet defined criteria, tends to be used to assure that relevant data are
gathered. Miles and Huberman (2004) outlined 16 common qualitative sampling
strategies, each reflecting the questions or purpose guiding the study. The
strategy utilized within this study has been a combination of convenience and
criterion sampling. Convenience sampling is used when the researcher relies on
his or her own networks to identify candidates. The benefit of convenience
sampling is to take advantage of situations or participants who are close at hand;
therefore, it is less time and effort exhaustive as other types. The main drawback of this approach is that it offers ease and expeditiousness sometimes at the expense of information and credibility (Miles & Huberman, 2004). To mitigate this, criterion sampling also was used. Criterion sampling means defining certain characteristics that the participants must have to take part in the study. The selection criteria for this study are described in the next section.

Selection Criteria

Selection criteria enable the researcher to distinguish candidates who are likely to provide rich and relevant data from those candidates who would not be able to do so. This study needed to include individuals who had experience with either directing or being involved in generative organizational change initiatives. As a result, three selection criteria were defined:

1. The participant attended the 2009 C4C Dialogue. This event focused on generative change and its principles. It was reasonable to assume, therefore, that participant had exposure to the concepts of generativity. The researcher also attended this conference, which gave her direct access to this group of 119 individuals who reflected a diverse range of business, social sector, and philanthropic leaders of varying ages, genders, and nationalities.

2. The participant holds a senior position within his or her organization and, therefore, has the authority to guide or influence change. This criterion was defined to assure that the participant had a broad view of change within his or her organization. It was believed that being in a leadership position would better enable the participant to identify the facilitators and outcomes of generative change.
3. The participant has hands-on, real-world experience with initiating and implementing change initiatives. Ideas about change and what actually happens during change do not always match. Therefore, it was important to involve participants who could share actual stories of change.

Selection Procedures

The researcher sent an email invitation to all those who attended the 2009 C4C Dialogue. The invitation explained the purpose of the study, the confidential and voluntary nature of the study, and an invitation to participate in a 60-minute interview. This invitation was accompanied by a letter from the Dalai Lama Center for Peace and Education that stated the organization was aware of the study and also ensured that no personal information other than what the researcher already had access to would be shared. Interested participants were asked to respond directly to researcher by email or telephone to confirm their participation (see Appendix A).

The researcher responded to each interested party with a follow-up email that confirmed their participation in the study, restated the study purpose, described the confidentiality and consent procedures, and scheduled a time for the interview. After the researcher had confirmed participation with 10 individuals, participant selection ended.

Participant Description

Ten interviews were conducted for this study. However, only nine interviews were included in the study, as one interview recording was inaudible and could not be transcribed. Of these nine, three were men and six were women. All nine participants held upper management positions in their
organizations. Participants were equally distributed across age groups: two were aged 30 to 39 years, two were aged 40 to 49 years, three were aged 50 to 59 years, and two were over age 60. The participants were well-educated: two held bachelor's degrees, five held masters degrees, and two held doctoral degrees. Most participants had involvement in more than one sector and industry: three were involved in for-profit corporate entities, three were involved in nonprofit entities, one was involved in a philanthropic business, and four were business owners.

Confidentiality and Consent Procedures

Institutional approval to conduct the proposed research study was obtained through the Dalai Lama Center for Peace and Education and Pepperdine University's Institutional Review Board. In addition, the researcher successfully completed and passed the web-based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants” by the National Institute of Health Office of Extramural Research.

All participants signed a research consent form before undergoing an interview (see Appendix B). All participant responses to interviews were kept confidential. During transcription of the audio recordings, actual personal and business names were given a pseudonym. Participants’ transcripts were identified by code. Only aggregate themes are reported in the results, although individual anonymous quotes are provided as exemplars of the themes. All research-related materials were kept on a password-protected and encrypted laptop owned by the researcher. Additionally, all handwritten notes, tape recordings, and transcripts of audio recordings were stored securely in the
researcher’s locked file cabinet during the study, where they will remain for a period of 5 years, at which point they will be destroyed.

**Interview Procedures**

Three common interview designs exist: structured, unstructured, and semi-structured. With structured interviews, the respondent is asked a series of pre-established questions that have pre-determined response categories. Structured interviews feature a rational and standardized design; therefore, they allow little room for variations in participant responses. The interviewer plays a quite limited role in this type of interview.

In contrast, the unstructured interview is non-standardized, open-ended, and in-depth. It tends to generate a vast amount of data (Punch, 2005). In this type of interview, the participant’s perspective of the phenomenon being study takes precedence over the researcher’s. It often mirrors the nature of an intimate conversation and requires that the researcher have a developed skill set in this type of interview for rich and relevant data to result.

The third type, semi-structured, features a blend of pre-determined form and flexibility, as topics and questions are determined in advance; however, the wording and sequence of questions can be adapted to fit the nuances of the emerging research conversation. This was the most appropriate type of interview for this study, as the researcher wanted to gain deep insight into the experiences, thoughts, and perspectives of the participants and the researcher had identified specific topics to explore in the interview.

**Interview Design**

The interview was organized into three categories of questions:
1. Demographics. Four questions were posed to gather information about the participants’ age, education, level in their organizations, and the nature of their business.

2. Experiences of generative change. After providing a definition of generative change as “change that builds upon itself and calls forth imagination, creativity and courage . . . [and] which is recursive, designed to achieve multiple and multiplying benefits and is grounded in an appreciative mindset,” the researcher posed five questions to gather information about the experience, catalyst, obstacles, means for overcoming obstacles, and impacts of generative change.

3. C4C dialogue. Two questions gathered information about the participant’s intention for attending the dialogue and what the impact of the conference was. This information was gathered primarily as feedback for the conference organizers and was not reported as part of the study data.

Following these scripted questions, the researcher posed a final catch-all question to gather any additional insights the participant wished to share about generative change. Open-ended questions were used extensively to allow for greater flexibility in the research conversation, to give the participant the freedom to answer authentically, and to generate answers with greater depth.

The interview script was reviewed and piloted with two of the researcher’s colleagues who were not involved in the study. Feedback was solicited at the completion of the pilot interviews regarding the clarity of the questions and the flow of the conversation. The researcher also noted the duration of the interview, tested the recording equipment, and reflected on the data collected to ensure the
questions yielded meaningful data. The interview script was adapted as needed. Appendix C contains the interview script used in the study. All of the interviews were conducted using this list of questions as protocol, although certain questions were expanded upon based on individual responses.

**Administration**

To be able to effectively generate data that is relevant, it is important that the researcher possess certain skills. Kvale (1996) proposed that successful interviewers are knowledgeable about the focus of the interview; sensitive, empathic, and gentle in their questioning; and clear and structured in establishing the frame for the interview and posing questions. In addition, interviewers need to remember what participants said earlier in the interview, critically challenge what participants say (e.g., by dealing with inconsistencies in interviewee’s replies), and clarify and extend the meanings of interviewees’ statements through ongoing interpretation. In addition to these skills, it is important that the researcher has exceptional listening skills, is skillful in interpersonal interaction, and exercises the awareness and ethical fortitude to avoid biasing the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The interviewer can develop these skills by conducting practice interviews.

Interviews can be conducted in person or by telephone. In-person interviewing can be advantageous for developing rapport with participants and for gathering data about the participants’ nonverbal communication. It is important to listen for and capture not only what the participant is saying, but also how they say it, listening closely for the nuance behind what is being said (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). However, in-person interviewing requires significantly more
time and cost to conduct the research. Due to the geographical diversity of the participants and time and resource constraints, interviews were conducted by telephone for this study.

Given that interviews can generate volumes of information that must be analyzed, it is critical that the researcher set an appropriate time for the interview duration that allows a balance between collecting enough meaningful information without getting overwhelmed with superfluous data. Additionally, the participants' time must be respected. Each interview in the current study was approximately 45 to 60 minutes.

Before each interview, the researcher reviewed the study purpose, research questions, and interview questions to mentally focus on the interview. The recording device also was tested to avoid technical malfunction.

At the start of the interview, the researcher thanked the participant for his or her involvement, confirmed his or her understanding of the study purpose and answered any questions about the consent form. The researcher also reminded the participant that participation was voluntary and that the interview would be audio-recorded. The researcher proceeded with the interview script provided in Appendix C.

Interviews were recorded on a handheld recording device and a backup recording device in MP3 format. The researcher took handwritten notes. The MP3 recordings were given a participant code and sent to a transcription service for transcribing. The researcher confirmed with the participants that they could be contacted for clarification on any data that was not clear in transcribing. The researcher noted observations and personal speculations at the end of each
interview. The researcher sent each participant a follow-up thank-you note at the conclusion of the interview.

Data Analysis

Data analysis is the search for general statements about relationships and underlying themes. Marshall and Rossman (2006) suggested that data collection and analysis go hand-in-hand and that the overall strategy is closer to the interpretive-subjectivist end of the continuum than the technical-objectivist end.

The researcher used the following procedures to analyze the data collected (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 2004):

1. The researcher organized the data collected, which included transcripts of all interviews, handwritten notes taken during and the researchers’ personal observations. Data were recorded in a spreadsheet with types of data collected according to dates, times, and participant codes. This helped to ensure consistency and that no data were overlooked.

2. The researcher read the interview transcripts and corresponding notes several times to become intimately familiar with the data and to start the process of reducing the data. This assisted the researcher in developing an understanding of nature, depth, and breadth of interviews and the data gathered.

3. The researcher then reviewed the answers participants provided for each question individually to start the process of generating categories and themes. An initial set of themes that represented the data was identified for each question and coded. The researcher also employed the method of writing analytic memos consisting of notes, reflections, thoughts, and insights to see if any unusual insights may emerge.
4. Answers for each question and participant were then sorted according to the themes for that question.

5. Following the sorting in Step 4, a list of themes and the data associated with each were reviewed to evaluate the appropriateness of each theme and its wording. Themes were reworded, combined, or expanded as needed.

6. The number of participants reporting each theme was calculated when the analysis was complete.

7. The researcher also reviewed her own notes and observations and calibrated this with the completed data analysis.

8. A second coder was used to review the data analysis for all the interviews and determine whether the results appeared to be valid. The second coder was provided with the interview transcripts and asked to follow Steps 3 through 6 of this procedure. The researcher and the second coder compared results and, where discrepancies were found in the results, the researcher and the second coder discussed and agreed upon how the analysis was revised. The information was then synthesized into an overall summary.

**Summary**

This chapter provided a summary of the research paradigm, design, and methods used to address the question of what factors and conditions lead to generative change. This study utilized a qualitative semi-structured interview design. Ten people who attended the 2009 C4C Dialogue were interviewed. Participants were asked about their experiences of generative change and of the C4C Dialogue. One recording was inaudible; therefore, the remaining nine
transcripts were included in the study. Content analysis was used to produce the study results, which are reported in the next chapter.
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Results

This chapter reports the results that emerged from the study. These findings correspond to the research questions for this study, which investigated the personal characteristics, group characteristics, and systemic conditions necessary for generative change to occur as well as the outcomes that result from generative change. Participants expressed enthusiasm for the research and attempting to operationalize generative change. One participant shared,

Well, I love, love, love the idea of generative change and transformational change and the fact that you’re studying it and thinking about what the factors are that give rise to it. And that you’re trying to somehow operationalize what can’t be operationalized, define what is not definable.

Another shared,

it gives me great encouragement that there are very professionally minded people that are spending their time more and more in this Connecting for Change kind of environment. It’s going to take people that aren’t considered fringe, like the peace movement of the sixties. This is not what this is about. We’re not all hippies sitting together and saying this. It’s everybody. It’s all levels. There’s a very strong voice.

Participants were asked to share their experiences of generative change in an organizational context. One participant shared that she has seen a significant rise in cases of generative change recently:

Almost every one of my businesses has gone through some experience of generative change. I’ve just seen a real sort of sea-change that feels very generative over the last 18 to 24 months where people didn’t really understand what was going on in the sustainability space. And now pretty much every corporation has embraced it and gotten behind it because of a few significant leaders in the space.
The study data suggested that generativity requires certain attitudes and actions at the individual level. The individual then connects with a community that, in turn, exhibits certain generative conditions and processes. When this community engages with a structure that features a supportive set of goals, type of leadership, environment, and processes, generativity is further supported. The final element necessary for generativity is time, so that a multiplying ripple effect may take hold (see Figure 2). The following sections describe these aspects in detail.

Individual Facilitators

Analysis of the study data suggested that individual-level attitudes and actions were necessary to support generative change. The following sections describe these attitudes and actions described by the participants.

Attitudes

Three personal attitudes were named in the study data as necessary for igniting generative change: deep personal engagement (cited by nine participants), openness to the unexpected (cited by three participants), and inner confidence and belief (cited by one participant).

Regarding deep personal engagement (cited by nine participants), interviewees described the need to connect to those things they uniquely find meaningful and to take action in their day-to-day lives. Generative change is believed to emerge from the inside out. Sample participant comments included . . . as the Dalai Lama says, it all starts at home. Calling people to action on meaningful things that they can do in their day-to-day lives to make a difference.
Figure 2
Facilitators of Generativity
I would say that the catalyst was actually internal. And the internal catalyst is something that I’m really musing on right now, reflecting on right now, which is that bodily sense, that Mack truck sense, inside of you of recognition and—of recognition that this is essentially who you are and what you need to do. A recognition of the call. I’m trying to figure out how we know what we know that it is essentially one’s own and that it hits the nail on the head in a very primal place of selfness. We all recognize it and when that happens that’s the catalyst. That opens things up inside and makes me—or makes one receptive as opposed to closed and directed. Some call it divine inspiration and it’s something bigger . . . it is that resonance and we all recognize it.

On a personal sense I’m in a space where I’m trying to figure out how to tell the best story and better understand how to weave an effective story. When you can kind of cut through at the very beginning and connect to someone’s heart or their emotions on some level, you can save a lot of time.

You can’t transform systems by edict. Change actually comes from within, not from without.

The second theme, openness to the unexpected (cited by three participants), is illustrated by these quotes.

I described this past year as a sort of a personal pilgrimage that I was on where I just gave myself permission to follow my nose and to follow my heart without evaluating it. Being responsive to the things that called to me and not forcing myself to do the things that didn’t. [When I was assigned a partner for a conference] It was the sense that I had met someone—something that was going to be life changing. And those are very rare occurrences but very recognizable. And all of my connections from that point forward . . . were no-brainers. They weren’t effortful, they weren’t planned. They just came very naturally as kind of an inner necessity and a fallout from what needed to be done and what was self-evident.

I would say that it starts by abandoning the 5-year plan. . . . I always had a 5-year plan. . . . And built my practice around the ideals at the time that were more based on sort of a set mindset, . . . you start letting go of your preconceptions and are open-minded to the fact that maybe this sort of synchronistic life might make sense and if you abandon the framework and embrace the intuitive, that it allows for this generative change.
You have to let go [and] . . . put your intentions out there for where you want to go and then be open to things kind of taking on a life of their own. So generative change really is kind of like, for me, bottom up rather than top down.

The final attitude was inner confidence and belief (cited by my one participant). This participant explained, “The bigger challenges are the internal ones. I had to not care about what other people thought about the credibility. And I could use my own historical credibility as a foundation for being able to reach an audience.”

**Actions**

Participants named four personal actions that are necessary to stimulate generative change: practicing mindfulness and reflection (cited by three participants), overcoming inertia (cited by two participants), practicing personal presence (cited by one participant), and engaging in careful conscious sharing (cited by one participant).

The first action, mindfulness and reflection, was cited by three participants. These interviewees spoke of the importance of contemplation and observing the self:

I have now an awareness and a mechanism inside of me to be an observer of what my own reactions are and what is happening rather than being swept away by it or pulled back into habits. So as long as I can be the author of my life in an active way and in an observant way, then I can monitor and regulate the kind and amount of change that I can do at any given time.

I exposed myself to or became exposed to meditative, contemplative values. That’s exactly what it was, ‘cause it wasn’t one particular path. It was actually a lot of reading of different paths but all sort of based on that contemplative view.
The second action of overcoming inertia (cited by two participants) referred to letting go of one's own homeostasis of the personal and professional roles one had achieved. Participants described these old roles and ways of being as obstacles to generative change:

Prior identity. And the way self, family, community, conspire to keep one in one's place. There are always these forces [and this] . . . homeostasis that sort of brings you back to the balance that everybody knows how you fit and what you're supposed to do and who you are. And they're invisible and non-verbal and sometimes very obvious forces that look at you like you're crazy or make you feel guilty and selfish or just need you to be who you've always been. And those obstacles—those are the forces that sort of you have to push through and have the courage to be authentic so that you're not pushed back into a womb that you've outgrown.

Probably the biggest obstacle was to let go of 25 years of experience in a field that I had gained a tremendous amount of experience and recognition and to move into a whole other arena was a big step.

Personal presence was the third action, which referred to avoiding an over-reliance on the intellect. This was cited by one participant:

My sense is it's really presence that brings us into the generative field, not the intellect. I think still we have a very strong bias towards over-relying on the intellect as being our primary way of knowing. And the intellect, I think, is very helpful at pointing to the generative spaces, but doesn't necessarily help us get there. And we can run the risk of opening up a lot of language around it but not actually touching the cloth of what it is. In terms of a direct encounter with being present to a generative field. . . . There's a particular quality of presence . . . that in itself is potentially transformative.

The final action was conscious, careful sharing, which referred to exercising judgment about how much and with whom one shares the details of change in order to support one's own growth. This was cited by one participant, who explained,
Sometimes I don’t tell everybody everything. I choose my battles and choose who I trust to tell things to. Sometimes I don’t sort of wear that radical “I’m changing” banner on my head, because sometimes I know people can’t tolerate it or that I won’t be able to tolerate what comes back to me. So, sometimes I don’t share. What I would say more broadly is that I’m very discriminating about which parts of myself I share with whom, when, in order to protect and preserve my growth trajectory.

**Community Conditions and Practices**

Analysis of the study data revealed a set of community-level conditions and practices needed to support generative change. The following sections describe these conditions and practices described the participants.

**Conditions**

Two community-level conditions were identified by participants: being in one’s tribe (cited by five participants) and forming creative partnerships (cited by four participants). When these conditions are present, generative change tends to flourish.

The first condition, finding one’s tribe, refers to being with others who have common values and goals:

There was one group that I connected up with. We haven’t done anything together yet, but I was pleasantly surprised to learn more about them at the conference and hope that we’ll work together in the future. And then there were other really beautiful souls that I connected with that I may work with in the future, although we’re not necessarily working together yet. More than anything else, it’s, like, meeting someone and after 5 minutes going, “Okay, I’ve known you forever.”

Kindred people that I connect with . . . that’s what keeps the glue together because what I realize is that when you don’t really like the people, you treat it as work. Whereas if they’re friends, then it gives you the bandwidth to stay in the game a little longer through the non-linear process of the emergence. Friendship and resonance is very important.
The second condition, creative partnerships, refers to establishing situations for people with common interests and complementary strengths to work together:

Surrounding myself more and more with people who are embracing this more intuitive way [is important for generativity].

I worked with a group of four organizations that wanted to put on a retreat for mental health educators . . . These were people from different organizations who have not collaborated before . . . Here, they really got to know each other and also see the perspectives of each. . . . I think it’s about the experience of collaboration . . . that each person can bring their unique perspective. That you can speak across difference—even if you disagree. Generativity, [is] related to creativity [and] requires engaging with parts of yourself or others that you’re not comfortable with or don’t know so well. This gives an experience of working across those borders.

**Practices**

Participants described four key community-level practices that inspire generativity. These include dialogue (cited by six participants), reconciling different paradigms and cultures (cited by four participants), shifting the language and mindsets (cited by two participants), and innovative thought (cited by one participant).

The first practice, dialogue, refers to discussing and exploring deeply through conversation. Sample participant comments included

When you’re in dialogue with a group or individuals, group of individuals, regardless of the topic, the relationships endure because those connections are not so common in everyday life in a sustained way. To meet over time calls in that level of depth and inquiry that fosters a lot of generativity because human beings ultimately want to interact in the world from their truest place. People are always looking for ways to keep in that space, in that conversation. By definition, the imagination is attracted to show up.

We had some generative conversations with the faculty where I think because of the shift of climate, people were able to deal with
issues of dissent more honestly . . . we could actually deal with some of the elephants in the room . . . we began to understand dissent differently as a form of caring as opposed to disloyalty or not being a team player. I think that it’s developing a greater closeness and vulnerability as it becomes safer for people to say what is so for them. I think it ripples out into making agreements that are—have greater ownership and I think that that impacts the student body in that they see that faculty is becoming more mutually supportive.

The second practice, reconciling different paradigms and cultures (cited by four participants), referred to anticipating and dealing with the inevitable differences in worldviews, beliefs, values, and behaviors that arise when a diverse communities and tribes come together. In particular, participants described challenges in bridging national cultures and in bridging cultures and practices across sectors:

For [our women’s aid program in] Burundi, the biggest obstacle was [having] to set up a checking account with this fellow that did have a non-profit there. And I felt like we kind of lost control of the money ‘cause there’s a lot of gender issues in Burundi. They not only have the Hutu and Tutsi issue but then they also have the male-female issue. . . . When we were back home trying to send money to them, we lost control of how it was distributed. . . . I always had to send the money through this one man. . . . He would take most of the money and just give a little bit to the women. I thought for about a year how to rectify this and couldn’t come to any good conclusion. So I finally stopped it. So unfortunately I don’t know as today what’s going on. But at least I know we jumpstarted these hundred women to go in a new direction.

The most challenging part was several years down the line, working with bridging that non-profit/for-profit divide. [The greatest obstacle] was around the cultural differences between operating as a non-profit, operating as a regulated non-profit, and operating in a for-profit model.

The third practice (cited by two participants) was shifting the language and mindsets, which meant deliberately seeking frame-breaking experiences:
We really need[ed] an upcoming group of senior leaders who have a much broader, more diverse, more worldview of possibilities. And [who] can engage sympathetically in different cultures and with different people come from very different perspectives.

Where I work is in the realm of language, bringing new language in, introducing a language that is the language of the imagination as distinct from the language of strategy and help the people I’m working with.

The fourth and final community-level practice is innovative thought, which refers to thinking beyond the current forms of organizations and structures:

And then [realizing] we’re moving to a place where the challenges we’re facing have evolved beyond all the different institutions that are meant to deal with these challenges. So we have to think collectively and everything’s interdisciplinary. Then you start thinking about what you need to do in your business. Then you start noticing it in all these other areas around you and it starts to hit home more strongly.

Structure

Participants’ responses pointed to certain goals, leadership, environment, and processes needed at the organizational level to support generativity. These factors are described in the sections below.

Goals

Participants emphasized that clear goals and a viable compelling cause are required to support generativity. Each of these themes were mentioned by two participants. Participants’ comments about clear goals included

It was about intentional management. . . . You’ve got to have really clear goals. This is just kind of my natural propensity. It wasn’t so much as I set up a plan for it as it is my manner that I engaged. This was the manner which I have learned to get things done that I want to get done and care about. And so people rise to the challenge.
There needs to be framing so that people can actually rally around some core elements and realize that they’re part of the same business.

Regarding having a viable, compelling cause, participants shared,

One is a purpose and a cause that I buy into. [For example, ] shifting the world through shifting our conversations. The third thing is cause for hope. Even if you like the people and there’s a worthy cause, but you really think it’s a dead-end situation, it’s not going to go anywhere. No one’s going to pay attention . . . the bulldozers are going to come and run everyone over tomorrow, then, there’s no cause for hope. Reasonable cause for hope. Reasonable hope for success.

I think the catalyst really was that in both situations they were desperate. And one was desperate for just basic food and survival. The other was—the other young girls were desperate in a sense of their future. Both groups also had a certain sense—they hadn’t lost complete hope. I think that both groups still had a glimmer of hope that something would happen. They didn’t know what it might be but that somehow they’d be able to work their way out of the situation.

*Leadership*

Participants described the type of leadership that was necessary to support generativity. Three participants simply emphasized that generativity required a different type of leadership, such as providing a framework:

There needs to be strong leadership, obviously. But there needs to be framing so that people can actually rally around some core elements and realize that they’re part of the same business. Compelling leadership is one of the first [factors supporting generativity], usually.

I think it could have been resolved if there were more effective leadership above: vision, integrity, insight, really having the support, the mission. Basic stuff.

Two participants added that leaders need to encourage the leadership and contributions of others:

Vulnerable leadership allows for other people to bring their gifts and competencies to the table. In vulnerable leadership that’s always
right, you go, well, they don’t need me, you know, so it tends to render other people incompetent or useless. But in a vulnerable state, people tend to show up to help.

The generative change occurred [when] we moved from what I would call charismatic leadership to a more collaborative model. And that had ripple effects and is still having ripple effects through time in terms of creating a greater level of participation. And it was not only the fact that we replaced the one person with the two people, but the two people were much more collaborative in the way they dealt with things. So I think the collaborative framework creates greater safety and therefore creates greater participation and trust.

A final concept was that the leader needs to have the trust and respect of others:

But again, it’s so dependent on who that messenger is. Because everybody has their own baggage and perceptions and I think people have oftentimes—depending on how open or closed minded an individual is, oftentimes people have decided in advance of really—your even speaking, whether they’re going to take you seriously. . . . There needs to be a level of trust and respect toward the messenger.

Environment

Participants emphasized that the environment is critical for fostering generative change. One participant explained that it is necessary to “recognize the power of place, whether it’s located in the physical environment, in a natural environment, or whether it’s connected to design, whether it’s connected to community.” Accordingly, four additional participants stressed that the field or space needs to be created so that it supports generative change:

It’s very powerful, I think, in beginning to create a generative field out of which things can just naturally begin to organically unfold. . . . We spend far too much time focusing on generating seeds of possibility, but we don’t spend enough time creating soil that can actually help those seeds take root and grow. It’s helpful and I think it’s creating a generative field, creates sort of enabling capacities
that actually means—when things happen they have someplace to land. And just some home for them that’s been established.

It was sort of the new generative transformational conversation or at least it was creating a field for the possibility of that conversation to occur. I think there was an easy tipping point to just kind of let the conversation and the authority of the field that’s generated in that, guide us towards where we go. It becomes truly, purely generative in nature. And the kind of magic that—it’s the potentializing of that space, I think, through that coming together of strangers into some kind of common field. The potentializing of the space that—the potentializing of the field so to speak that occurs in those times. You don’t know what’s going to come from it.

Day 1 in the church was magical. The space was great and the space enabled a very sort of high level of energetic connection. Day 2 in the hotel in the ballroom was not even close. The space was not good. It was more of a disconnected flow of things. And I was fully prepared to say, “Wow, this just isn’t working today.” And then I [realized] the space makes such a difference in the outcome.

In the afternoon we had the breakout that was honoring the artistic side, okay. And I sat with that group of people and it was the single handed most magical gathering I have ever been involved with. It was incredible. We sat, an energetic circle, that was palpable. It became the space.

Processes

Participants mentioned a number of processes to enact within the larger structure. Four participants emphasized that change leaders needed to build in support that helps people think and act more generatively. Participants elaborated,

If you give people a clear understanding of the larger picture and their role in it, and you’re continuously reminding them how this small little thing that you need next week fits within the larger picture, and you have faith that whoever’s doing it can do it, even if they’ve never done it before but if, you know, as it turns out if they think you already know how to do it, they’ll figure out how to do it. So it’s the same thing around learning. You take students where people haven’t expected much of them and you start expecting a lot of them and give them the appropriate support structures for getting there, they’ll get there. It’s [Vygotsky’s] proximal zone between challenge and support.
Some people have a bigger sense of innate oneness with the earth or a sense of responsibility. I’m intrigued why that is so different in different people . . . this individual person was able to see the big picture . . . they were able to see the longer term . . . they weren’t so focused on themselves and the recognition or maybe their job security in the next year and the next shareholder meeting. They were able to step out of that shell and just see the bigger picture and the value that this was going to bring not only to the corporation but to the communities that it served. I found that big-picture thinkers are able to understand this or this resonates better with them. If they don’t naturally do it, [we need to be] helping people think through that process.

What we really want to be is noise specialists. So what are the random things present at the system and the other thing about a system is that a system always has emerging strategies according to the conditions that it finds itself . . . the question is what are the processes that we can put to support the emerging strategies. The change has to emerge from within the system.

Specific tools for building in this support included introducing new concepts slowly, harnessing the power of surprise, and amplifying the change.

Participants explained:

Feed them things along the way: so here’s a conference, here’s a client, here’s a book, here’s an article. Feed them things along the way that they can hold on to help them stay in the game.

All real change is unexpected. Things that matter that shift systems are always unexpected . . . How do you harness surprise? Seems to me like if you talk to anybody that is in the transformational business, it was always a surprise, it was always unexpected, it was always a sudden insight that they then lived. Change is lived. This is going back to the learning journey rubric—the cognitive work is just preparation. The call is simply preparation. The journey where the emotional learning and the surprise and the unexpected shows up, that’s where change occurs . . . the rest is how do you harness that? How do you put that to work through reflection and awareness and decision making? I think it’s terribly important for people to understand change. And I think mostly they don’t. And that’s why most change efforts fail.

I think some of the basic rules . . . amplifying positive deviance is a good one. That produces generative change ‘cause you’re taking what’s already happening and amplifying it. A dissipative structure
is a system through energy moves. And so what happens is in a
dissipative structure model, you have feedback loops. When the
feedback loops get amplified enough, the system becomes
unstable and then new properties emerge. And there’s what they
call a bifurcation point. The system gets unstable enough at the
bifurcation point, there’s two things that fundamentally determine
the change. The system can change towards demise or it changes
toward greater capacities. The other is random things present in the
system at the moment the system’s ready to change which they call
“noise” in the system. In some ways it’s an attribute of the butterfly
effect. Small things sometimes produce large differences. So when
a system is in need and it’s time for a system to change, it’s getting
feedback that’s amplifying, amplifying, amplifying. It either leads to
the destruction or the transformation of the system.

A second important process for supporting generative change is to
address people’s preconceived notions and resistance to change. Participants
explained,

Well, the biggest obstacle and challenge is public perception . . . it
was mostly getting over resistance of people in the system to see
these people in their new roles which, in fact, they’ve been
occupying for the last five years without anybody knowing.

Some of the major hurdles are just some people’s disbelief in
climate change. It’s an interesting to me why there are a fair
amount of disbelievers out there still. I think personally it’s ‘cause a
lot of people aren’t motivated by fear and resent the fear tactics.
Part of it was climate change and non-believers in the plant.
Another one of the problems that’s come in to be an issue [is that]
there’s someone in charge who is more worried about personal
glory and job security so everything that he’s done is so benign and
kind of PR-speak and vacuous, frankly, that even though there’s
something going on it’s not enough to cause change ‘cause it’s just
not rocking the boat in any way. So it’s not enough to just ask for
and try to get this embedded, because the people that then are
tasked with taking it on don’t necessarily see it in the same way or
want to accomplish the extent of change that you want to
accomplish.

A third process is to reconcile an organizational focus on stability and
productivity with a focus on change. Participants commented that organizations
often are not built for continuous change and that a large portion of organization members leave when change occurs:

Organizations are a little bit more challenging. Usually when you’re doing any kind of transformative change with groups, you have, like, 30% exit rates. I think some of these smaller companies like Patagonia, Burt’s Bees, and others, that started up in that sort of social venture space with a big mission (Body Shop being one of the classic ones) really grew as organizations with this very strong center of values. And then left it when they got older to make money, and then everything got lost. So I think that there are sort of examples in certain lifecycles of organizations where you see some really nice transformation happening. It’s hard to make it last in the current financial model and economic structure that we have. Everything’s about scale and leveraging and merging and growth as opposed to keeping things small and nimble in ways that I think could serve the kind of change that we need much more effectively. [What stalls or prevents change from being generative in large organizations is] the structure of the entity itself. The structure is the problem and when the structure’s set up in a certain way it doesn’t really align . . . the bottom line is maximizing profits for a very, very large public corporation. It’s set up to not cope with [generative change].

Some actually left the organization once I moved it out of here and they had been in the organization—in that organization for many, many, many years.

Participants offered a range of additional suggestions to support generative change, including completing successful proofs of concept, having a supportive building design, focusing on strengths in the system, using reasoning, and facilitating whole system dialogue:

A lot of it was showing best practice of other companies. Saying, “Look, it’s already been done and it’s been done successfully.” Not many people like to be first movers. There’s a lot of risk in being a first mover, so that’s helped.

And so that’s been a very tangible outcome of the design of that mandala because the mandala, as you know, is a very centering form. And it just had that effect. It’s become a magnet for the community. After the first year [the developer] went, oh, my gosh, look at this book of business . . . this is crazy. What did you guys do
out there? And then they brought their whole upper management out from New York to spend a weekend in this hotel to experience the space, to try to figure out just what the heck was the magic.

It’s beginning to understand what the nature of that shift is and the language I bring in, which has been expanding over time, has been around gifts and the idea that generative cultures are gifted cultures.

The challenges that literally manifested I could engage with reasoning and evidence. So the external ones I could meet very readily with the norms of the organization, which are rationality and evidence. Well, not so much evidence as rationality, but reasoning.

[The two women who took over are] wonderful learners themselves. And just because of the fact that they were working very collaboratively before, it’s a natural way for them to work. I think another major benefit is from a relationship end, that nobody’s brokering conversations. In a charismatically led system, the charismatic leader listens to everybody and decides and winds up brokering conversations which I find creates very—much poorer decision making. I think when people have disagreements you should put them in the room together and let them work it out. You get a more holographic view when you put people together and discuss things. I think you make better decisions.

*Time*

Time is a final critical factor necessary for generative change. Participants explained that generative change develops through a multiplying ripple effect over time:

[It begins with] thought leadership that shows results . . . [and] talks about it at conferences. Then all of a sudden, the next level of early adopters comes along. So I’ve seen quite a bit of change in that space. And that’s informed by other the external factors that [further push for change]. . . . We see what’s happening with non-sustainable businesses all around us and it’s starting to seep into people’s consciousnesses more.

Because the nature of emergence is it doesn’t always happen in the time and in the way you want. In fact, it probably takes longer and it probably happens differently than you planned. If your fulfillment or conditions for satisfaction are linked to those outcomes, both in quantity—in its nature and its timing, there will be
a high rate of disappointment. And that’s too much for people to bear.

The individual . . . [is] the source of generative change, is the change within that then leads to the change with others, then to the community, then to the world.

What you see is women in the grassroots working on the ground just, for example, in Africa in villages coming together and discussing these issues with women that are like me working in, say, a medium-sized [non-governmental organization]. Then, in turn, we’re able to have these discussions with women that are working more regionally or globally. And Women’s Federation is globalist as well as my [non-governmental organization]. It seems very small, but you can even maybe take one small village and help uplift the standard of living for women in extreme poverty. Even if it’s just a very small increment that, to me, seems like—using creativity and imagination to do that is part of generative change.

One participant provided the stories of her grassroots work in Mongolia that have rippled out to the larger global community:

One example was we decided to work in Mongolia on a scholarship project. . . . We systematically decided we’re looking for six young women that are very bright and were also motivated . . . that had no economic possibility of going [to college]. . . . We would promise to them that we would take them through 4 years of college. And what happened with them was quite astounding ‘cause I went over to Mongolia the first year and interviewed and met the first six. And each one of them only had a mother or a father or no parents and each one of them, their self-esteem was very low. But not only that, the whole family’s self-esteem was low. Nobody would look you in the eye. They’d kind of hang their head down. Even though we had a translator, there was a real sense of kind of hopelessness. . . . [By] the third year, . . . all of a sudden, something changed. . . . They saw that we were standing by them and we were following what we said. . . . Not only did the young girls’ self-esteem raise by about the third year; but, her whole family’s [did too]. . . . That first group did graduate. . . . [One girl] . . . went back and she’s working with the young children. There’s another young woman that is working in tourism. There’s a couple that are working as . . . elementary school [teachers]. And then there’s one that went on to work as an engineer. . . .

The tangible impact is actually continuing on. Just for instance, we’ve really been able to raise the level of awareness about in our
community... So it’s really having these ripple effects and impacts that are kind of astounding in a way, for our small little group here. But we’ve been working away at this since 2005 and I guess some notice has happened about it.

**Generative Outcomes**

Participants named several outcomes that resulted from generative change. These included individually felt outcomes such as increased morale and personal transformation; group-level outcomes such as people offering their talents and gifts, shared responsibility for outcomes, intuitive group coordination and action, and transformed cultures; and system wide outcomes such as having greater reach, earning greater respect, and creating new possibilities.

**Individually Felt Outcomes**

Two participants described the personal transformation that results from generative change:

I think they take people to a greater sense of self. I’m really interested in people having experiences where they recognize that they can do more than they thought they could, that they matter more than they thought they did, that they are developing a new sort of story for themselves about what’s possible in the world with their leadership, their own personal leadership. I just love to see that where people come to the place of not really believing that they can make a difference and then following through.

The tangible impacts on me were huge in that it gave me a forum for the best internal expansion in a work environment I’ve ever had. There were no limits, no internal limits. It was a constant—it was this lovely daily experience of just doing it and just trying whatever. . . . And the ways in which that gave me a kind of freedom to lead in the much bigger way. Others just talked about the ways that required them to grow and expand and—tapped into all of their own insecurities and places where kind of—old places where they hadn’t wanted to grow or move. It allowed people to show up in new ways. Because it was social-emotional learning, you could see the growth in the students themselves. You could see the reflection at the graduation when their family members reflected on their
growth. I’m still in touch with some of those students who have talked about how it was internal expansion for them.

Another participant commented that generative change tends to increase morale among those involved:

Well, I think the tangible impact is morale in the staff goes up. I saw morale go up, even at the point where people were doubting that we made the right move, the staff morale was up. And that was important to make—people seemed happier and more engaged, more willing to show up.

Group-Level Outcomes

The participants named four group-level outcomes of generative change. The first, that people more readily offer their talents and gifts, were explained by two participants:

So that allows other people to rise in the system . . . people tend to bring their gifts more when there’s a place—when they’re needed.

A tangible impact, it has been the ability to raise money for these causes. . . . through these connections and open energetic interaction with other organizations, we’ve been able to create a sort of gathering of human energy, people dedicating time, volunteering to the organizations. And also people donating money to the organizations. So I’d say that it’s tangible and a physical way of people, hands-on, offering more time to the cause.

Other group-level outcomes included shared responsibility for outcomes, intuitive group coordination and action, and transformed cultures. These themes were mentioned by one participant each:

I think information moves more freely in that kind of environment because it’s not being bottlenecked in one person.

One of the most tangible things is if they said is that I leave here knowing that if I have problem I could call up anybody in this room and get it sorted out in an instant. That wasn’t possible before we came together. I think the capacity for the organization to move quickly, move adaptively and act coherently in the face of a large unknown and a lot of complexity is probably one of the big benefits.
They were used to operating in a certain kind of culture that expected one set of things from them and now they were operating in a culture that expected a completely new set of things from them.

**System Wide Outcomes**

Three system wide outcomes were identified by the participants. The first of these was having greater reach in one’s work, mentioned by three participants:

I’m also connecting with a larger world community and resources and seeing myself more as a world citizen and being sought out in that way as well. Suddenly I’m just one person and then I connect with another human being and we engender excitement from the Dalai Lama Centre, engenders an opportunity to reach out to a world of, you know, 50 million (however many it is) people and touch other people. So that’s just been a spiraling effect of people wanting to pitch in.

I think the division of labor and the collaborative dynamic has allowed more people to become visible in the system and I think that also, from a staff point of view, increases morale.

A very tangible result has been that the Institute has had a rather elite reputation in the community. We designed this mandala to really not only facilitate the meetings or business but private events which would be to the public—such as, you know, birthdays and weddings. And so most business hotels or most spaces like this, don’t, you know, that would be considered—like a banquet room. Okay, yeah, sure, people will come in and they’ll hold their banquets and it’s will have “x” you know, percentage of business. Well, the community absolutely was ready to come to this building and say, “Oh, great another fancy place that doesn’t embrace us.” Well, it has been unbelievable how many events are booked now year wide for private functions or for public, you know, functions that embrace the community and not just the business of the Institute.

The second of these outcomes was greater respect, mentioned by two participants. One of these participants commented, “I actually am surprised to say that I’ve—as much as there’s that whole resistance and homeostasis I’m feeling concurrently more respect from people in—that I’ve dealt with in the past.”
The third and final of the system wide outcomes is the creation of new possibilities, cited by one participant:

Well, I think they’re—we put it on the radar screen and that’s great. And I think what we’ve done now is kind of created a new sense of what the possible is without really articulating exactly what that means, but just kind of a sense of excitement for some around opportunities. There has been some concrete progress in terms of more sustainable operations so less emissions, less waste, all that type of thing.

**Summary**

Table 2 presents a summary of the findings from this study. Facilitators of change were found to occur at the individual, community, and structural levels. A final critical ingredient to support generative change is time. Participants similarly described personal, group, and system wide outcomes of generative change. Figure 2 on page 42 presents a model of generative change. The next chapter provides a discussion of these results.
Table 2
Summary of the Facilitators of Generative Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Deep personal engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Openness to the unexpected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inner confidence and belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>- Practicing mindfulness and reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overcoming inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Practicing personal presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Engaging in careful conscious sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Being in one’s tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Forming creative partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>- Engaging in dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reconciling different paradigms and cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shifting language and mindsets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Thinking innovatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A viable compelling cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>- Providing a framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Encouraging the leadership and contributions of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Having others’ trust and respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>- Recognize the power of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Create the field to support generative change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>- Build in support that helps people think and act more generatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Address people’s preconceived notions and resistance to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reconcile an organizational focus on stability and productivity with a focus on change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Institute processes that support generative change (e.g., complete successful proofs of concept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Generative change develops through a multiplying ripple effect over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>- Personal transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>- People more readily offer their talents and gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shared responsibility for outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Intuitive group coordination and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transformed cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System</td>
<td>- Having greater reach in one’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Greater respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creation of new possibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5
Discussion

This study examined the conditions that lead to generative change and the outcomes that emerge from it. The research questions examined the personal characteristics, group characteristics, and systemic conditions necessary for generative change to occur as well as the outcomes that result from generative change. This chapter provides a discussion of the study results, including conclusions for each research question, practical recommendations, limitations, and suggestions for additional research.

Conclusions

Conclusions were drawn for the research questions posed in this study:

1. What personal, group, and systemic characteristics are necessary for generative change to occur?

2. What outcomes tend to occur as a result of generative change?

It is important to note that an unanticipated factor (time) was discovered in the course of this research as being a final critical ingredient to generativity. This factor transcends the three levels of change named in the research questions. This suggests that the personal, group, and systemic conditions support generativity but that it does not happen overnight. The effects of all of these conditions build upon each other and, given time and space, shifts manifest. This is an important element of each of the conclusions that are described in the sections below.
Personal Characteristics

Participants described certain attitudes and actions that were necessary for individuals to have if generative change was to occur. The most prominent of these was deep personal engagement, suggesting that people need to have a meaningful connection to a certain cause or that they needed to feel a personal calling toward one’s aspirations or toward change in general. Another leading characteristic was being open to the unexpected, meaning that people needed to let go of preconceived ideas and to embrace intuitive guidance. While it was important to set intentions, it was important to stay attuned to one’s intuition and to internal and external opportunities as they unfolded. Specific practices that participants believed necessary for generativity included overcoming inertia by letting go of old roles and the status quo and also practicing mindfulness and reflection. These activities further helped build attitudes of deep personal engagement and openness to the unexpected.

This study’s findings are similar to some of the past literature on generative change. Gergen (1978) and Jacobs and Heracleous (2005) emphasized the importance of examining one’s mental models and shifting old paradigms. These concepts are similar to participants’ ideas about mindfulness and reflection, although they did not use the same terminology as the previous authors. Further, Gergen suggested that these reflective activities may result in new alternatives for action, similar to participants’ emphasis on allowing for and being open to emergence. Additionally, it is important to note that the previous authors discussed these concepts as they related to group generativity. Literature was not found on the individual-level factors that led to generativity.
Identifying these personal factors represents a valuable contribution of the present study.

Based on these findings, it is clear that people need a sense of deep connection to the change effort if they are to support it. This concept is consistent with much of the change literature (e.g., Schein, 2004). Additionally, the findings suggest that change efforts need to allow employees time for reflection and space for emergence to unfold. These ideas depart dramatically from traditional approaches to planned change, which focus on identifying the future state and driving the organization toward that end. According to these approaches, individuals who have alternate ideas or seem to balk against the change are seen as resistant and not “on board.” Based on the present study’s findings, it is possible that these “resistant” people might be reflecting, listening to intuition, and discerning a different (and possibly better) way forward. The present study’s findings suggest that when people are not given the room to deeply connect with the change, reflect on the change and its evolution, and share the fruits of their reflection, organizations might miss critical insights and opportunities to fine-tune the change effort. Thus, generativity may be thwarted and suboptimal results might be achieved. Perhaps this could explain the high rate of failure in change efforts (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

This approach of initiating change and then allowing for emergence seems to be antithetical to the way that change initiatives tend to be planned and implemented. For example, organizations tend to invest significant time and resources into analyzing the organization’s internal and external environment, identifying and evaluating alternatives, and then designing and implementing the
change. Given this investment, organization and change leaders may be attached to the change plan rather than allowing it to be revised based on feedback from employees throughout the organization. This may be especially true of larger and more hierarchical organizations.

Thus, the question remains: When businesses are moving and changing at the speed of light, how can they slow down and allow for emergence? While these ideas are similar to chaos and systems theories that have been applied to organizational change (e.g., Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, & Flowers, 2004; Scharmer, 2007; Wheatley, 1999), what still is missing is a workable change approach that allows for emergence and is palatable to organization leaders. This is a leading direction for additional research.

*Group Characteristics*

The community conditions and practices for generativity began with two supportive conditions of being in one’s “tribe” of likeminded individuals and forming creative partnerships within which productive action could take place. Within these contexts, it is then critical to come together and mix together—hearing each other’s stories; witnessing and leveraging each other’s perspectives, strengths, and experiences; and also acknowledging and addressing members’ differences. These ideas were the essence of the practices of dialogue, reconciling different paradigms and cultures, shifting language and mindsets, and thinking beyond the present forms.

The present findings are echoed in the past literature on generative change. Cule and Robey (2004), Ball (2009), and Bushe and Kassam (2005) all described how narrative and storytelling enhance group members’ understanding
of themselves and each other, create a collective framework, and enable the higher performance of groups.

These findings suggest that if group members are able to surface their differences, see different perspectives, and also leverage their collective strengths, they will gain a clearer sense of direction and be propelled toward action. Importantly, these activities also should help groups surface and mitigate the potential pitfalls of change along the way (e.g., cultural differences). These activities also create more space for creativity and innovation, reduce the need for unproductive conflict, and promote shared commitment, understanding, and vision for change.

Given these findings, it seems imperative to make time for people to gather together, share their stories, and reconcile their strengths, weaknesses, and commonalities if generative change is desired. It is critical that part of this time is spent discovering, acknowledging, and addressing differences, as what might be standard practice for one person might be foreign, nonsensical, or even corrupt for another. While it might seem paradoxical to spend precious group time in this manner, taking such measures results appears to be highly beneficial.

Nevertheless, significant resistance tends to emerge when such activities are proposed in practice, often by labeling these pursuits as “pajama parties” or “kumbaya” experiences. Leaders also may believe that they are given the responsibility to lead and they do not need to incorporate others’ paradigms. Thus, leaders’ egos can get in the way and employees also might abdicate to leaders. A limitation of this approach also might be that people might not want to
care about the work and the change. That is, some people simply come to work and do their work rather than bring their whole selves to work. This leads to important questions: Are these practices appropriate in the present business world? What level of self-disclosure truly is safe in groups? Some dangers of disclosure are that it can become group therapy or that the information gathered could be used for personal gain. Finally, what should the process be with group members who prove to be dangerous, damaging, or simply a poor fit for the group?

While this study has generated important insights, more research is needed on organizations that have embraced these principles. For example, it would be helpful to conduct longitudinal studies on the effects of the practices on retention, profitability, and innovation. Additionally, it would be helpful to study workers’ willingness to engage in these activities in group settings. The results of these research projects would demonstrate the feasibility of these conditions and practices for organizations.

Systemic Conditions

Analysis of the study findings suggested that generative change tended to occur within a structure of certain goals, leadership, processes, and environmental conditions. Regarding goals, there needed to be a clear and direct framework as well as a compelling cause. This meant that a general direction needed to be set. Participants emphasized that a different type of leadership was required—particularly as it differed from charismatic leadership. Specific processes were needed to support people in continuing to think and act generatively, addressing people’s preconceived notions and resistance to
change, reconciling an organizational focus on stability and productivity with a focus on change, and instituting processes that support generative change. Environmental conditions including selecting an appropriate physical place and creating the field to support change and emergence also were needed. A complete container needs to be created.

These findings are consistent with past literature, which emphasized the need for shared vision (Appelbaum & Goransson, 1997; Jacobs & Heracleous, 2005) and creating a suitable environment (Schein, 2004)—notably, creating the field for generativity (Senge et al., 2004; Wheatley, 1999). The present study also highlighted a new direction for additional research of examining the role of leaders in spurring generativity. Several participants mentioned that attended the C4C conference largely to “rub elbows” with prominent figures, such as the Dalai Lama.

These findings suggest that generative change is, at least in some ways, similar to planned change in that both forms require a container. Thus, change agents might use similar language and ways of operating for both forms. Importantly, these findings also suggest that systemic conditions are necessary but insufficient for generative change. That is, the individual and community pieces also must be in place for generativity to occur. If the individuals and communities are not acting generatively, the change likely will not become generative.

One might object to these findings, wondering if generativity truly is possible if it relies upon certain actions and attitudes at the individual and group level. This leads to a risk that companies might look generative but not truly be
generative. That is, a company might exhibit cosmetic change (e.g., create the container), but not be truly generative (demonstrating generativity at the personal, group, and systemic levels).

More research on the systemic conditions for generativity would be helpful for examining how the container affected the generativity. Specifically, it would be helpful to examine what factors were facilitative and what factors were obstructive. It also would be helpful to examine what this container looks like in practice and how it affects the groups and individuals within the system.

**Generative Outcomes**

The study findings suggested that generativity resulted in outcomes at the individual, group, and system levels. Individual outcomes included personal transformation and increased morale. Group outcomes included people more readily offer their talents and gifts, shared responsibility for outcomes, intuitive group coordination and action, and transformed cultures. System-level outcomes included having greater reach in one’s work, greater respect, and the creation of new possibilities. In sum, these findings suggest that generativity builds capacity in organizations and unleashes people and their groups and organizations to become more functional—more responsible, more open, more agile, and more able to deal with complexity. People become free to be fully themselves, which enables them to get down to the real work without energy being diverted toward self-protection. Importantly, all of this happens through a ripple effect over time.

These findings align with Veltrop’s (2006) assertions that generativity results in the enhancement of the human spirit, greater aliveness, and greater creativity. He further explained that outcomes tend to be recursive and are
designed to achieve multiple and multiplying benefits. They grow the individuals and the organizations capacity for growing. Similarly, other authors emphasized that generativity can result in new personal, group, and organizational forms that result in unpredictable, emergent, and highly beneficial outcomes (Busche, 2007; Cule & Robey, 2004; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995).

These findings suggest that generativity is highly positive and that generative approaches could be very powerful for addressing present and challenging issues, such as sustainability, clean technology, and economic recession. However, implementing such approaches requires an enormous paradigm shift about how business is done, including making dramatic cultural shifts, redistributing control and power, and rethinking how people, groups, and organizations spend their time.

A reasonable first step is to increase visibility about the success of generative initiatives. Additionally, it is important to consider key questions such as: How can early adopters be motivated to launch generative approaches? How can generative approaches be promoted beyond early adopters and into the mainstream? Beneficial research projects would examine success cases and identify what it took to shift toward generativity. Such research would identify and produce ideas about overcoming barriers to generativity. Other research could examine whether generativity “sticks” over time or if people get “change fatigue.” The present researcher’s hunch is that rather than change fatigue, generative people and systems would become more functional, productive, and authentic.
Recommendations

This study has generated a number of insights. These insights point to two key recommendations for change agents and organization development (OD) practitioners. First, it is important for OD practitioners to familiarize themselves with generative change and how it compares and contrasts to planned change. The study findings suggested that some similarities between these forms exist. To that end, change agents might use similar language and ways of operating for both forms. However, the findings also suggested that creating the container for change, driving change, and other elements of planned change do not necessarily allow for generativity. This suggests that OD practitioners may need to gain additional insights and skills to support this kind of change. This has implications for OD training programs, which also would need to introduce generative concepts and approaches as part of their curriculum. This is an important shift to make, given the beneficial and powerful outcomes of generativity.

The second recommendation is for OD practitioners and their clients to adjust their mindsets to allow for generativity. Unlike appreciative approaches, generative approaches do not focus heavily or primarily on the best of what is. Especially when differences are being identified and addressed and people, groups, and systems are enhancing their authenticity, it is natural for their strengths and their weaknesses and shortcomings to emerge. Therefore, it is critical for OD practitioners to develop their ability to deal with the “shadow” of individuals and systems. As a result, self-as-instrument competencies including
self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and interpersonal skill may be even more critical when OD practitioners endeavor to facilitate generative change.

**Limitations**

Three key limitations affected this study's results. These concerned the study sample, researcher and participant bias, and the method. First, the sample was small and consisted primarily of women. Additionally, the stories of generativity largely dealt with activities in the nonprofit sector. Notably missing were stories of generativity in large systems. Finally, although 10 interviews were conducted, it was not possible to record one of the interviews due to the poor quality of the telephone connection. These combined limitations could be overcome in future studies by expanding the sample size to include equal numbers of men and women from a range of industries and sectors. The sample size also should be large enough to allow for attrition in the event of poor audio quality. For example, a better sample size for a similar interview study would be 30 participants.

The second limitation was researcher and participant bias, as all parties were proponents of generative approaches. Therefore, both the researcher and participants were consciously or subconsciously predisposed to identify and promote the benefits of generativity. While challenges and obstacles of generativity were discussed, the drawbacks or adverse outcomes of generativity were not fully addressed in this study. Additionally, the participants knew the study results would be shared with the Dalai Lama center. Again, they might have been consciously or subconsciously motivated to help everyone (and the concept of generativity) “look good.” In the future, this limitation could be
mitigated by including the views of those who do not actively support generative approaches.

The third limitation concerned utilizing the method of interviewing to gather data. While interviewing is helpful in studies where the variables cannot be identified and the constructs being investigated are complex, it also enhances self-report bias. Specifically, this research sought to identify the outcomes of generativity and this might be better examined through unobtrusive measures such as performance measures or surveys of the members of a system. It would be beneficial in future studies to employ multiple forms of data gathering.

Suggestions for Additional Research

While this study has generated important insights, more research is needed to advance the understanding and practice of generative change. The first suggestion for research is to examine organizations that have embraced the principles of generativity. Longitudinal studies that examine the effects of generative practices on retention, profitability, and innovation would be particularly beneficial.

The second suggestion for research is to examine how generative approaches might become a credible, practical offering for clients. Generative approaches of initiating change and then allowing for emergence seem to be antithetical to the way that change initiatives tend to be planned and implemented. While chaos and systems theories have been applied to organizational change in theory, applications of it remain at the fringe of OD practice in the for-profit sector. As the benefits of generativity are strong (based upon the accounts of this study’s participants), it is important to explore how
these approaches can become more mainstream. This could be determined through interviews or focus groups with leaders and employees considering or engaged in generative change. Case studies of organizations undergoing generative change also would be beneficial.

The third suggestion for research is examining whether generativity “sticks” over time or if people get “change fatigue.” The present researcher’s hunch is that rather than change fatigue, generative people and systems would become more functional, productive, and authentic. Examining the long-term outcomes of embracing generativity would illuminate potential drawbacks of generativity and also could further motivate individuals and organizations to pursue this kind of change.

Summary

This study examined the factors and conditions that lead to generative change. The research questions examined the personal characteristics, group characteristics, and systemic conditions necessary for generative change to occur as well as the outcomes that result from generative change.

Nine men and women who attended the 2009 C4C conference were interviewed about their experiences of generative change along with the catalysts, obstacles, and outcomes of those experiences. Content analysis was used to identify the themes in the data.

Facilitators of change were found to occur at the individual, community, and structural levels. A final critical ingredient to support generative change is time. Participants similarly described personal, group, and system wide outcomes of generative change.
While limitations of the sample, bias, and method affected the results and additional research is needed to examine the long-term outcomes of generativity and how this might become a practical and credible change approach, the findings of this study emphasize that generative change is an approach worthy of exploring. OD practitioners, as a result, are advised to enhance their knowledge and skills sets related to this powerful form of change.
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Appendix A

Study Invitation
Email to Connecting for Change (C4C) Participants Requesting Participation in Research Study

Hello C4C Participant

I hope this email finds you well. As you were a participant of Connecting for Change, I would like to ask for your voluntary help.

As mentioned by Charles Holmes at the conclusion of Connecting for Change, I am enrolled in Pepperdine University’s Master of Science in Organization Development program.

One of my program requirements is to conduct research thesis project. I am conducting my research on “What factors and conditions lead to generative change?” The results of my research will be shared with the Dalai Lama Center for Peace and Education (DLC) in an effort to further the mandate of the center, as well as inform a sustainable methodology for Connecting for Change. I have done my due diligence with the DLC to ensure that they are aware of my research and to protect your privacy. Please see attached letter for further details.

I am looking for approximately 60 minutes of your time in February to participate in an interview to discuss your experience of Connecting for Change and it’s relation to your current organization.

Please note the following:
Your participation is completely voluntary.
Your information and responses will be kept completely confidential. Information will be aggregated to present overall themes. Individual responses will not be reported.
Research will be used for academic purposes only.
You and your organization will be disguised to protect the confidentiality of both
A copy of this research will be made available to you (upon request) once the study is completed.

Please let me know if you are willing to participate in the research via email ([contact information omitted]) or phone ([contact information omitted]) by March 10th. Once I hear back from you, I will follow up to schedule a time.

Thank you,

Terry VanQuickenborne
Pepperdine University MSOD Candidate 2010
March 4, 2010

Dear Connecting for Change participant,

Re: Research project

We are writing to you to let you know about a research project being undertaken by Terry Van Quickenborne. Terry is a volunteer with the Dalai Lama Center’s Connecting for Change program and is enrolled in Pepperdine University’s Master of Science in Organization Development program. One of her degree program requirements is to conduct a research thesis project. Her research is examining “What factors and conditions lead to generative change?”

Terry will be contacting to invite you to consider participating in her research. (Participants in Connecting for Change 2009 shared email addresses within the program and she will use these to communicate with you. The DLC will not share any of your personal information with Terry.)

We want to apprise you of two key issues:
- The DLC has no role in, nor responsibility for, Terry’s research, as a sponsor, partner or otherwise.
- The DLC has confirmed that Terry’s research has been approved by her institution’s research ethics review board.

You may wish to follow up directly with Terry with about other particulars including the following:
- Voluntary participation.
- Confidentiality of all information and responses, for you and your organization.
- Aggregation of information to present overall themes. (Individual responses will not be reported.)
- Use of the research for academic purposes only.
- Confidential data retention and destruction.

The results of Terry’s research will be shared with the Dalai Lama Center. Connecting for Change, in particular, will have an interest in learning from the research. The research project findings also will be publicly accessible; a copy of this research will be made available to you (upon request) once the study is completed.

Any questions about the research should be directed to Terry Van Quickenborne by email - tvq@telus.net. Please let me know if you have concerns. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Renfie Keates
Managing Director

PO Box 3652 Station Terminal, Vancouver, BC, Canada, V6B 3Y8
T: 604 215 2362  F: 1 866 869 9919
info@dalailamacenter.org
dalailamacenter.org
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Appendix B

Consent Form
INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Participant: ____________________________________________

Principal Investigator: Terry VanQuickenborne

Title of Project: Exploring Generative Change

1. I ____________________________ agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Terry VanQuickenborne under the direction of Dr. David Jamieson, PhD, Pepperdine University.

2. The overall purpose of this research is: To research the factors and conditions that lead to generative change. Specifically the goals of the research are to:
   • Assess the personal characteristics;
   • Group characteristics, and;
   • Systemic conditions that are necessary for generative change to occur.

3. My participation will involve the following: Participating in an interview either in person or via phone.

4. My participation in the study will be approximately 60 minutes. The study shall be conducted either in person in Vancouver (office TBD) or via phone.

5. I understand that the possible benefits to myself or society from this research are: To gain an understanding of the factors and conditions that lead to generative change and thereby apply them to my own organization. Further to this, the research will be provided to the Dalai Lama Center to further the mandate of the Connecting for Change program.

6. I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.

7. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

8. I understand that the investigator(s) will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state, provincial and federal laws. Under California law and British Columbia law, there are exceptions to confidentiality, including suspicion that a child, elder, or dependent adult is being abused, or if an individual discloses an intent to harm him/herself or others.
9. I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact David Jamieson, Ph.D. at [contact information omitted] or [contact information omitted] if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Jean Kang, Manager, GPS IRB & Dissertation Support, Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education and Psychology at [contact information omitted] or [contact information omitted].

10. I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

11. I understand that in the event of physical injury resulting from the research procedures in which I am to participate, no form of compensation is available. Medical treatment may be provided at my own expense or at the expense of my health care insurer which may or may not provide coverage. If I have questions, I should contact my insurer.

12. I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

Participant’s Signature

Date

Witness

Date

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person’s consent.

Principal Investigator

Date
Appendix C

Interview Script
Interview Protocol:

• Introduce researcher and thank participant for their time. Clarify that the interview will be approximately 60 minutes.
• Provide a brief overview of the study.
• Remind interviewee that participation is completely voluntary and at any point they can choose not to participate. Participants are also not obligated to answer a question if he/she prefers not to.
• Outline that participant responses will not be identified and their identity will be protected.
• State that this study is for academic research purposes. Results will also be shared with the Dalai Lama Center for Peace and Education.
• Review that the session may be recorded via audiotape and that the researcher will take handwritten note. All notes and audio recordings will be held in a locked filing cabinet for the duration of the study and period of 5 years post completion of the study, at which point they will be destroyed.
• Address any questions and comments.

Interview Script

Part 1 Demographics:

Q1. What is your current position within your organization?
   ____ Upper management
   ____ Middle management
   ____ First-line management
   ____ Individual contributor

Q2. How would you describe your organization?
   ____ Corporate entity
   ____ Not-for-Profit
   ____ Philanthropic
   ____ Owner-managed business

Q3. What is your current age range?
   ____ 20—29 years
   ____ 30—39 years
   ____ 40—49 years
   ____ 50—59 years
   ____ 60 years or older

Q4. What is your highest level of education?
   ____ High-school diploma
   ____ Associate degree
   ____ Bachelor degree
   ____ Master's degree
   ____ Doctoral degree
**Part 2: Exploring Generative Change**

**Working Definition of Generative Change:**

For the purposes of this research Generative Change is described as change that builds upon itself and calls forth imagination, creativity and courage. In contrast to planned changed which is typically episodic and focused on “fixing” a prescribed issue, generative change is recursive, designed to achieve multiple and multiplying benefits and is grounded in an appreciative mindset.

Q1. When you think about this idea of generative change, tell me about an experience of generative change that you have been part of.

Q2. What do you consider to be the catalyst for change in the experience you described?

Q3. Reflecting on the experience that you have described, what was the biggest obstacle or challenge, if any?

Q4. How did you overcome any obstacles or challenges?

Q5. Consider for moment the impact of this experience on you as an individual, your organization, or on your local community. How would you describe the tangible impact of this experience?

Q6. What was your intention in attending Connecting for Change?

Q7. Did Connecting for Change impact you? If so, please describe how.

This concludes my formal questions. Now I would like to open it up to you and any additional questions or thoughts that you have.

Q8. Is there anything else I should have asked? Is there anything else you would like to share?

**Conclusion of Interview:**

- Thank participant(s) for their time.
- Reiterate confidentiality agreement and procedure of keeping information in a locked filing cabinet.
- Address any final questions and comments.
- Clarify approval for further contact if clarification is needed on any points made during the interview.
- Provide contact information of researcher to the interviewee.
- Follow-up with a “Thank you” e-mail.