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ABSTRACT

It has been said that the only constant thing is change, and to prove this point one needs to look no farther than the American manufacturing plant. The downturn in the world economy, globalization of business practices, international competition, and the need for expanding markets has pushed manufacturing into reevaluating the base assumptions about operations management. In this volatile and demanding environment, companies cannot afford to risk strained production resources on short-term improvements only to have the productivity diminish as quickly as it appeared. Despite the influx and propagation of effective Lean and Six Sigma practices\(^1\), the long-term benefits still elude most organizations.

The objective of this work is to provide a new methodology leveraging the organizational dynamics that either make or break a site-wide transformation. The project consists of detailing the structured methodology of the Organizational Change Process that addresses the full spectrum of mindsets and behaviors needed to transform an organization from short-term point solutions to a sustainable culture of continuous improvement. Addressed in this work are the historical context, practical implementation steps, diagnostic, and the operational tools necessary for facilitating transformative organizational change as well as the theoretical framework underpinning the methodology. The structure of the Organizational Change Process follows a 16-week protocol that includes a site-wide diagnostic evaluation, design of a future-state production system, developing an implementation plan, and management of the implementation phases of the project. This project draws examples and learnings from a four transformation projects across three distinct manufacturing sites for which the principal investigator served as lead consultant for two sites and in a support role for the third site from January 2011 to January 2012.

\(^1\) “Lean” is shorthand to refer to a lean manufacturing system, of which the Toyota Production System is the foremost example. “Six Sigma” is a set of business management techniques that was developed at Motorola, USA. These terms are often used interchangeably to refer to the tools and techniques used to identify non-value-adding processes, eliminate waste, and improve the flow of products through the manufacturing process. Lean references the process of eliminating waste or non-value added elements. Six Sigma refers to a numerical integration technique based upon a regression analysis where one Sigma represents one standard deviation from the Mean within the population. At six sigma, or six standard deviations from the mean, essentially all errors are accounted for.
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PART I: EVOLUTION OF THE LANDSCAPE

Context & Framework

The point is not merely to succeed, but to become a deeper, more complex, more mature person through your struggle. You allow the alchemy of your challenging journey to etch itself into your character, making you into a rich personality. Then whatever work you do will have the quality of your experience and your capacity to be ripened by it.¹

– Thomas Moore

Objective and Scope

This work represents the summation of learning gained from working with multiple organizations, in multiple industries, over the span of three years. All of these companies were faced with the challenge of envisioning and evolving a more productive, profitable, and sustainable organization. What has emerged from this experience is a structured approach to organizational dynamics that is grounded in the principles of transformational psychology.

Literature

The bookstore shelves dedicated to business is vast and, should you not be impressed with the local brick and mortar store, there are many more available online. There are several categories of these books.

Case Studies

The first category of business books are those written by very skilled management practitioners describing their experiences in creating successful companies. While one can learn a great deal from case studies, they look retrospectively on what has happened,
in a specific place, during a specific time, with a specific set of issues, and a unique team of individuals. While informative, it is impossible to recreate the outcome by the mere fact that the protocol was established after the success occurred, when everyone sat back and said, “That was great! How did we do that?” Even with the best of intent, there are innumerable confounding variables and lapses in memory. These retrospective accounts are valuable, however, in that everyone likes a good underdog story, it gives us hope.

**Business Novels**

Another category is the business novel. Like a case study, these books tell the story of a fictional character on a hero’s journey to save the company. These books are informative and can provide a sequence of events that move the hero through a series of insights until the end when he, and the hero is usually male, rallies the team and saves the plant. A friend of mine calls this genre *business porn*, and his assessment isn’t that far off. They describe something the reader is familiar with, but in a fantasied environment with predictable characters who follow the script to the expected ending. The problem is that it never quite works that way in real life and the struggles, if discussed at all, are superficial -- bearing little resemblance to one’s own struggles. Business novels can provide an introduction to useful concepts but they must be read with the understanding that ones own experience will be very different from what is described.

**Models and Theories**

In another category are books that provide models and theories for operations management and organizational change. These methodology books attempt to organize
observation and experience into a process that is repeatable. The challenge with many models and theories, however, is that they are often long on what is observed and how change is experienced but fall short on a discussion of why. And in my opinion, the question of why is the most interesting.

**Operational Research**

The final group includes operational research published in academic and trade journals. Like the models/theory category these writings focus on establishing a premise, testing that premise and a discussion of the results. Like much academic research, unless the reader has an affinity for scholarly writing, it is not exactly the material that would capture the imagination of most executives. Academic studies, however, often stumble when applied to a less controlled environment with issues exceeding the limits of the study. The result is that although the data may be quite useful and provide some profound insights into the field, much of the research is not operational until it is filtered through and modulated by one of the more accessible styles of presentation.

Of these styles, this dissertation project spans several of these genres. Included in this project is a historical framework to provide the reader with an understanding of the contributing factors to the study of organizational change, a practical methodology for facilitating transformational change in a group setting, and a theoretical discussion grounded in psychological theory supported by academic research. It is my intention to provide a conceptual model of organizational change based on a retrospective description of my own experiences of using this methodology onsite in companies with whom I have consulted.
It is important at this point to note what this work is not. This project diverges from the strict academic structure of hypothesis/test/results in that the focus is not only on what the process is, but also contains significant discussion as to why each step of the process is important. This is not the only way to create change in an organization, but it is a process that I have used and found useful. In this work I have utilized many tools and techniques generally available and give credit to each author, theorist, and/or developer to the extent that they can be identified separate from the public domain. My contribution to this field is to assemble the parts into a cohesive whole and provide the theoretical grounding that addresses the question of “why.” A major goal in developing this work is to provide a firm grasp of the underlying dynamics so that the sticky issue of what to do when things don’t go as planned may be identified and addressed. For each element in the process I have identified the symptoms and behaviors that occur when a particular step is skipped or incomplete. No project ever goes 100% according to plan, and I propose that this is a good thing. We learn best when we have to stop and figure things out. It is my hope that through the descriptions and stories provided here, the reader will come away with a better understanding of the psychological, spiritual, and transpersonal aspects of organizational change.
Historical Context

In order to properly assess the effectiveness of the tools presented, it is necessary to provide a context around the subject by exploring the historical and socio-cultural aspects surrounding the American experience of work and how that experience has changed over time. What follows in this section is a brief assessment of organizational change models set in what I understand to be the major shifts in the social and business culture that gave rise to these models.

Recognizing that globalization has played an important role in the discussion of increased productivity, this discussion is focused specifically on the American experience. It is my belief that the difference between change and compliance is the ability for individuals to connect with that which they perceive to be larger than themselves. Change is inevitable and how individuals adapt to change is a function of how a behavior is woven into the personal narrative. Individuals will comply with new behavior when there is external motivation to do so. However, unless an individual finds purpose and meaning in the act that satisfies an intrinsic need, a compelled behavior will be disbanded as soon as the external motivation no longer exists. Conversely, a new behavior infused with meaning and purpose such as acceptance and self-esteem, will be adapted to easier and for a longer duration. Therefore, to set the foundation for further discussion, let me begin to place organizational theory within the context of how work life and spiritual issues are connected.
Context

Change has always been with us. Philosophies concerning the management of change through organization and leadership can be traced back to Plato and Aristotle. Even in antiquity, the desire to coordinate the effort of a group of people toward a common objective was of importance. Military campaigns had the direct motivation of physical safety, either personal in the case of conscripted service, or in defense of one’s tribe. However, as Plato described in *The Republic*, persuading the guardians of Athens to embody the qualities and attributes of a just and democratic society was a bit more challenging.2 In his discussion about the just man and the unjust man, Plato makes the following observation about the apparent unfairness in society:

Because he [the unjust man] deals with realities and does not live by appearances, he really wants not to seem but to be unjust. He
Reaps thought’s deep furrow, for therefrom
Spring goodly schemes
-- schemes which bring him respectability and office, and which enable him to marry into any family he likes, to make desirable matches for his children, and to pick his partners in business transactions, while all the time, because he has no scruples about committing injustice, he is on the make. In all kinds of competition public or private he always comes off best and does down his rivals, and so becomes rich and can do good to his friends and harm his enemies. His sacrifices and votive offerings to the gods are on a suitably magnificent scale, and his services to the gods, and to any man he wishes to serve, are far better than those of the just man, so that it is reasonable to suppose that the gods care more for him than for the just man. And so they conclude, Socrates, that a better life is provided for the unjust man than for the just by both gods and men.3

As Clifton D. Bryant notes in the introduction to his compendium entitled *The Social Dimensions of Work*, “We never escape the shadow of work … We are shaped, molded, regulated, even assimilated by our work. Work is our behavioral product, but so, too, are we and our lives the products of our work.”4 Behaviors at work are a byproduct
of the attitudes and beliefs of the individual and as Plato describes, understanding these behaviors can be a challenge; modifying them is even more so.

Motivation and group dynamics remained in the domain of philosophy until the Industrial Revolution gained a firm hold on manufacturing between 1750 and 1850. In 1904-1905 German sociologist Max Weber published a two-part article, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, in which he proposed that it was the underlying religious morality of Protestantism that provided the necessary foundation for capitalism to flourish. Weber argued that since the Protestant ethic promoted the value of an individual’s work to service of God and the greater society, individuals would voluntarily subjugate their own desires in exchange for personal salvation and a standard of moral living that benefitted the community as a whole.5

In the agricultural society existing prior to the Industrial Revolution, work was referred to as drudgery6 and considered a necessary evil. Customized economic activity served simply as the means to sustain a lifestyle. Those who could afford to hire laborers were exempt from the drudgery as wealth was viewed as a sign of God’s favor. Those less fortunate therefore “needed to work” in order to atone for their sins. The association of God’s favor with material wealth, by definition, sets up a social structure wherein economic struggle is judged as a moral failing. Too often the resulting belief structure is that “the ends justify the means” as individuals, seeking status and salvation, enact behaviors that may otherwise be deemed offensive, immoral, or even illegal. As we shall see, this theme of material wealth as a measure of spiritual worth, and the resulting social and political power, runs throughout American business, social, and political history.
Based upon Christian doctrine, labor was understood as a consequence of Adam’s disobedience and subsequent fall from grace. Genesis 3:17-18 states:

... cursed is the ground because of you;  
in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life;  
thorns and thistles it shall bring forth to you;  
and you shall eat the plants of the field.  
In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground,  
for out of it you were taken;  
you are dust, and to dust you shall return.7

In order to serve as penance to God, work was supposed to be painful and unpleasant. However, while work was understood to be difficult, the sacrifice was only required, insomuch as was needed to provide for ones needs.8 Once survival and lifestyle needs were met, the remainder of one’s time could be devoted to more pleasurable activities such as family, community, personal interests, and contemplation. Weber wrote, “Since work has no intrinsic value, laborers, when they are not under the compulsion of others, cease their exertions once their needs are met; the truly important matters of life begin once work has ended.”9

Labor only to meet ones economic needs, however, was insufficient for the new industrial revolution. The consistent production of goods required workers to conform to a schedule that was established by the factory rather than by their own needs. It was simply not acceptable for a worker to decide that they had earned enough for that day and it was time to go home. Weber suggested that it was the shifting of toil “from meaningless labor, to work that was infused with religious obligation, that created a culture in which ‘a secular ‘calling’ [became] a way of serving God.”10 As Buder notes in Capitalizing on Change, this elevation of work to religious duty and moral obligation “created a psychological pressure that internalized values of thrift, honesty, persistence,
and disciplined behavior, with worldly wealth regarded as evidence of grace. … People would live to work, believing that by doing so they served God and testified to their spiritual worthiness.”

From Agriculture to the Factory

The concept of the manufacturing plant began in the English textile mills during the late 1700s and allowed the proliferation of goods to a broader market, including the American colonies. New England in 1830 was an agricultural based economy with the majority of the population living on self-sustaining farms. Elements such as a stable government with clear laws and a commitment to education created an environment well suited for a new industrial economy. As Peter Temin writes in Engines of Enterprise, “Even with these legal advantages, British visitors who observed industrial establishments in New England in the 1850s were amazed. The United States was an agricultural country with very productive farms. Labor on these farms was paid well, and Americans were surprisingly tall and healthy as a result. How could fledgling industrial enterprises compete with established agriculture for labor?” The belief was, “that it would be hard to attract labor away from the prosperous American agriculture to work in industry.”

In 1822, the Boston Associates, a consortium of investors, constructed cotton mills twenty-five miles outside of Boston that included worker dormitories calling the new town Lowell, Mass. In need of labor, the Boston Associates recruited locally. Buder writes, “To attract a reliable low-cost workforce, the decision was made to employ the unmarried daughters of New England farm families – and since these families would
not risk their daughters’ morals and health in an ordinary industrial setting, Lowell was built as a model community.”

Lowell was hailed as a commercial utopia that provided the moral, religious, and cultural training necessary to support a proper industrial workforce. The utopia was, however, short lived. Mill management cut wages by 25% in 1834 and the workers struck, not only for the loss of pay, but also for the increasingly difficult working conditions. By the 1840s Irish and French immigrants provided the low-cost labor working a diurnal workday six days a week, from sun up to sun down in the winter and thirteen hours a day during the summer with a single half-hour break allowed for the noontime meal.

Industrialized production meant that consumer goods once reserved for the wealthy, were now widely available. Mechanized weaving in the 1840s dramatically reduced the cost of carpets and fabric. Mass-produced clocks, glass, furniture, and other ready-made products, offered through urban retailing, fueled an emerging consumer culture. As consumer demands for affordable products increased the need for factory workers also increased driving specialization and standardization in the workforce.

By 1880 life in New England had changed dramatically with most of the population living in cities and purchasing their food with wages earned in service to others. Without the self-sufficiency provided in the agricultural economy, workers became bound to the labor-for-wages relationship in order to provide for themselves and their families. Once workers could be motivated to show up on a regular basis, the next question was how to maximize their productivity once they were there. It is this question of ensuring ongoing and increasing productivity that is at the core of any change.
management endeavor and has developed into the academic study of Organizational Dynamics.

It’s all about the process.

Advances in transportation, oil refining, electricity, and steel fueled the rise of big business in the late 1800’s. Through the empire building of such men as Vanderbilt, Rockefeller, JP Morgan, Westinghouse, and Carnegie, the industrialists changed the landscape of American business. New industries, founded by charismatic entrepreneurs, led their new empires with a reputation and style that defined the corporate image. For two decades beginning in 1880, industrial corporations with their focus on growth and market control became the new standard of production. Owner-managed businesses in many segments of the new economy gave way to professional managers who operated the businesses through hierarchic organizations.\(^{19}\) The goal of these organizations was increasing production and lowering cost in order to dominate the market. In his book *Capitalizing on Change*, Buder writes, “These managers were professionals with special skills who were expected to create a ‘system’ suitable to the nature and scale of the enterprise.”\(^{20}\) These new systems, oriented to mass production, “required a rethinking of the organization of the factory floor. The persistence of traditional craft work and weak management practices demonstrated the need for a new management style to reduce confusion and inefficiencies.”\(^{21}\)

Inspired by the scientific method and the 1886 paper by Henry Towne entitled “The Engineer as Economist,” Frederick W. Taylor (1856 – 1915) used his experience on the factory floor of the Midvale Iron Works to develop his own ideas about the right way
to optimize a factory. The established craft tradition held individual experience and expertise in high regard, a practice Taylor believed, was detrimental to increased production. By employing time studies and best practices, Taylor segmented the work into small, easily taught, repetitive tasks and established a management structure to ensure rigid adherence to the established process. The results of this new system, specifically his 1898 work with the Bethlehem Steel Company, were impressive in significantly reducing labor costs by increasing the per person output.22

Taylor managed the organization as a machine and utilized the tools of scientific inquiry to optimize the production process. The four elements of Scientific Management are:

1. Gather detailed data about the process
2. Select appropriate workers for the job and train them in the desired process
3. Apply and use the new methods
4. Divide the business into managers and doers23.

According to Taylor, the function of managers is to analyze the work of the employees, make necessary adjustments to the standard work, and ensure that the workers had the required resources to do their job. The function of the workers was to perform the requisite task consistently and uniformly in accordance with the standard work.24 While the end results were impressive, workers resisted improvement standards based upon the speed of the fastest worker and viewed the practice as exploitation, “used for no other apparent reason then to make more money faster, at their expense.”25

Taylor’s methods of scientific management had sweeping influence across the cultural spectrum. Taylor’s 1911 publication of The Principles of Scientific Management
utilized the conservation efforts of Theodore Roosevelt to validate his methods. Taylor wrote:

> We can see our forests vanishing, our water-powers going to waste, our soil being carried by floods into the sea; and the end of our coal and our iron is in sight. But our larger wastes of human effort, which go on every day through such of our acts as are blundering, ill-directed, or inefficient, and which Mr. Roosevelt refers to as a lack of “national efficiency,” are less visible, less tangible, and are vaguely appreciated.\(^{26}\)

America was ripe for the efficiency that Taylorism offered and advocates applied Taylor’s methodology to a variety of settings. Melville Dewey, a Taylor disciple, created the Dewey decimal system to organize the nation’s libraries and a 1912 article in *The Ladies’ Home Journal* advocated home economics based upon the theories of scientific management.\(^{27}\)

The idea of conservation of resources through efficiency had mass appeal and advocates of Taylorism attempted to optimize all aspects of modern life in a procedural and structured manner. Taylor’s process efficiency, however, was most applicable in the factory. Interestingly, Taylor’s method as a change agent within factories gained limited acceptance. As Buder notes,

> Management approached Taylorism cautiously, believing it had limited applicability. The few firms that tried to introduce Taylorism as a complete system encountered opposition from old-line management, which felt as threatened as workers on the factory floor. Yet Taylor’s ideas did contribute to the formulation of the classical input-process-output (IPO), which dominated management training from the 1920’s to the 1970’s.\(^{28}\)

Although Taylor referred to workers as “feeling animals,” it was the supremacy of the data to determine the most efficient process that he believed would ensure lasting change within an organization.\(^{29}\) While his work was, and still is, embraced by those
looking for greater economic efficiency, others concerned with working conditions and worker stress perceived Taylorism as a vehicle for the exploitation of labor.  

Although not fully embraced in Taylor’s time, his method of process improvement through scientific inquiry still provide the basis for factory floor optimization and are the underlying foundation for the current fields of *reengineering* and *business process engineering*. A contemporary promoter of using scientific methodology for process improvement is Hammer and Champy’s 2001 book entitled *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*. Taylor’s methods are also the foundation for contemporary methodologies such as ISO9000, Six Sigma, and Total Quality Management. As Warner Burke notes, “These days, it may not be politically correct to claim to be a devotee of Frederick Taylor, but to be involved in any of the techniques and methods just mentioned is to live in his long shadow.”

**No, it’s all about the people.**

Process efficiency is measured by the quantity of production per labor-hour, however, by the early 1900’s it became clear that machine efficiency alone would not meet the production objectives. The movement from work as craft to the assembly line resulted in a loss of autonomy and a de-skillling of the workforce. Through the use of task standardization and emphasis on routine and speed, there was no room for personal initiative. It was the role of the white-collar leaders to scientifically determine the most efficient process and to enforce blue-collar compliance to the standard work through top-down management. Even the terms white-collar and blue-collar echo the clear distinction between the workers, whose clothes were expected to get dirty as a result of
their manual labor, and the managers whose hands-off direction allowed their white shirts to remain clean. The archetypal image of the clean and the unclean remains evidence of underlying cultural beliefs that equate status as evidence of Divine favor.

Few American workers at the turn of the 20th century belonged to unions and without laws regulating safety and working conditions, many workers endured “deplorable conditions, dangerous tasks, grueling hours andpressive wages.”33 In November of 2012 a textile factory in Bangladesh took the lives of more than 100, mostly female workers. Cramped working conditions, flammable materials, locked doors, and inadequate fire exits created an inferno where workers jumped from the nine-story building to escape the blaze.34 As hard as this was for Americans to witness, this is not the first time such a tragedy has occurred. The news reports of the 2012 Bangladesh fire are strikingly similar to the 1911 Triangle Shirtwaist Fire in New York City.

Like Bangladesh today, American workers in 1911 had few rights. A successful strike was led by the International Ladies’ Garment Workers’ Union (ILGWU) Local 25 in 1909 after the firing of 150 suspected union sympathizers from the Triangle Shirtwaist company. This strike had resulted in 15,000 garment workers in New York negotiating better pay and working conditions. The management of the Triangle Shirtwaist Company, however, disregarded this agreement and “continued to refuse to recognize unions, update any of their safety measures and continued to operate what was described as a sweatshop.”35 The Department of Labor website describes the event:

At 4:45 in the afternoon of March 25, 1911, the four-month anniversary of a fire in Newark, N.J. which killed 25 people, fire broke out in a cutting area on the eighth floor of the Triangle Shirtwaist factory in Greenwich Village, New York City. Within minutes, the top three floors of the Asch Building at 23-29
Washington Street were engulfed in flames. Many of the staff, mostly recently immigrated Jewish and Italian women, some as young as 14, were trapped in a building that claimed to be fireproof. Some began to fall and jump from the windows. Police and firefighters from nearby stations were impeded by the bodies on the sidewalk.  

It took the death of 146 workers in 18 minutes at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire to begin to change American views regarding working conditions. As the U.S. Department of Labor notes, “The Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire, one of the nation’s most deadly and horrific, led to some of the nation’s strongest changes in worker safety in the manufacturing industry. From the ashes of tragedy rose the phoenix of reform.”

In addition to long hours and working conditions, factory workers found the repetitive nature of assembly work to be tedious and exacting which, in turn, led to an increase in absenteeism and turnover. As Stephen Meyer wrote in *The Five Dollar Day*, “American industry soon found that the proper handling of labor was necessary to realize maximum efficiency.”

Taylor expressed a view typical of the early industrial revolution by stating that workers were motivated primarily by monetary compensation. Taylor advocated that workers should be paid enough, but not too much lest they succumb to the moral evils of excess. In an article entitled “Shop Management”, published in the Transactions of American Society of Mechanical Engineers in 1903, Taylor expressed his views on work as the structure for worker’s moral wellbeing. Steven Meyer quotes Taylor saying:

“if overpaid,” he [Taylor] noted, “many will work irregularly and tend to become more or less shiftless, extravagant and dissipated. It does not do for most men to get rich too fast.” Nonetheless, [Taylor] concluded that, “most men become more instead of less thrifty when they receive the proper increase for an extra hard day’s work…. They live rather better, begin to save money, become more sober, and work more steadily.” Hard work with appropriate pay was the path to spiritual and material contentment and to productive and efficient workers.
In 1913, Henry Ford was experiencing a 380% turnover in his Highland Park assembly plant. In order to reduce the costs of recruiting, retraining, and motivating employees, Ford introduced his “$5 day” wage for an eight-hour workday. While often framed as the benevolent advocate for fair pay and reasonable work hours, Ford’s actions solved the more practical problem of retaining employees by paying “efficiency wages”, the economic term for “pay that is above the minimum level required to hire and retain workers.” Where Taylorism focused on the data and process, Fordism utilized the techniques of process improvement but focused change and productivity efforts by addressing the issue of motivating workers.

In addition to the new wages, Ford Motor Company established the Ford Sociological Department, which as Meyer notes, “attempted to manipulate and to mold working-class social and cultural forms to suit the requirements of mechanized production…. Furthermore, the Ford Sociological Department tossed a wide-ranging and tightly-knit web of social controls over the Ford workforce in order to create, to develop, and to instill positive industrial values and disciplined work habits in the Ford labor force.”

It has been said that everyone has a price, and as Ford calculated, in 1914 the price to keep an assembly worker on the job and exhibiting appropriate behavior was $5 a day.

A contemporary example of this method of organizational motivation is incentive based compensation: commissions for the sales force, performance-based bonuses for executives, stock options, competitive wages and benefit packages. While compensation is an important component in worker satisfaction, not everyone is motivated by money to
the same degree. For those employees who seek purpose and meaning in their work, high compensation can feel like velvet handcuffs and lead to a diminished self-worth for having “sold out.”

Well, actually it’s both people and process.

Beginning in 1924, researchers at the Hawthorne Works division of General Electric began a series of studies to better understand the relationship between worker conditions and productivity. Elton Mayo and Chester Barnard were psychologists who faulted Taylorism for “viewing workers as motivated only by economic gain, arguing that employees needed a sense of self-worth and accomplishment in the workplace.” Over the course of nine years, a series of experiments were performed that generated some surprising results.

While evaluating the effect of lighting conditions, the Mayo and Barnard discovered that regardless of whether the lights were turned up or down, it was the change and subsequent observation by the researchers that accounted for the increased production. The conclusion drawn was that the increased output was not correlated to the working conditions, but rather was a result of the attention workers received from being studied, a phenomena commonly known as “the Hawthorne effect.” A contemporary rule of thumb extrapolated, but not necessarily fully validated from this study, is that one can expect a 30% increase in productivity simply by measuring it.

The Hawthorne studies advanced a new era of academic inquiry, currently called industrial and organizational psychology, by addressing the understanding of individual and group responses to organizational change.
During the 1920’s, American business was booming. Alfred P. Sloan took over General Motors in 1921 with a style opposite of the entrepreneurial risk-taking of his predecessor William C. Durrant. Sloan believed that the responsibility for innovation “should be a matter of decision making by teams of managerial specialists.”45 It was these managerial specialists who were tasked with not only making product but also, and more importantly, delivering on the main objective of the organization, to make money. Meeting these objectives required clear systems and procedures that emphasized corporate strategy and structure over personal leadership.46 As Buder writes, “Alfred Sloan would even claim that a great strength of the corporation was that it was designed to be an ‘objective organization,’ in contrast to the personality-driven proprietary firm.”47 This narrative of corporations as being objective organizations is still very much present to this day as evidenced by the popular phrase, “Nothing personal, its just business.” Sloan’s emphasis on organizational structure as the lever for innovation would dominate American businesses until the late 1900s when charismatic innovators began to change the very fabric of American life from their Silicon Valley garages.

The end of WWII began another shift in American’s relationship with work. For the first time, an increased number of new college graduates entered the workforce looking for white-collar professional positions. Many of these new graduates had been trained in the military during the war and, after the war ended, received degrees as a result of the GI bill. For these new professionals, small business was no longer seen as a promised land. After the insecurity of the depression and war years there was a desire for
the prosperity and security that big business offered and this generation set their sights on climbing the corporate ladder. Comfortable with the hierarchic structure of military command and control, WWII veterans were welcomed by big businesses that applied their analytic skillset to tactical and strategic planning.48

During the late 1940’s to the early 1950s, Edwin A. Fleishman conducted a research project at the International Harvester Company that began to look at the functions of leadership. The Fleishman surveys reflected that leadership was comprised of two primary functions: “(1) initiation of structure, the provision of task direction and conditions for effective performance, and (2) consideration, the leader’s sensitivity to and consideration of subordinates’ needs and feelings.”49 What was interesting about the International Harvester research was although sensitivity training increased supervisor consideration scores in the short term, these results did not sustain over time unless the attitudes and behaviors of their boss created an environment consistent with the goals of the training. While sensitivity training offered short-term gains, it was the culture and one’s relationship with their direct management that was a better predictor of long-term behavior.50

Fleishman’s work was typical of Industrial Organizational (I/O) Psychology that addresses the relationship between the individual and their experience of working in the context of business and industry. Industrial psychologists developed tools and techniques to aid business in the development of the reflexive skills supportive to effective performance in the workplace.51
I/O Psychology uses both surveys and training tools to effect organizational change. These methodologies identify the current behavior through data collection via survey or personal feedback. Using applied behavioral psychology, change is facilitated as a result of presenting the data, discussing the meaning, identifying the desired change, and jointly creating action plans. The challenge with this approach is the same problem that behavioral psychology has in a therapeutic setting, that knowing better does not always translate to doing better. While raising dysfunctional behavior to conscious awareness may affect change in the short term, it makes the assumption that once irrational beliefs are identified and proven to be faulty, more rational behavior can then take its place. Rationality as a catalyst for change, however, decreases in effectiveness as individuals express vague, irrational, or passive-aggressive opposition.

**Ok, people and process, but in the context of the whole system.**

American business prospered between 1940 and the mid-1960s becoming the standard by which the world measured prosperity. Corporations launched advertising and public relations campaigns aimed at fostering images of civic virtue and good citizenship leading Peter Drucker to describe the corporation as “America’s representative social institution.”[^52] The opening of Disneyland in 1955 is a symbol of the pleasures offered by the rising standard of living and affluence of the middle class. The immaculate and idealized Main Street Disneyland created romantic nostalgia for happy and prosperous communities. Walking down Main Street visitors were led directly into a futuristic Tomorrowland, where technology and business heralded a new era of progress and leisure.[^53] This not-so-subtle juxtaposition remains to this day as a visual reminder of the
promise made by the industrial revolution. “Better living through chemistry,” as the saying goes.

By the late 1960’s things began to change. The Vietnam War was active and a new generation began to openly question the narrative of the Great Society based upon materialism and conformance to the needs of big business. Objections to the war, social justice, ecological concerns, and the health and safety of workers became flashpoints that ignited protests calling for new government regulations and the rights of individuals.⁵⁴

During the 1970’s America seemed to be fraying at the edges. President Nixon resigned with disgrace after the Watergate scandal. Arab embargos dramatized the loss of American self-sufficiency with fuel shortages and long lines. Higher oil prices led to high inflation with little growth and a period of economic stagnation. All these elements, combined with the lack of a decisive “victory” in the Vietnam War, contributed to a crisis in self-confidence and feelings of economic uncertainty for the first time since the Great Depression.⁵⁵

Representative of growing tension, the 1973 wildcat strike at the General Motors Lordstown manufacturing plant was lead by young workers “to protest not low pay or hazardous conditions but the alienation of the assembly line and a hierarchical corporate bureaucracy.”⁵⁶ As Buder describes:

A General Motors vice president angrily complained that among younger workers “the traditional motivations of job security, money rewards, and even opportunities of personal advancement were proving insufficient.” Workers needed to be reminded, one corporate executive lectured a journalist, “that a job is the most important thing they can have.” If American workers were spoiled by affluence and “no longer could cut the mustard” then, some argued, applying the lash of economic adversity and job insecurity would return discipline to the workplace.⁵⁷
In July 1980 the *Harvard Business Review* published an article entitled “Managing Our Way to Economic Decline” stating, “During the past several years American business has experienced a marked deterioration of competitive vigor and a growing uneasiness about its economic well-being.” Although productivity continued to increase during the 1970’s, the American increase of 50% between 1960 and 1980 was dwarfed by gains in both Germany and Japan, of 100% and 400% respectively.

It is important to note that American workers did not simply slow down production. As the inflation rate rose, interest rates also increased making capital less available for expenditures such as new equipment and factory upgrades. Slower domestic growth led to lower profits and a downward cycle that resulted in the once booming manufacturing centers of the Midwest to be termed the “Rust Belt.” However, with baby boomers coming of employment age, and the increase of women in the workforce, America did not suffer the labor shortage of other nations. Labor became a commodity and in the absence of new equipment, increased labor filled the gap.

Adding more labor however, added to the cost of production, which in turn, made offshoring manufacturing to cheap foreign labor an attractive alternative.

Labor union membership declined and the agreements that had been put into place to protect the health and conditions of workers came under attack accused of having raised labor costs to unsustainable levels for the growing international market.

Deregulation became a household word in the 1970’s as the country debated the cause of economic problems such as high inflation and unemployment. As manufacturing, which had been the “nuts and bolts” of the American economy moved overseas, students entering business schools began specializing in finance rather than
operations. During the 1980’s manufacturing became referred to as “the forgotten industry” as the American economy shifted from tangible goods to the more abstract commodities of information and money.

If the 1970’s were the decade of personal uncertainty, then the 1980’s were the decade of corporate uncertainty, as workers could no longer depend on spending their entire career at one company. “Supply-side” economics, promoted by Ronald Regan, began a movement that lowered taxes on the wealthy with the promise that this would provide investors with more capital. More capital, it was proposed, combined with removing government restrictions on business and banking, would translate to a booming economy that would eventually “trickle down” to the masses. The Regan years did see an economic turnaround but it was not without a price. Lowered taxes translated to lower government revenues, however, domestic defense spending increased as Regan sought to gain the upper hand in the Cold War with the Soviets. As Buder comments, “In many ways, the Regan years would be an era of striking contradictions. More, not less, federal spending occurred during his presidency, as the national debt tripled.”

The increase in capital did spur business investment during the 1980’s, although the form it took may have been a surprise to the majority of American workers. Rather than investing in new machinery and production methods, corporate speculators began to grow their businesses by consuming other companies through hostile takeovers and leveraged buyouts. In an attempt to ensure against specific industry downturns, large holding companies began to amass “diversified portfolios” that often had no connection to the company’s initial business. Any sign of weakness would draw the attention of corporate raiders. Where managers had previously received accolades for their
operations and production planning, in the winner-take-all world of mergers, successful managers now had to utilize their finance and accounting skills to show quarterly profits, every quarter. Buder writes, “Nearly half of all big U.S. corporations received a takeover offer in the 1980s. In 1986 alone, 20 percent of the Fortune 500 corporations disappeared through merger and acquisition.” Effectively, the Fortune 500 had become the Fortune 400 within a single year.

Eric Trist, an organizational researcher in the U.K. began to research an anomaly in the struggling coal production industry. Although the industry as a whole was underperforming and absenteeism was at 20%, the South Yorkshire coalfield was an exception. Trist describes what he found:

The work organization of the new seam was, to us, a novel phenomenon consisting of a set of relatively autonomous groups interchanging roles and shifts and regulating their affairs with a minimum of supervision. Cooperation between task groups was everywhere in evidence; personal commitment was obvious, absenteeism low, accidents infrequent, productivity high. The contrast was large between the atmosphere and arrangements on those faces and those in the conventional areas of the pit, where the negative features characteristic of the industry were glaringly apparent.

Trist goes on to describe how the men had self-organized in order to better utilize the new technology by evolving “a form of work organization based upon practices common in unmechanized days when small groups, who took responsibility for the entire cycle, had worked autonomously.”

Previously overlooked, the new paradigm began. Known as socio-technical systems, Trist focused upon the relationship and inter-dependence between the individual and the way in which the technology enabled a social structure in which the work was
performed. Sociotechnical focuses on a series of interrelated elements of both technical and social aspects of the work. Central to this paradigm shift is the focus on work-groups as interdependent and self-regulating communities. The idea that workers could hold each other accountable without direct oversight of supervisors and managers was the direct opposite of Taylorism. Key elements of sociotechnical systems are:

- Work organizations consist of two *interdependent* systems: the technical system (equipment, machinery, chemical processes, etc.) and the social system (individual workers and groups of workers).

- The *work system* is the basic unit, comprising a set of activities that make up a functioning whole, rather than single jobs or tasks.

- The *work group*, rather than the individual jobholder, is central.

- *Regulation* of the system is performed by the group itself, instead of by supervisors (completely counter to Taylor’s scientific management notions).

- An individual worker is *complementary* to the machine, rather than an extension of it.\(^{71}\)

Sociotechnical is a methodology currently promoted by John Kotter and currently permeates the field of organizational transformation. In his 1996 book, *Leading Change*, Kotter lays out a prescriptive 8-step methodology for implementing change based upon his experience as a management and change consultant:

1. Establishing a sense of urgency
2. Creating the guiding coalition
3. Developing a vision and strategy
4. Communicating the change vision
5. Empowering employees for broad-based action
6. Generating short-term wins
7. Consolidating gains and producing more change
8. Anchoring new approaches in the culture\(^ {72}\)
What is different about Sociotechnical methodology is that it operates on three distinct yet interdependent levels from the micro to the macro: *primary work systems*, *whole organizational systems*, and *macrosocial systems*.\(^{73}\)

In my own work I have seen these three areas defined in a more confined scope with the primary work group identified as either *upstream*, which encompasses everything from sales and order entry through production scheduling and material on the floor, and *downstream*, from production through shipping. The Whole Organization System was defined as the Value Stream where the business divided into smaller segments based upon common production processes that allowed for optimization of the factory floor. The Macrosocial System, on these projects, addressed how the individual production sites operated within the larger division and holding company.

While I agree with the concept of autonomous work groups I have also seen problems when implementing this throughout large organizations. The increase of enthusiasm at onset of the first Value Stream quickly dissipates when the change becomes difficult. Ideas and training are exciting but the exacting work of analysis and data verification requires long hours of tedious work that needs to occur in addition to “the day job” of production. Outsiders, those who are not part of the first Value Stream changes, observe the increased stress level and become disillusioned at the apparent chaos that inevitably occurs during a whole-system transformation. Because context can be easily obscured by chaos, problem solving can turn into a game of Whack-A-Mole as more and more issues surface and individuals feel threatened when their area of expertise comes into question.
Leadership is a vital component of organizational change. In order to keep the change initiative from being just another float in the parade, organizational leadership must delicately balance being actively involved in the process and allowing the workers ownership of the process. This delicate balancing act requires managers to operate in ways that are often unfamiliar. Patience and coaching are key elements for success yet these are skills developed outside of the methodology.

And to understand the system, you must understand the environment.

As an outgrowth of the industrial revolution a metaphor and cultural paradigm developed that likened organizations, and the people employed in them, to machines. This analogy, at its core, is based on and propagates the belief that organizations tend toward disorder (entropy) and that controls must be put in place to prevent it. In the directive model of Jack Welsh at General Electric that advocated ranking employees and cutting the bottom 10% each year, and other organization’s prescriptive do-as-we-say, get on the bus or get thrown under it style, entropy rules with the belief that only “good talent” will counter the inevitable demise of the organization. Margaret Wheatly makes this observation in her book, *Leadership and the New Science*,

Each of us lives and works in organizations designed from Newtonian images of the universe. We manage by separating things into parts, we believe that influence occurs as a direct result of force exerted from one person to another, we engage in complex planning for a world that we keep expecting to be predictable, and we search continually for better methods of objectively measuring and perceiving the world.74

There is, however, another metaphor that has emerged. When organizations are viewed as living systems containing multiple specialized functions working together, these open systems provide a more expansive metaphor than is offered by the metaphor of
mechanical systems. Where machines are a unit unto themselves, open systems are highly influenced by their environment. Where change in a mechanical model is a process of fine-tuning the internal workings, change in an open system is a result of responding to stimuli from the external environment.

Warner Burke and George Litwin published an article in 1992 entitled “A Causal Model of Organizational Performance and Change.” In this article, Burke and Litwin provide a retrospective account of their change modality that has evolved from their consulting work, most notably with British Airways, and is a result of both fieldwork and academic study. The Causal Model is based upon the open system framework and combines both implementation theories that address what change is required to meet the organizations needs, and change process theory about how that change occurs. Burke and Litwin assert that the critical lever for organizational change is how a company adapts to the external environment by way of the organizational climate and culture. Climate, in this model, is defined as the foreground perceptions of the daily work environment, Culture is defined as the background beliefs and values, the Imaginal Structures or lenses through which meaning is assigned to the foreground actions. In addition, Burke and Litwin are clear to differentiate between transactional and transformational change. They describe transactional change as that which alters the climate of an organization by changing the methods of the processes or transactions. Transformational change is defined as “fundamental changes in behavior (e.g., value shifts).” These fundamental behavioral changes are transformational because they alter how the organization is perceived and therefore the shift is a result of changes in the
culture of the organization. Where transactional changes are often termed “fake it till you make it”, transformation is a process where the previous behavior no longer is appropriate because the context has changed. Transactional change disrupts familiar patterns. Sustaining transactional change is difficult because it requires conscious adherence to the new methodology. Like staying on a diet, or remaining sober, the old familiar behavior is not far under the surface. Transformational change, however, is a change in paradigm - a fundamental and holistic shift in beliefs and perceptions that manifest in organic and sustained changes in behavior. The elements of the causal model are defined in Figure 1.

What the causal model adds to the field of organizational change is a definition of the causal dynamics of change. Burke and Litwin are clear to assert that “culture has a stronger influence on systems than vice versa” and that transformational change is primarily the domain of the organization’s leadership where transactional change generally resides at the managerial level. Interestingly, the approach to changing culture starts with changing the climate. Burke and Litwin describe how the elements of their model interact:

In our causal model, we argue that day-to-day climate will be a result of transactions around such issues as
1. Sense of direction: effect of mission clarity or lack thereof.
2. Role and responsibility: effect of structure, reinforced by manager practice.
4. Fairness of rewards: effect of systems, reinforced by manager practice.
5. Focus on customer versus internal pressures, standards of excellence: effect of culture, reinforced by other variables.
Figure 1. The Causal Model

Where other models have been inwardly focused, the causal model is quite specific that any internal change must be in response to improving the customer’s experience. Burke and Litwin concede that the underlying meaning and values that comprise the organizational culture are complex, “difficult to manage, to alter to even be aware of totally.”81 Instead of addressing the issues of culture change directly, Burke and Litwin propose changing the organizational cluster by starting with the transactional issues that
will, in effect, destabilize the climate and create space for the transformational change to occur. Burke and Litwin describe how “The new organization culture, as it becomes accepted, would create a modified, if not an entirely new set of dimensions around which climate would be perceived, described, and responded to.”

This is a very brief description of the causal model, however, what is gained from utilizing this work is an understanding of how, like an organism, an organization is affected by the environment with which it interacts and of which it is a part.

**Additional thoughts and current directions**

Although this has covered a significant amount of ground, there is much that has not been included. For purposes of streamlining the discussion I have not addressed several thought leaders who have provided significant insights into the field of organizational change. Among these are Demming and his work with Total Quality Management, and the Toyota Production System with its implementation in both Japan and America. All of these methodologies have valid and useful components and are clearly evident in current manufacturing operations across the United States and abroad. Understanding that there are other significant models, I have focused on Taylorism, Fordism, the Hawthorne Studies, Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Sociotechnical, and the Causal model in order to illustrate the progression of thought over time and this progression can be documented in the literature. The historical context presented here is just a foundation, there is much more to learn and explore. As the paradigm of quantum physics, energy fields, and consciousness studies continue to come into the mainstream of
the collective conscious, they will continue to mold our collective ideas about organizational development and change management.
Theoretical Framework

Changing corporate culture has been referred to as the “soft stuff” because the boundaries are not clear and industry has, to date, not included the transpersonal dimensions of organizational dynamics. Absent the acknowledgement of higher states of group consciousness, the concept of a corporate culture is reduced to analyzing observable behavior and quantifiable data. Each of the models defined previously address specific aspects of the transformational process, yet has failed to define the subtle dimensions where insight and wisdom are accessed.

There are several thought leaders who have been pioneering the field of organizational change that are beginning to address the concept of accessing the collective wisdom of groups. Among these leaders are: Peter Senge, C. Otto Scharmer, Margaret Wheatly, and Peter Block. In my masters essays I explored the function behind each step of The Inner Counselor process as a complete structure for facilitating individual psycho-spiritual transformation. In this writing, it is my hope to expand upon my initial work and explore how the process of individual transformation may be made applied to groups, organizations, and corporate environments thereby creating a comprehensive change model that is also both operational and scalable. A description of The Inner Counselor Process and the parallels with this Organizational Change Process are detailed in Part III.

Imaginal Structures are the lenses through which we perceive the world, and these lenses are held within the framework of science. The scientific paradigm has changed significantly since the dawn of the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions. The practice of
how organizations are managed and the experience of employee relationships are still, however, primarily founded upon a belief in the deterministic certainty of Newtonian Physics. Fritjof Capra, in his book *The Turning Point*, clearly defines how the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment, and the Industrial Revolution have comprised values and ideas that have been fundamental in shaping the Western Culture.

They [the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment, and the Industrial Revolution] include the belief in the scientific method as the only valid approach to knowledge; the view of the universe as a mechanical system composed of elementary material building blocks; the view of life in society as a competitive struggle for existence; and the belief in unlimited material progress to be achieved through economic and technological growth.83

It is these values that have both defined the foundation American production and, at the same time, are the seeds of its demise. Raymond Firth from the London School of Economics notes that, “A factory is not simply a place where goods are produced and wages are paid. It, too, is a little social world.”84 Capra describes the success of the Cartesian approach while acknowledging that, “it has limited the directions of scientific research. The problem is that scientists, encouraged by their success in treating living organisms as machines, tend to believe that they are nothing but machines.”85 When we extract the human aspects of will, purpose, and meaning from labor we prevent understanding about how experience shapes behavior. “Out go sight, sound, taste, touch and smell and along with them has gone aesthetics and ethical sensibility, values, quality, form; all feelings, motives, intentions, soul, consciousness, spirit. Experience as such is cast out of the realm of scientific discourse.”86

When Copernicus demonstrated that Earth was not the center of the universe, as was believed at the time, it shifted man from the center of creation to a participant in a
much larger galaxy. The problem, however, is that although man may not be the center of the universe, Earth is the center of man’s perception of the universe. This paradigm shift created a polarity wherein meaning, faith, and subjective experience are perceived as the antithesis of scientific inquiry. The current challenge is to move beyond the division between science and subjectivity towards the integration of science, purpose, and meaning. By doing so, organizational effectiveness is poised to expand the study of productivity by including the experience of work as a vehicle for participative community making.

There are two parts to facilitating effective organizational change. The first part is the directive act of facilitating change; the second is the process of navigating the archetypical energies that are released during the change process. Where the former addresses how change happens, the latter addresses why specific elements of the change model establish an environment where change is possible and where archetypical energies emerge uncovering the shadow aspects of the organization. Failure of change initiative, and change initiatives that fail to sustain over time, do so because the organizational shadow was never addressed. Failure to acknowledge and address the organizational shadow presents itself as resistance during the change initiative and/or a reversion to the prior homeostasis once the initiative has completed.

The Organizational Change Process presented in this work addresses both of these aspects: the process, and the archetypical energies that emerge as a result of the process.
PART II: FACILITATING CHANGE

Our complexes are not only wounds that hurt and mouths that tell our myths, but also eyes that see what the normal and healthy parts cannot envision … Our falling apart is an imaginal process, like the collapse of cities and the fall of heroes in mythical tales – like the dismemberment of Dionysian loosening which releases from overtight constraint, like the dissolution and decay of alchemy … Afflictions point to Gods, Gods reach us through afflictions.

-- James Hillman

Part I provided an overall context for organizational change. While this context is necessary for understanding the larger socio impact, it is by itself, insufficient for actually doing the daily work of transformation. Part II describes the process of successfully leading an organization through a site-wide transformation project. Just as having only the history is ill preparation for the task of doing the work, the ability to successfully execute the tasks is also limited by the level of understanding of the reasons for the tasks. Rationale for the sequence of each task is outlined in Part II. In Part III the discussion deepens as the subtle, and occasionally not-so-subtle archetypical energies that emerge in the process are addressed.
Stepping onto the starting block

“One of the things the scientific community acquires with a paradigm is a criterion for choosing problems that, while the paradigm is taken for granted, can be assumed to have solutions. To a great extent these are the only problems that the community will admit as scientific or encourage its members to undertake. Other problems, including many that had previously been standard, are rejected as metaphysical, as the concern of another discipline, or sometimes just too problematic to be worth the time. A paradigm can, for that matter, even insulate the community from those socially important problems that are not reducible to the puzzle form, because they cannot be stated in terms of the conceptual and instrumental tools the paradigm supplies.”

-- Thomas Kuhn

The first step in the transformation journey is the Diagnostic process and it is here where one first discovers the paradigms currently existing within an organization. Scratch the surface and one will find that the organization-as-machine paradigm discussed in the historical context of Part I is still not far below the surface, that is, if it is below the surface at all.

Given the banner waving and bravado talk from organizations looking to change the way they operate, it is, in fact, often not a transformation they actually desire. In my experience, what is occurring in the business is an increase in the type of problems that
the current structure is inept at resolving and the desire is to simply solve the presenting problem(s) while remaining within the current organizational paradigm. As a student of transformative practices, returning to the corporate world involved becoming aware of how the language of transformation is being used within the organizational change community. What I found is that while many companies talk about transformation, what they mean is that they are undertaking a new initiative that they hope will give them the problem-solving techniques they need with as little disruption to the existing armature of the organization as possible. It is my experience that when a company begins talking about transformation what they envision is an industrial engineering application of Lean Manufacturing techniques to address the operational side of the business while leaving the remainder of the organization intact. Evidence of this is found in looking through job postings for organizational change and lean transformation. The vast majority of the job descriptions include the possession of an advanced engineering degree as a mandatory requirement for the position. While fixing problems on the factory floor is a noble cause and worthy occupation, not all manufacturing problems originate on the factory floor. Despite the automation that has entered into the manufacturing process in the past 50 years, it is the people who still make the decisions that drive the business practices. Attempts to implement an engineering a solution to a people problem is problematic from the start for the primary reason that people are not machines. Utilizing the tools and techniques of Lean Manufacturing is necessary yet, by itself, an insufficient structure for a full site-level transformation.

Peter Senge in his book *The Fifth Discipline* addressed how the essence of the Toyota Production system wasn’t in the tools, but was a way of life. Senge writes,
“Practicing a discipline is different from emulating a model. All too often, new management innovations are described in terms of the ‘best practices’ of so-called leading firms. I believe benchmarking best practices can open people’s eyes as to what is possible, but it can also do more harm than good, leading to piecemeal copying and playing catch-up.”

Senge continues his story, “As one seasoned Toyota manager commented after hosting over a hundred tours for visiting executives, ‘They always say ‘Oh yes, you have a Kan-Ban system, we do also. You have quality circles, we do also. Your people fill out standard work descriptions, ours do also.’ They all see the parts and have copied the parts. What they do not see is the way all the parts work together.’ I do not believe great organizations have ever been built by trying to emulate another, any more than individual greatness is achieved by trying to copy another ‘great person’.”

I propose that the primary reason that change initiatives have such a low long-term success rate is due to focus on the process of Lean implementation tools to the exclusion of the intra- and inter-personal “soft” skills necessary for the development of an interconnected continuous learning community.

There is a distinct difference between Lean Manufacturing and Transformation. The Lean Institute and many university extension classes are available that will allow a student to become “Lean/Six Sigma certified” at either a green-belt or black-belt level. The majority of these are very good programs taught by instructors often actively employed in industry. While there is currently no licensing or other regulating board for the practice of Lean Manufacturing, there is a level of standardization for the set of specific skills that, when mastered, provide significant process improvement to an
organization. Implementation of these Lean tools and techniques may drastically alter the process by which product is manufactured thereby resulting in systemic changes in the organization. These changes, however, may or may not be transformative.

The difference between change and transformation is not simply the quantity of the change, but rather the quality. In addition, change is procedural and structurally assembled from A to B. Transformation on the other hand is not a linear process. Transformation is the process by which old patterns, beliefs, perceptions, and behaviors no longer apply. Rather than participants becoming compliant to new process methodologies, real transformation changes the fundamental structure of underlying beliefs and perceptions, and their related automatic response patterns. This renders the old methods obsolete. A defining characteristic of the transformation process is that it does not present as a linear progressive change in behavior, but rather as a dramatic and immediate shift in being.

For a child who is learning to crawl, going forward on all fours rather than scooting randomly about is a significant improvement. Learning how to crawl more effectively is process improvement. Learning to walk, however, is transformative as traveling upright on two legs completely replaces the previous mode of transportation offering greater speed as well as the ability to utilize the hands to carry items in the process. Transformation isn’t just about doing it faster, cheaper, and better. Transformation creates a difference in perception that gives imagination to a whole new level of possibilities. To use another transportation example, we didn’t learn how to cross the ocean in four hours simply by building faster boats.
Overview of the Process

The transformation process that follows consists of a series of steps: Diagnostics, Design, Planning, and Implementation. Each of these steps provides a description of part of the transformative landscape. Navigating the transformation process, however, is not a cookbook recipe. Yes, there are specific steps and they do flow one to another, but transformational work is not a directly linear process. A better mindset when beginning this journey is to understand that the process described herein is more akin to a topographical map that describes the surface terrain, local history, and culture. Like a map, however, it is not a substitution for the actual experience. Having a guidebook such as this, however, can maximize the experience by pointing out known pitfalls and guiding one to uncover the hidden treasures that only the locals know.

The assumption that this work makes is that, like a traveler, the reader is coming to this experience from outside of the organization. As an external consultant it has been my experience in working with a variety of industries and multiple sites, to think of this work as a travel log of sorts – a description of what I have found along the way, insights as to what worked and what didn’t, and thoughts about what lies beneath the surface. The benefit of looking at an organization with traveler’s eyes is that it is much easier to perceive the subtle nuances of culture, beliefs, and modes of communication that are so familiar as to be transparent to the locals.

Drawing from my own experiences, this work describes a site-wide transformation process in sixteen-week segments, two weeks for Diagnostics, two weeks for Design, one week of Planning, and eleven weeks of Implementation. As I have yet to
find a business that can shut down completely in order to restructure, this process is
designed to operate on one value stream at a time concurrent with the ongoing production
process. A value stream is defined as “all the activities (both value-added and non-value
added) required within one company to design and provide a specific product from its
conception to launch, from order to delivery, and from raw materials into the hands of the
customer.” Each sixteen-week segment addresses a single value stream. The first value
stream, however, is the largest project because, although the manufacturing may be
segmented into like-products and similar processes, it is most common for the upstream
processes including marketing, sales, order entry, purchasing, materials management,
inventory, production control, and scheduling functions, to be shared across the
organization.

The sixteen-week schedule reflects the projects that formed the basis of this study:
mid-sized manufacturing companies with $100 million to $250 million in revenues, 500
to 1200 employees, and technically complex product lines. Smaller organizations could
possibly work through the steps more aggressively. For larger organizations, however, I
suggest scaling the project to fit within the sixteen-week framework adding additional
sixteen-week segments as necessary to meet the stated goals. Four months is a long time
to work at such an intense pace and consideration must be made so as not to create
burnout and subsequent resentment at the site.
Creating a team to fit the dream

Our transformation journey starts with assembling the project team. For medium to large sites, between 500 – 1200 employees, my experience is that a team of six to nine full time people is optimal for the first value stream with additional support, input and commitment from subject matter experts in both the functional areas and the executive leadership team. As the facilitation skillset expands throughout the organization, subsequent value streams may require only a small transformation team to provide project management and coordination across value streams. It is important that at least half of the team come from within the organization and have intimate knowledge of how the organization currently works, what the political alliances are, and the organizational history. This is important because the companies that are most in need of transformation are those with a high level of dependence on unwritten policies and procedures. The only way to decode the tribal knowledge is to have members of the tribe on the team. These individuals need to be the best the organization has to offer and “availability” should not be the determining criteria for inclusion. Effective site team members need to already have a level of trust throughout the organization and demonstrated leadership skills. It is not necessary, however, for them to come from existing leadership positions.

A basic level of training is required for the newly formed team. The initial training session should be offsite in order to facilitate team building and minimize distractions. Training must, at minimum, include the following topics:

- **Team introductions and team building exercises** – It is important to establish a foundation for effective group processing. The transformation
team must have foundational knowledge in how to effectively participate in a team environment. These skills include trust, willingness to engage in conflict, commitment, accountability, and attention to results. These skills are outlined in detail in Patrick Lencioni’s book *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team*. Companion training materials are available at [www.tablegroup.com](http://www.tablegroup.com).

- **Stated company objectives** – Described further in the section on Diagnostics, the stated company objectives is the acknowledgement of overall motivation for embarking on the transformation project. This is not the detailed diagnostic that will result from the Diagnostic phase of the project but rather the overall objective, or True North for the organization as a whole.

- **Key Performance Indicators** – Also covered in more detail in the Diagnostic phase are key performance indicators. The function of this first identification is to establish a baseline to quantify the outcomes of subsequent changes. Clarifying the high-level key performance indicators provides the transformation team with knowledge of executive and shareholder expectations.

- **Experiential exercises and training to gain experience in Lean principles** – While this work details the organizational dynamics of a transformation project, there are specific skills needed to streamline the manufacturing process. Information in Lean Manufacturing can be found through The Lean Institute® at [www.lean.org](http://www.lean.org), a nonprofit educational
organization dedicated to the effective use of Lean principles and the
Toyota Production System. Additionally consulting firms such as
Empowered Performance, LLC (www.empoweredperformance.com)
provide onsite training, project management, and consulting services for
implementing Lean principles and the Toyota Production Systems. To
place this in context, Lean is a process of eliminating waste in the
manufacturing process. This socio-technical system was developed in
Japan by Toyota between 1945 and 1975 and is known as The Toyota
Way⁹².

• **High-level overview of the project phases** - The phases of the project are
discussed in detail in the sections entitled Diagnostics, Design, Plan, and
Implementation. What is important in the training is to provide a
conceptual framework that the team can use to ensure that each
component of the process is successfully completed, and how to identify
the organizational symptoms that arise when a component needs to be
revisited.

• **Formal Reportout expectations** – These are discussed further in the
Diagnostics, Design, Plan, and Implementation Reportout sections of this
document and include the project management guidelines for daily and
weekly status reports.

• **Value Stream Mapping** – While not discussed in this work, Value
Stream Mapping is a valuable tool for understanding and communicating
the overall processes of an organization using industry standard symbols
and diagraming conventions. An excellent reference for creating value stream maps is described in Rother & Shook’s 2009 book *Learning to See: value-stream mapping to create value and eliminate muda*.

- **Organizational Dynamics** – This topic is discussed at length in the Backstory section of this work and is intended to provide an understanding of the people side of change.

Managing a project with so many moving parts requires a significant commitment. Building trust and allegiance within the transformation team makes the process more productive and enjoyable for all.

When I was working with a multi-site international defense contracting company, the transformation project was staggered. Nine sites, also called Business Units were grouped into three divisions, United States West, United States East, and Europe, each containing three sites. Each division had two to three Divisional Leads who provided expertise, education, and overall project management for each site. Project start for the three regional sites was staggered into waves with a 10 day offsite training prior to each wave with Divisional Leads, acting as internal consultants, providing the training. My role in this project was as a Western Divisional Lead. Examples and stories of this project come from both my personal experiences as well as collaborative efforts with other divisional leads across the organization.
Once the team is formed and the foundation established with the offsite training, it is time to get to work. The first task is the Diagnostic phase of the project. Diagnostics is a phase of inquiry, of finding new information and a time for deepening one’s knowledge of how the organization is currently operating. It is vital in this phase to remain in inquiry mode and resist the temptation to succumb to quick and easy solutions. As my friend Mike has said, “there are no easy solutions because all the easy stuff has already been done.”
DIAGNOSIS

“What I can bear to look at directly may give me an unpleasant time, but it no longer owns me.”

-- James Hollis

Getting Real – Presencing the Problem

“It’s common to say that trees come from seeds. But how could a tiny seed create a huge tree? Seeds do not contain the resources needed to grow a tree. These must come from the medium or environment within which the tree grows. Yet the seed does provide something that is crucial: a place where the whole of the tree starts to form. As resources such as water and nutrients are drawn in, the seed organizes the process that generates growth. In a sense, the seed is a gateway through which the future possibility of the living tree emerges.”

-- Peter Senge

Change is everywhere and, as Stanley Buder notes in *Capitalizing on Change*, “The onset of capitalism signified the shifting of history into a gear of accelerating change.” Competition in the world economy combined with the financial pressure to produce short-term results has eroded the high standards that characterized the era of
craftsmanship. Rebecca Costa, in *The Watchman’s Rattle*, describes a scene common in today’s fast-paced world: “Every day, experts draw new conclusions based on correlations. They hastily put out a press release claiming they have uncovered a long sought-after elixir to a massively complex problem and rush to reap the monetary rewards and fame that come with that discovery. Then, without questioning their claims, the rest of society follows suit, prematurely implementing false remedies one after another as time runs out.”96 These fads and false remedies are so prevalent in the manufacturing industry there is a formal term used to describe its effect on an organization: *initiative fatigue*.

Initiative fatigue is the result of repeated attempts to apply overly simplified solutions to complex problems. Gaging how much initiative fatigue has jaded the site staff brings into sharp focus the extent to which the draw of easy solutions plays in the organization. The question is, how can the transformation leadership keep the current project from being simply another float in the parade of change initiatives?

When the horizontal plane predominates, mundane and daily problems of individual performance become the focus of improvement efforts and the organization is perceived as lifeless and turbulent. When this happens, there is no, or very little, access to the perspective offered from the vertical plane.97 Meaning and purpose, so important to a vibrant work life, go underground and the focus becomes simply getting through the day, week, or next review cycle. When employees do not have a clear understanding of their role in the organization, and the impact they have on its success or failure, they lose the ability to identify the causes of their biggest threats. In the absence of facts and
knowledge, beliefs and rumors become the currency of the organization. As Costa notes, “We are a society that is extremely quick to accept correlations as proof of fact.”

Every organization, be it a Business Unit or a department within a Business Unit, feels that they are unique, that their problems are not like anyone else's. While it is true that each group has its own "fingerprint", the overall quantitative metrics remain consistent across business models. Every manufacturing site has materials, methods, people, and processes. Quantitative measures should address these four areas. When presencing the problem at all levels of the organization, from the executives to the janitorial staff, it is important to listen to the voiced frustrations while maintaining open to the larger vertical plane perspective of the larger issues of the organization.

Peter Senge, in his book Presence, identifies this process of including the vertical plane perspective by coining the term presencing. Senge describes presencing as the act of “‘pre-sensing’ and bring into presence – and into the present – your highest future potential.” This future potential is not an exterior from the higher self, but rather is something that calls forth the highest possibility “related to your own highest purpose or intention… a future seeking to emerge.” When existing problems are identified at the commencement of a site wide transformation project, it is to be done in such a way that the statement of fact identifies how maintaining the status quo is incongruent with the highest future potential of the organization and, as Martin Buber said, “it stands in need of you in order to be born.”

Since a full-site transformation requires a significant investment of already scarce resources, a clear description about the current state of the organization is the first task.
This statement of fact is a short synopsis of the quantitative reason for change and operates as the baseline from which future gains will be measured. These quantitative measures provide the basis for data driven Key Performance Indicators. Sometimes referred to as the burning platform, the statement of fact is an executive level description of the effects of the current organizational state. Examples include: Not meeting revenue goals, low earnings, high turnover, low market share, low customer satisfaction, high costs, part shortages, and excess scrap. The objective is to clearly define the pain points of the organization – what is keeping the CEO up at night? This admission from the top of the organization is a powerful reality check and is a rallying point that satisfies the rational brain’s need for objective and measurable data.

Without a clear and compelling statement of fact the Group/Organization fails to see how the metrics reflect their daily activity. As the project moves forward difficulty in understanding the meaning of the metrics is a sign that the quantitative reasons for change have not been fully articulated. Like a scoreboard at a sporting event, the metrics provide the current daily status and stated goals of the game. The players may be doing the very best they can but effort does not always indicate effectiveness. Quantified and objective metrics measured over time make the effectiveness of the change activity visible.
What it Looks Like – Symptoms and Behaviors

*When a civilization is faced with indiscernible complexity, progress is dependent on the amount of wasted effort and resources the civilization is willing to tolerate.*

- Rebecca Costa

Gathering the information necessary to create clear quantifiable data is no easy task. The first time I presented my well-researched data I was asked, “So what?” This set me back a bit. This experience was a powerful lesson that there are clear divisions between objective data that measures the effect of dysfunction, and the subjective experience of dysfunction within an organization. While quantified data is objective, the statement of fact and admission of the current dysfunction within the organization begs the next question: so what? The problem occurs when, as Robert Sardello remarked during a 2013 workshop, “Information becomes a substitute for soul connection.”

I saw firsthand the effects of this lack of soul connection in the first large transformation project in which I participated. The site had historically struggled with a significant amount of employee distrust and departmental infighting. In response, the human resources department had initiated an Excellence at Work program in an attempt to civilize employee interactions. While successful in modifying the most offensive behaviors, when the transformation project gained momentum and the subsequent changes increased the stress levels, “excellence” was one of the most common words spoken as the behaviors rapidly reverted to infighting and scapegoating. David Whyte, a poet and organizational consultant, had a similar experience and made this observation,
“It takes only a modicum of psychological savvy to admit that a corporate culture that constantly repeats the word excellence to itself must still have endless reservoirs of mediocrity on which to draw and is deathly afraid of facing up to this fact.”105

Clearly articulating subjective experience makes explicit the impact of the dysfunction. As Whyte describes, “The soul bereft of meaningful experience begins to engineer its escape from the structures holding it in check, by dying to itself. The person bereft of imagination interprets the soul’s wish literally and begins to look for a full bottle of sleeping tablets.”106 Likewise, an organization bereft of the imaginative creativity inherent in meaningful endeavors dies to itself by becoming apathetic and dissociated from soulful connections between coworkers.

Accessing the qualitative reasons for change is a process of facilitating storytelling. In his book *Life at Work*, Thomas Moore quotes a poem by Robert Trammel entitled “Dreaming” in which he wrote the following lines:

A life is mostly remembered in bursts of short stories
Beautifully interwoven with people, places, and events
A work, a picture, a smell can set it all in motion
And you can close your eyes and see it clearly
As if it happened only yesterday

As Moore reflects, “Few things in life are as precious as the opportunity to tell your story with an open heart to a friend or kindhearted stranger.”108 Recognizing and acknowledging the symptoms of dysfunctional processes through storytelling allows for the depersonalization of the behavior. When dysfunctions are seen as symptoms of an underlying issue, the organization can then have an honest and open discussion about WHAT (Process), rather than WHO (Person), is the problem.
Through the process of defining the qualitative reasons for change, the symptoms and behaviors that result from the current state are uncovered, thereby identifying “the configuration of relationships that determine the system’s essential characteristics.”

Margaret Wheatly provides guidance for this process of pattern recognition:

A pattern has been defined rather succinctly as any behavior that occurs more than once. This seems elementary, but it is important to note what we are trying to see. So first we need to encourage each other to look for recurring behaviors and themes, to stay away from the seduction of examining isolated factors or individual players. Often patterns become discernible if we ask simple questions: “Have we seen this before?” “What feels familiar here?” To see patterns, we have to step back from the problem and gain perspective. …It is the nature of life to organize into patterns. This recognition welcomes us into a different approach to organizational change.

Identification of the symptoms gives the organization an opportunity to "air the dirty laundry" by taking a close look at the qualitative ways the dysfunction manifests. This step provides a baseline of the culture by identifying the current mental models and is the entry point for examining the organizational shadow. Connie Zweig and Steve Wolf in their book, Romancing the Shadow, describe how the individual shadow develops using a metaphor by Robert Bly:

“When we were very young, we had a 360-degree personality, which radiated energy from all directions. But the adults around us could not tolerate this much exuberance. So, in their own discomfort, they unintentionally but inevitably betrayed us by shaming and humiliating us for certain feelings, such as vulnerability, or behaviors, such as competition, which we then learned to hide. Our teachers may have scolded us for other behaviors, such as daydreaming, our priests may have imposed terrible guilt for our sexual feelings. These denied, disowned parts of our souls – anger or depression, jealousy or resentment, intellectuality or sensuality, athletic or artistic ability – get exiled into the dark. As a result, the full circle of energy that was our birthright is sliced away piece by piece, leaving only a thin, proper façade to greet the world. …Without our knowing it, the shadow is at work attempting to recreate early childhood relationship patterns with a secret mission – to heal old wounds and feel loved.”
While childhood experiences begin the development of the individual shadow, it matures in the work environment where the achievement of success is dependent upon the ability to mold oneself into the organization’s performance expectations. As Zewig & Wolf describe, the parts of the self that are negotiated away in exchange for participation in the larger organization go underground and into the shadow creating “a Faustian bargain in the arena of work.”

We give up individuality to fit into the collective mold. We trade off soul for money. We sacrifice creativity for security. We surrender emotional relatedness for a mantle of power. Turning a boss into a parent, we become childlike and mute to achieve safety and approval. Then we pick up our shields and come to believe that we are what we do, that our function is who we are. We become so identified with the character who sits at the head of the table in the workplace that we create persona work.

While individual shadows can be traced back to personal experiences, those parts of the personality that are repressed are a reflection of the larger collective shadow. When looking for the source of organizational dysfunction, James Hollis provides some insight:

Jung declared that he did not seek the cause of a neurosis in the past but in the present: ‘I ask, what is the necessary task which the patient will not accomplish?’ Invariably, the task involves some new level of responsibility, some more honest encounter with the shadow, some deepening of the journey into places we’d rather not go. Yet all of those psychic states have a soulful purpose. Our task is to live through them, not repress them or hurtfully project them onto others. What is not faced within is still carried as a deep personal pathology. To experience some healing within ourselves, and to contribute healing to the world, we are summoned to wade through the muck from time to time. Where we do not go willingly, sooner or later we will be dragged.

If an organization does not address the group shadow consciously, it will manifest unconsciously within the corporate culture. It is a whole lot easier to identify the shadow and archetypical energies by putting them in dialogue with each other, than it is to
repeatedly mitigate their effects. These effects include: firefighting, just pushing product through, high inventory, no preventative maintenance, cutting corners, meetings that "churn", little or no problem solving, blaming, fault finding, & finger pointing.

The objective of acknowledging the organizational shadow is to establish a safe container in which the leadership can openly and honestly discuss the process and structural causes rather than personalizing the symptoms. Indications that this step of the transformation is incomplete are resistance to change by continued justification of the current dysfunctional methods.
How we got here & who can help

_In life as in theater we may never understand fully either a person or behavior until we know the context in which it is embedded._

- _Stephen Larsen_

Becoming aware of the organizational shadow is a process akin to defining the environment in which other processes exist. Like the air we breathe, when the organizational shadow becomes thick and oppressive it is difficult to focus on anything until the weather gets better.

Behavior and processes when viewed in isolation tell us little of what is really going on. It isn’t until there is a context that we begin to understand how specific behaviors or processes came about. While immensely valuable, the context may not always be easily accessible. Terms like "We've always done it that way" are indications that the organizational dysfunction may be the result of a legacy workaround that has continued long after the conditions of the initial problem it solved have been forgotten. Just noting that there are things being done and we don't know why, is enough to begin a discussion about organizational transparency. An organization becomes transparent and the organizational shadow eases when everyone understands how each step in the process fits into the whole, is clear about their own role and responsibilities, and understands the consequences that occur as a result of unexpected behaviors.

Interesting things happen during the process of uncovering the source of the dysfunctional behaviors and broken processes. Key to finding the source is allowing all
of the individuals involved to describe the overall process. While individuals are usually competent at their function, many will have difficulty describing how each of their activities support or enhance the overall process. Holding the space, and allowing individuals the time to discover for themselves the extent and/or limits of their understanding will open the door to further discussions. Without offering suggestions for improvement, asking appropriate questions elicits a deeper discussion that places a context around the current process. What is important at this point in the process is to simply listen.

Linda Sussman, in her book *Speech of the Grail*, describes how, “if one stays lost in the mirror, captive to the unexamined habits and impulsivity, one will not be able to develop the inner witness who can look into the mirror. To gain that perspective, one must become silent and stop – which is to say, meditate. The particular form of the practice matters less than the regular *activity* of doing it, which gives the initiate-speaker increasing command of his or her own powers of attention.”

Context is important because it fills out the story by identifying patterns. Numbers tell *what*; context addresses *why*. Perceiving dysfunctions as adaptations to prior problems normalizes the behavior, reduces blame, and allows focus to move to the solution. Hollis describes it this way, “All behaviors, even those we dub “crazy,” are logical when seen as an expression of, or reaction to, a certain emotional premise. …No matter how symbolically disguised, visible symptoms dramatize an unconscious affective premise. This causal relationship between affective state and symbolic expression has a cyclic effect and in time becomes not only an expression of a particular wound but also a generalized personality form and strategy. We become our wounds, so to speak.”
There is a reflexive quality about context gathering. For example, duplication of work identifies where there is a lack of trust. Extensive policy procedures can be an indication of an excessive need to control and/or a desire to abdicate the responsibility for divergent thinking to the “experts.” The workarounds that characterize cumbersome processes are reminders of when things went bad and points of excessive inventory in the manufacturing process demonstrate a fear of not having enough.

Memory is an interesting thing and what exists within an organization is the result of its collective memory. Joshua Foer, in *Moonwalking with Einstein*, describes expertise as “vast amounts of knowledge, pattern-based retrieval, and planning mechanisms acquired over many years of experience in the associated domain. In other words, a great memory isn’t just a by-product of expertise; it is the essence of expertise.”

Organizations value experts, both within and outside of the corporate structure, because they are the keepers of the collective memory. When it comes to climbing the corporate ladder, it is often the one with the most stories that wins.

But collective memory, like individual memory, is faulty and prone to meaning making. As Jung emphasized throughout his writing, the elements of our own psychic contents that remain unconscious manifest first as projections. It is always easier to see in others what we are not willing to admit in ourselves. Hollis describes,

The central idea that animates Jungian psychology is the reality of the unconscious. While this idea may seem commonplace, it is not in fact at the heart of those psychologies which are not psychodynamic in character, nor is it a common assumption in the experience of daily life for most human beings. Few have tumbled to the profundity of that autonomous force operating within, quite outside one’s ability to comprehend, will away or even predict. Thus the obsessions, addictions, and projections of complexes that originate from within ourselves are transferred to the outer world, unconsciously burdening others even as we complain of their oppression.
Foer describes how this transference manifests:

“How we perceive the world and how we act in it are products of how and what we remember. We’re all just a bundle of habits shaped by our memories. And to the extent that we control our lives, we do so by gradually altering those habits, which is to say the networks of our memory.”

Defining context is a process that requires reflexivity, both at the individual and the group level. Addressing the individual and group shadow, which is an integral component of context, is a process of owning ones projections. The objective of this step in the Organizational Change Process is to determine if a current task is based on fear (this happened before and we don’t want it to happen again), or function (we do this because we need …).

Individuals and groups that are unable to address the group shadow by placing context around dysfunctional processes will display a lack of both ownership and clarity in taking the next step. Resistance will manifest as using other people/departments as the reason change cannot be implemented. Comments such as “Yes, but what if …” will keep the process in a holding pattern. The insistence on increasing levels of analysis is a strategy used as justification for keeping the status quo.

Underlying the denial of individual and organizational shadows is the fear of being seen as something other than the well-crafted image that is displayed in public. As Hollis writes however,

What is intimidating in its power is also healing in its motive. To align oneself with those forces within rather than reflexively adjusting always to the powers without, thereby furthering our self-alienation, is to feel grounded in some deep truth, the nature of our nature. In those moments of contact with the deep truth of the person, the encounter with what Jung calls the Self, one feels the connection and support necessary to assuage the universal fear of abandonment.”
When doing a site-wide transformation, getting through the knothole of addressing the organizational shadow and taking the first steps towards organizational transparency opens the door for honest discussions about who can help. As the organization exhibits reflexivity and ownership of the current behaviors, the group can then discern what assistance is needed going forward. Clarity around the problems allows for an honest discussion about the group’s growing edges. Knowing where the challenges are makes it easier to identify individuals with the expertise and the wisdom to come forth as midwives and guides.
What it gets us – Protective Intent

“As obvious as this notion of independence is, and as desirable as we may profess it to be, most of life is a flight from the anxiety of being radically present to ourselves and naked before the universe.” 125

-- James Hollis

As we come to understand that dysfunctional patterns are result from workarounds that address problems lacking an alternative resolution, attachment to these patterns begins to loosen as the group gains perspective on both the individual and collective Imaginal Structures that frame the experience. Imaginal Structures is a term that describes the mental models, framework, or lenses through which experience is filtered and meaning arises. While the term Imaginal Structures describes the overall perceptual environment, this environment, existing in the imaginal realm, is the home of images, symbols, and identifiable archetypical energies. An example of a common Imaginal Structure in a business environment is that of competition and the belief that success creates winners and losers.

Addressing problems that cross departments I have found it common for groups to scapegoat other functional areas in an effort to preserve the image of competency and thereby gain (or maintain) an advantage in the competition for resources. A group Imaginal Structure is a lens through which one group perceives the actions of the Other as threatening.
When it comes to why these non-optimal patterns persist over time we must turn our attention to the payoff or secondary gain that is achieved. In my experience, the single biggest reason for resistance and the ultimate sabotage of change efforts is that the underlying gain achieved from the dysfunctional patterns has not been addressed. Regardless of whether it is a behavior, process, or Imaginal Structure, failure to acknowledge the benefit of the current state will stall the project every time.

Traditional change management and reengineering methodologies from such thought leaders as Frederick Taylor, Alfred Sloan, and John Kotter, are addressed from the archetype of the Engineer and work with observable behavior, organizational structures and processes. These methodologies address aspects that exist in the physical dimension of reality. What are not addressed in these modalities, however, are the subtle dimensions of reality. These subtle dimensions are not fake, unreal, or nonexistent and yet at the same time they do not exist in the physical dimension. The subtle dimensions inform and infuse both the physical and the imaginary or fantasy. The imaginal is the place between; it is the place of potential that exists between and bridges what is and what could be.

Carl Jung worked extensively with the power of the symbol and images, dialoguing with them through active imagination in order to release the energy stored within. Images and symbols, as Jung discovered, comprise the language of the imaginal dimension and it is through their metaphoric messages that deeper meaning and understanding arises. One archetype existing in this imaginal realm is that of the Gatekeeper. Tasked with the role of safeguarding the current Imaginal Structure and thereby the individual and/or group persona, the Gatekeeper seeks to maintain
homeostasis by restricting experience to the known and familiar. On the individual level, the Gatekeeper archetype can be described as the internal voice, or subjectivity, that finds fault with our actions, instills fear of the unknown, and creates doubt about our competency and self-worth. The voice of the Gatekeeper sounds like, “slow down, not so fast”, “be careful”, “don’t trust”, “you don’t know enough”, and “you’re not good enough.”

Just as there are gatekeepers on the individual level, this archetypical energy operates on collective levels as well for departments, divisions, and organizations. It is through dialogue with the gatekeepers at all of these levels that the underlying fears may be addressed. It is important, however, to understand clearly that the Gatekeeper, and the imaginal realm in general, is not a logical place. Much like Alice’s trip down the rabbit hole, Imaginal Structures refract reality by reflecting experience off of the myriad of personal histories that comprise both the personal and group shadows.

Rebecca Costa notes in *The Watchman’s Rattle* writes, “Unfortunately, the truth is that we haven’t yet developed efficient processes for thinking about and solving massive systemic issues. So, rather than become paralyzed by complexity, we are drawn to simpler explanations, beliefs, and behaviors instead. This includes blaming individuals for what we already know are complex, embedded problems.” And, as Robert Half, an American business icon has noted, “The search for someone to blame is always successful.”

For example, an organization I worked with made technically complex products and had a pronounced lack of trust that resided just below the surface in the corporate shadow. Requests for proposals regularly came to the marketing department who, in
order to respond appropriately, would enlist the support of engineering for the 
specifications. Engineering was an amazingly capable department that could, and did, 
build any product a customer could dream up. When marketing would ask, “can you do 
this?” Engineering, hearing can, would respond “of course.” Both groups would return 
to their respective desks, marketing would respond to the customer and engineering 
would go back to whatever crisis-de-jour met them at the door. Since only a fraction of 
the proposals actually turned into contracts, engineering had no directive to actually 
create the new design. Proposals were submitted and contracts, on the occasions that 
they were awarded, followed a minimum of a year later. Sales, having previously been 
given approval from engineering, would accept the contract and subsequently send the 
order to production for manufacturing.

As there was no procedure in place to flow down custom requirements, 
manufacturing would build what they believed to be the correct product. However, 
when, after another year or two of manufacturing leadtime and parts were shipped, the 
customer would be furious that the product delivered did not meet the specifications. 
This miscommunication caused frequent and costly rework. Marketing would blame 
manufacturing for not building the correct product and manufacturing would blame 
marketing for accepting an order they couldn’t build. Because each group was viewing 
the situation through the lens of their departmental Imaginal Structures and a corporate 
shadow of distrust they perceived the Other as incompetent bumbling idiots who they 
could not trust to be professional at their job. Finding fault with the Other gave each 
department the rationale needed to justify their belief that “this is just they way it is, 
nothing will change.”
This fatalistic view of the organization served the protective intent of maintaining each department’s assertion of competency. In order to enter into dialogue about the source of the problem and the subsequent actions needed to address the problem, each department had to own their projections by recognizing their fear of being perceived as incompetent. In addition, engineering had to acknowledge that they quite liked the recognition they received for riding in on the proverbial white horse to save the day.

So, while dysfunctions are a result of adaptations and manifestations of projections from the collective shadow, continuing the dysfunctional behavior happens because there is some payoff to it. Change can only be sustainable when the payoff is clearly defined and owned. It is important to not stop at identifying only the surface need, and to utilize tools such as the 5 Why method and root cause problem solving to get to the intrinsic need. Look for base reasons such as job security, us/them rivalries, feeling worthy (heroes), feeling valued (hoarding information), modulating fear, to be listened to, inability to see any other way, or a need to control. Excuses for maintaining the current state include:

- It gets product out the door.
- It gets corporate off our backs.

Examples of gain from the current state include:

- Firefighting creates Heroes and heroes get awards.
- Lots of work = lots of overtime.
- I feel valued when everyone comes to me for answers.
- Job security.
- If I/we don't look busy someone will give me/us more to do.
• If we don't spend all our day in meetings, how will we get anything done?

• Low inventory makes me fearful of running out of work.

• Reverting back to the prior state even after successful changes have been made.

When identifying the gain from the current state it is important to define what homeostasis looks like for the individual, group, and organization. Homeostasis is the set point, the default behaviors and patterns that will surface as soon as individuals (or organizations) feel stress. Knowing what to look for is vital to being able to recognize the small changes that precipitate larger regressions.
How’s that working for ya?

“So much of our experience is predicated on the consciousness with which we enter it, our future possibilities already mortgaged to past limitations.”

– David Whyte

Part of the American culture is the underlying and pervasive belief that with enough persistence and hard work, success will follow. As Buder notes in *Capitalizing on Change*, “These attitudes and core beliefs create a compelling national vision, stimulating action and an eagerness to embrace innovations that promise to enhance the economy’s performance.” Buder goes on to note that it is not necessary for one to believe in these values in order to recognize their impact on the collective psyche. What is interesting, however, is that the attributes of persistence and hard work are insufficient to solve problems that exceed the cognitive threshold. Costa likens the phenomena to being caught in a rip current.

When we are trapped in an undertow, we believe that if we simply set up our efforts and swim harder toward the shore, we will prevail against the current. Despite empirical evidence that this isn’t working, we refuse to abandon our belief and persist in swimming in a direct path toward land as we grow increasingly exhausted and panic ensues. No data, information, or facts will deter us from our conviction – not even the threat of death.

Attempting to resolve complex and systemic problems from a compartmentalized perspective is extremely difficult because the overall issue does not reside within one departmental silo. In addition, silo thinking further impedes problem resolution as each silo increasingly separates from the larger organization and interaction becomes
limited to the ideas, beliefs, and imaginal structures of each sub-group. Reliance on
digital communication rather than personal dialogue further fragments the organization
undermining the common objectives that are essential to a vibrant and cooperative
community. As Margaret Wheatly notes, “These omnipresent boundaries create a
strong sense of solidity; we use them to both protect and define us.”

Cosa elaborates on this point when she writes, “This is the untenable position
complexity causes. We may want to accept personal responsibility, want to take action,
but we are paralyzed by our inability to understand all the facts. Eventually, this leaves
us no other option but to depend on others to tell us what is right as well as what is
real.”

Defining the need of the new behavior, process, or system sets the "true north" for
the transformation and can only be effective when the stated goals are independent of
departmental positioning. In order to transcend departmental self-interests it is vital for
the site leadership to develop a compelling narrative of the post-transformation
possibilities. By shifting the focus from “what’s wrong” to “what do you need”
individuals, departments, and the organization as a whole can begin to clearly identify
why the current system isn't getting them what they need.

Forward progress is dependent upon the ability to recognize that although the old
patterns met a need at one point in time, these same patterns are now getting in the way
of meeting the current objectives. Such objectives could be:

• The need to make customers happy.

• The need to build a viable and sustainable organization that can grow.
• The need to create an organization where people want to be in for the long haul.

• The need to lower costs, inventory, overtime, turnover, or customer returns.

Organizations that are unable to create a compelling vision of what is possible when all of the needs are met will fail to establish, or demonstrate an inability to hold, a clear vision of the future state. As Wheatly notes, “It seems that every organization is wrestling with a similar dilemma – how to maintain its identity, purpose, and effectiveness as it copes with relentless pressures for speed and change. But there is another similarity I’m happy to report: A common human desire everywhere in the world to live together more harmoniously, more humanly.”¹³⁷
“Prophets are almost invariably the bearers of bad news.”\textsuperscript{138}

“Work, Paradoxically, does not ask enough of us, yet exhausts the narrow parts of us we do bring to its door.”\textsuperscript{139}

\textit{-- David Whyte}

It is important to be explicit about the way in which the current state is keeping the organization from getting what it really needs. All transformations go through a period of uncertainty and instability and it is not uncommon for an organization to feel lost and insecure as a result. Navigating the landscape of transformation includes these periods of uncertainty, especially in the liminal space when the old mindsets, processes, or behavior is no longer active and the new systems are not yet in place. Clear articulation of how the current state is insufficient to meet the organizational needs will solidify the motivation for the changes ahead even when the path forward is not clear.

Each area will have specific needs that are not being met by the current processes. It is important in this gap analysis not to personalize blame or accept vague statements such as “I just need them to do their job.” A more productive and actionable statement defines exactly what is missing and the effect it has on the overall process. Such a statement could be, “Manufacturing needs resolution on engineering change requests within two shifts in order to meet the customer’s shipping dates.”

Defining the greatest needs for the whole of the organization is a process of prioritization requiring a high level and long-range perspective. It is no surprise that this process will not be without some angst. As Hollis notes,
In the real world, to be a person of value rather than an emotional chameleon, choices perforce must be made and pleasing others cannot be at the top of the agenda. The angst that surges from below is experienced as overwhelming precisely because it dates from the time of one’s great childhood vulnerability. Because that energy is never lost but resides in the unconscious, it can spring forth with paralyzing power.\footnote{140}

Integral to this process are breaking down the existing Newtonian ideas that are the basis of organizational understanding. As Wheatly writes, “We manage by separating things into parts, we believe that influence occurs as a direct result of force exerted from one person to another, we engage in complex planning for a world that we keep expecting to be predictable, and we search continually for better methods of objectively measuring and perceiving the world.”\footnote{141} The challenge, however, is that not everything that is important can be quantified.

For most of our historical past, economic life and modes of production changed little from generation to generation. In a pre-capitalist society, the economy of merchants and the markets was not central to the overall wellbeing of its members thus idea of change and innovation was not a priority. It can be argued that historically change has been neither welcomed nor desired.\footnote{142} As the Harvard socio-biologist E.O. Wilson summarized in 2009, “The real problem of humanity is the following: We have Paleolithic emotions; medieval institutions; and god-like technology.”\footnote{143} Navigating the vast amount of information made available through information technology is a new skill for us humans and it is easy to become overwhelmed.\footnote{144}

Directly due to the difficulty in processing all the available data, transformations can easily be sidetracked into mitigation strategies. Mitigating the greatest threats is
dangerous primarily because it can too easily be confused with a cure thereby reducing the motivation for a sustainable solution.\textsuperscript{145}

In the Organizational Change Process, the technique of gap analysis is used to clarify where and how the current system is not meeting the needs described in the previous step. The goal of this analysis is to identify specific, and preferably measurable, gaps between the current state and the future state. This gap analysis opens the space for possibility of the new state to take root by distancing the limitations of current state of the organization from the organizational needs. Examples of this include:

- Quarter end pushes gets product out the door, but it burns out our people and drains the pipeline.
- Shipping everything we can increases revenue but decreases our quality and empties the next quarter pipeline.

When completing this analysis, focus should be on two distinct areas: quantifiable metrics, and the qualitative aspects that encompass an individual’s capacity to communicate and work as a team. Wheatly describes this process:

> Look carefully at a workplace’s capacity for healthy relationships. Not its organizational form in terms of tasks, functions, span of control, and hierarchies, but things more fundamental to strong relations. Do people know how to listen and speak to each other? To work well with diverse members? Do people have free access to one another throughout the organization? Are they trusted with open information? Do organizational values bring them together or keep them apart? Is collaboration truly honored? Can people speak truthfully to one another?\textsuperscript{146}

These attributes that describe how the people within the organization relate to one another are the decoder ring for the Imaginal Structures that underlie group behavior. What these relationships show is the overarching relationship to power within the
organization. Like energy, power that is held within specific levels or functions stagnates. To be effective, power needs to flow throughout the organization. As Wheatly notes, “What gives power its charge, positive or negative, is the nature of the relationship.”

When this gap analysis is skipped or incomplete it manifests later as insufficient time, resources, or ownership to move through the transformational process. It is this gap analysis that identifies how the old process, methods, and/or behaviors are insufficient to meet the current needs.
Diagnostic Reportout

In his book *Swamplands of the Soul*, James Hollis notes that Jung believed that the basis of neurosis was suffering for which there was no meaning. This type of suffering, which Jung refers to as inauthentic, is at the core of much of corporate dysfunction. Neurosis appear within an organization as a result of adaptation to situations that workers find both uncomfortable and meaningless. Neurosis within an organization present themselves as adaptive behaviors as individuals attempt to find alternative methods for completing their tasks. For example, bills of material that are incomplete or out of date require individual rework to resolve the discrepancy prior to the start of production. A supervisor, wanting to avoid delays during production, may add additional leadtime by verifying the data and inventory for each job. This inauthentic suffering is a result of meaningless rework that would be rendered unnecessary if the data could be trusted.

Authentic suffering, by contrast, “is a realistic response to the ragged edges of being.” Organizations who have successfully diagnosed the issues, have involved key stakeholders in developing the solution, and have communicated well to the larger organization may still suffer during the implementation. Changing behavior is a process rather than an event and the process inevitably takes a few attempts to work out the unintended consequences. However, when meaning is attached to the process this suffering becomes authentic and is tolerated because the workers are able to hold the polarities arising in the liminal place between what was and what is yet to be. The
purpose of the change leadership team then is not to alleviate the suffering, but rather to midwife the organization through the birth of a new way of being.

Midwifing begins in earnest during the Diagnostic reportout. Rarely will this process tell the organization something it didn’t already know, but seeing it presented, warts and all, in print can be a sobering reality. The question then is how to present the data in a manner in which the message can be received. This happens through the magic of story.

The vehicle for telling the story is less important than the content. In the projects I have worked on, Microsoft PowerPoint was the tool of choice for executive reportouts, primarily due to its familiarity, ease of distribution, and ability to support a formal presentation. The challenge is in retaining the story and not becoming mired in the details. As long as the presentation does not turn into “death by PowerPoint”, this can be a valid presentation tool. For reportouts beyond the executive level, however, I would encourage organizations to be creative in their storytelling.

Crafting the change story is the process of sharing the findings from the Diagnostic process. As Thomas Moore notes, “You tell a story well by giving it a shape and dynamics, but you also tell a story so that your heart is moved by it, and your thoughts go deeper and your emotions emerge.”

Data is simply data until it is transformed into information that can be acted upon. The goal of the Diagnostic reportout is to distil the vast amounts of data that has been gathered and frame it in a coherent and moving story. The difference between a reportout and a novel however, is that a reportout describes the results of the findings without creating heroes and villains.

The flow of the Diagnostic reportout answers the following questions:
1. Why are we here?
2. What is the problem?
3. How does it show up in the organization?
4. How did we get here?
5. What has gotten in the way of doing something different?
6. What do we need?
7. How does staying where we are keep us from getting what we need?

Notice how the questions that comprise the change story mirror the sequence of the Diagnostic process. The theoretical underpinnings of this approach, found in The Inner Counselor Process as developed by Ann Nunley and described in more detail in Part III, provide the framework for organizing and synthesizing the data in a manner that moves the story along. Each section, Diagnostic, Design, Plan, and Implementation, provides a chapter of the ongoing transformation story. The Diagnostic reportout is the opening act that sets the stage, introduces the characters, and creates the context for the actions to follow.

The developing change story should be reflective focusing upon issues of effectiveness – what has worked, what hasn’t, and how the organization could be better served by changing the current automatic responses. Then, as Wheatly so aptly notes, “We could stop arguing about truth and get on with figuring out what works best.”
DESIGN

* Purposes are deducted from behavior, not from rhetoric or stated goals*.\(^{153}\)

--- Donella H. Meadows

During the two week Diagnostic phase the objective is to discern the underlying dysfunction in the organization and gain clarity about how the current patterns are insufficient for meeting the overall objectives. The next two weeks of the project consist of the Design phase where specific actions are examined to establish a vision of where the organization could be, and will be, once the dysfunctional patterns are released. This process consists of creating a new vision of the future state in both quantitative and qualitative terms, and prioritizing the actions needed to achieve those goals.

Prioritization is made to ensure that the areas addressed will indeed have the greatest impact and lay the foundation for a transformed corporate culture freed from the legacy workarounds that bound dysfunctional processes to their history. During the design phase we also look into the resource needs for deployment leadership and discuss the importance of effectively communicating the new vision to the stakeholders as well as the whole of the organization.

As the collective understanding of the world shifted from qualitative to quantitative starting between 1250 and 1600\(^{154}\), the world was imagined as a closed and predictable system created by a master machine-maker God. This Newtonian framework became the foundation of how business and organizations were understood, designed,
and managed. A good organization, it was proposed, would operate like a well-designed
machine – dutifully performing repetitive tasks with precision and efficiency.
Management’s role then, was to keep the organizational machine operating smoothly by
taking measures to stave off the inherent entropy. As the concept of entropy entered into
the collective conscious, society accepted systems designed to control, stabilize and
regulate our experience with both the workplace and the world at large. As the scientific
method standardized thereby increasing defined experience, management became
synonymous with control. As Margaret Wheatly observes, “Lenin spoke for many
leaders when he said: ‘Freedom is good, but control is better.’”

When organizations are perceived as artificial creations in the same way as a
machine or a house, establishing systems to stave off entropy is a reasonable and rational
activity. As anyone who owns an older home will attest, constant repairs and adjustments
are needed to keep all the systems functioning properly. This has been the mental
framework with which organizations have been traditionally understood. Wheatly
describes how this understanding presents in the organizational culture:

We seem hypnotized by structures, and we build them strong and
complex because they must, we believe, hold back the dark forces that
threaten to destroy us. It’s a hostile world out there, and organizations, or
we who create them, survive only because we build crafty and smart-smart
enough to defend ourselves from the natural forces of destruction.

Like the products a factory produces, a level of preventative maintenance is
required to ensure the continuing productivity of the workforce. However, as has been
mentioned previously, attributing machine characteristics to the human workforce frames
the work experience in ways that are cold, dehumanizing, and soulless. Humans are not
machines and to understand how humans operate within the group structure of a
corporation, our attention needs to shift to understanding the role that the organizational
system plays in helping or hindering the naturally occurring self-organizational properties inherent in living systems.\textsuperscript{157} The view of workers as replaceable cogs in the organizational machinery limits them to partial contributions constrained by narrowly confined roles. “As we let go of the machine model of organizations,” Wheatly writes, “we begin to see ourselves in much higher dimensions, to appreciate our wholeness, and, hopefully, do design organizations that honor and make use of the great gift of who we humans are.”\textsuperscript{158}
Imagine something new – Big Idea

“Real change – change that matters – rarely comes from business as usual.”

-- Rebecca Costa

Integral to the Design process is a Dionysian dismembering that exposes the underlying structure of the organization. Loosening the connections that bind the current processes creates the space necessary for challenging the Imaginal Structures that frame experience. “Progress,” Thomas Moore notes, “…is possible only if separation takes place effectively.” This dismembering moves the organization away from the current path in order that it may be understood from a more disentangled perspective. As David Whyte so eloquently writes, “It seems that to find the real path we have to go off the path we are now on, even for an instant, and earn the privilege of losing our way.”

The experience of losing one’s way, however, requires the transformation leadership and the organization as a whole, to risk whatever illusion of security is currently held. The design process is both an exciting and challenging time because as long as we stay in the safe zone, nothing changes but wander to the edge and the gatekeepers turn into boarder guards who warn of monsters in the dark. To walk to the edge and peer across the boundary into the unknown territory is scary, to say the least.

There is, however, a purpose for dancing on the edge of the abyss. Inherent in existing systems is a lethargic complacency and to move the organization into a new place, the old world must be awakened. Linda Sussman in her book *Speech of the Grail*, describes this awakening noting that the awakened must then be “apprised of what has
been changed in a way that allows it to maintain its self-respect – its integrity and coherence – at the same time that it is integrating the changes. Humor, playfulness and ritual performance offer means by which human beings encourage each other to be reflexive and, thereby, to change without undergoing destructive conflict.\textsuperscript{162}

Utilizing methodologies and tools that facilitate group processing create a sense of teamwork and camaraderie. Teamwork and group processing is vital to facing the systemic problems that are an organization’s greatest threat because systemic problems are the very ones that require multifaceted, highly complex, and cross-functional solutions. As Rebecca Costa writes,

These problems cannot be reduced to simple cause and effect, and therefore solutions based on simple cause and effect don’t work. Translated, this simply means that the cure to our biggest problems requires money, energy, focus, endurance, and the postponement of gratification for unbearably long periods of time. And who would put up with that? On the other hand, mitigations by their very nature are cheaper, easier, faster, and produce an immediate result. But every mitigation we can name – financial bailouts, water rationing, cease-fires, border patrols, and increased airport security – addresses only one of two aspects of a larger problem. So, in the end there’s never enough critical mass to effect systemic change.\textsuperscript{163}

Discerning the difference between mitigations and comprehensive solutions is important during the design stage. For example, resolving material shortages on the production line by increasing Work-In-Process Inventory is a mitigation strategy that, while solving one problem, creates additional stressors on the inventory burden of the organization as a whole. As Costa writes, “The problem with any containment strategy is that the problems eventually outgrow their containers.”\textsuperscript{164} In our material shortage example, the two weeks of Design provide the opportunity to evaluate the larger systemic
problem of supply chain and material management taking into consideration the overall objectives of quality, cost, and availability.

One of the challenges during Design is the role economics play in the mental framework of the organization. The allure for dollars and cents to trump dollars and sense is enormous and is prevalent across the American culture. For the base reason that addressing systemic problems requires more resources over a longer duration than quick-fix mitigation strategies, an economic induced myopia can preclude utilization of the vast human talent and potential of the organization that lies just below the surface.\textsuperscript{165} To counter this myopia, when designing new processes for manufacturing, there must be a level of Return On Investment to justify the expenditure. The onus is on the design team to attend to the reconnections in such a way that new processes are effective, efficient, and sustainable.

Process sustainability occurs when the design encompasses all aspects of the process: the inputs, the process itself, the output, and the experience of the worker performing the job. Under Fredrick Taylor and the resulting era of scientific management, work was broken into discrete and efficient tasks. The Taloristic method of work organization that disregards the human experience displays a disdain for the workers as the tasks are to be performed without any thought or input. As Wheatly writes, “[Taylorism] didn’t just ignore [the workers], as has been done more recently with contemporary reengineering efforts. They disdained them – their task was to design work that would not be disrupted by the expected stupidity of the workers.”\textsuperscript{166} In addition to dehumanizing the workforce, Tayloristic design has proven to eventually be
unsustainable as it assumes a repeatable process that is constant over time, attributes that are rarely true in an ever changing and competitive global market.

Change happens not because the existence of a problem is known, but rather when the consequences of the problem are understood to inhibit the group from meeting its objective.167 To move an organization forward, time must be allocated for discovering what actions are worth shared attention.168 Visioning of the Big Idea is the step that begins to engage the imagination and thereby provides the "juice" to fuel the transformation. By the end of a successful Diagnostic phase the organization is prepared for the discussion about how the automatic reactions of the organization can be altered in such a way that the underlying needs can be met. With the clarity gained during Diagnostics as to how the underlying needs cannot be met with the existing behaviors, the facilitator should be seeing signs of excitement and engagement about new possibilities.

Effective design is predicated upon the restoration of knowledge and facts as the primary driver of decision-making.169 Existing dysfunctional patterns are able to exist and thrive within an organization because an environment, where the mental models include competition, distrust, scapegoating, and where information is hoarded, both intentionally and unintentionally, creates a fertile environment for them to grow. To change the patterns that live and thrive in the organization, the environment must first change. When an organization can become transparent about the facts there forms a foundation for honest discussions about what is and is not working. Costa describes the use of knowledge and facts as “powerful vaccines that protect us from surrendering to irrational beliefs.”170
The use of knowledge as an inoculation against beliefs is important for the success of the transformation because facts that can be agreed upon will reduce conflict by exposing irrational opposition to the change process. Irrational opposition, be it direct or covert, is always a symptom of ulterior motives and the need to manipulate others into choosing sides. Irrational opposition is a method of resistance employed to maintain homeostasis. As Costa writes, “An oppositional strategy polarizes choice. And choosing between two extreme options doesn’t work for solving highly complex problems like global warming, war, or healthcare because it forces the brain into choosing “which” rather than considering “what”.” Forced choice between known options does not address the underlying collective needs. New solutions, ones that engage the hearts and minds of the employees can, however, be accessed effectively by repeatedly focusing on how the group needs are, or are not, being met.

The goal of establishing a Big Idea is to blend the individual narratives into a compelling collective narrative that aligns the organization across departments. This allows for the identification of the group values and the development of the mission and vision statements. Fully articulating the new collective vision provides a compelling reason to move forward.

No one (and no department) is "the one" all by themselves. Each part is both unique and part of the whole, and any change, regardless of how small, will ripple throughout the whole of the organization. Therefore, it is the relationship, the departments in community, that fuels transformational change as opposed to step change. Combined effort is the sum of the collective energies focused upon a shared objective.
Within the Organizational Change Process, energy is held within the group container. As in alchemy, this container must be strong and well sealed to hold the energy released during the transformation process. In organizations, the energies of creativity and resourcefulness previously locked within dysfunctional processes, and the ensuing apathy that anything ever change, begins to loosen and flow as the vision develops. Rather than defining individuals “in terms of isolated tasks and accountabilities,” Wheatly writes, “we need to be able to conceptualize the pattern of energy flows required for that person to do the job. We need to see any person’s role as the place where energies meet to make something happen.” 174 This image of energies merging to make something new is both powerful and empowering to workers. W. Warner Burke writes, “Paying considerable attention to the use of human energy can help the organization’s leaders change things (norms, rewards, or authority structure) so that this energy can be focused more appropriately toward accomplishment of the organization’s goals.” 175

The effective movement of energy throughout the organization is dependent upon the connections between individuals and groups of individuals. In the same way that healthy blood flow throughout the body enables an individual, information is the lifeblood of an organization or community. Absent blood flow from the body and decisions become difficult, coordination suffers, and stamina is reduced. These same attributes apply when an organization or community is denied open and free-flowing access to information. Absent of timely and operational information an organization will base decisions upon rumor and speculation, coordination across departments becomes difficult, and stamina is compromised when the information can not be trusted. For
example, current manufacturing is highly dependent upon computerized Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems. When, however, an organization is plagued by poor data integrity such as incomplete or inaccurate Bill of Materials, an increase level of rework is required to ensure that material and tooling will be correct and available when the work order is released to the production floor.

In the process of developing the collective narrative, it is important to ask questions that connect individuals to the fundamental identity of the organization:

- Who are we?
- Who do we aspire to become?
- How shall we be together?
- What else do we need to know?
- Who else needs to be here to do this work with us?¹⁷⁶

Developing a Big Idea that includes processes that support and enable reflective conversations across the organization creates the environment for new meanings to develop and new information to be spawned. Organizations that can include reflexivity within the information sharing structures will grow in its intelligence and increase the capacity for collaboration.¹⁷⁷ As David White notes, “everything takes form according to the consciousness that shaped it. If our self-image is small and restricted, or cold and inert, then what we produce will probably be stillborn, like its maker. It is essential, then, to know what is vital and alive inside us and shape our lives [and organization] in its image.”¹⁷⁸
Development of the Big Idea is a creative endeavor because it carries with it the burden of identity. Leadership must be heavily engaged in the development of the shared vision for the company. Alignment however, happens within the larger organization and is dependent upon the clear and consistent flow of honest and operational information throughout the organization. The workforce will become engaged to the extent that they are participants in the norms, values, and structures that define who they are as a community.

The outcome of this step in the Organizational Change Process is some form of a visioning board or other tangible display of what the new state will be and how this new state of being will enable the organization or community to be fully enabled to fulfill the shared vision. This tangible display, and the accompanying collective narrative will form the basis of the design reportout.
What does it look like – Specific Qualities and Attributes

“We must interact with the world in order to see what we might create. Through engagement in the moment, we evoke our futures.”180

-- Margaret Wheatly

During the design phase, the organization is invited to imagine a new way of doing business. What does it look like? What attributes does it have? It is important at this stage that individuals involved be able to fully envision the desired outcome and see themselves actively participating in it. Facilitators need to engage the imagination of the design team by asking questions such as "What does it feel like?" and "What can you do now that you couldn't before?" These questions will both clarify and align the objectives. Envisioning themselves as participants in the new state increases ownership and motivation to make it a reality.

As the vision of the future state begin to take shape, the transformation team will begin to see themes and commonalities. The intent of the visioning process is to reconnect the organization with what gives it definition as a community. Through creating stronger relationships, the organization learns more of how the interconnections need to operate across departmental or functional areas. This knowledge about what is needed prior to and subsequent to any operation increases the accountability of each member. The extent to which the process inputs and outputs are defined, managed, and communicated is the extent to which workers will be empowered to troubleshoot and diagnose their own problems.
Healthy processes are those where the interdependencies are clearly understood and it is this clarity about how each step fits into the overall whole of the organization that creates better relationships. When workers can depend upon each other to share information and collaborate on problem solving, the ideas that have meaning create an energy and excitement that inspires collaboration and shared success. Myron Kelner-Rogers uses the term “Start anywhere and follow it everywhere” to describe his approach to organizational change. Focusing on the process of how connections are made across the organization and the decisions that arise from those interconnections is, I propose, more important than the actual solution. For when work is infused with meaning and good communication the free-flow of ideas and energy move throughout the organization. Good problem solving processes develop the capacity of communal resiliency. It is not so much the answer you get, but rather the way you get to the answer that will define success.

Albert Einstein said, “The … goal of all theory is to make the …basic elements as simple and as few as possible without having to surrender the adequate representation … of experience.” When applied to business processes, Einstein’s advice challenges the transformation leadership to discern the core elements that, like a fractal equation, organically develops into elegantly complex systems based upon recursive feedback. David Whyte writes,

The way to build a poem or a lifelike and useful system is to fold meaning into the simplest elements and allow complexity to emerge from their natural self-generation. Deal with as many simple elements instead of one complex system. Think locally, act locally, intuit globally. Once in a very blue moon the world allows us the God-given right to actually act globally, but the opportunity occurs more rarely than we would wish. We simply have less wisdom than the emergent intelligence of many individuals given enough information and the ability to act.
The emergent wisdom that arises spontaneously from individuals collaborating with a shared vision provides the organization the ability to wrestle with and resolve difficult and site-specific problems. Best practices are simply models developed elsewhere. While industry best practices can be a springboard for innovation, these externally designed solutions must be evaluated and customized for each implementation. Just as there is no “standard” organization, there is no “standard” solution that will magically resolve any problem. It is for this reason that discerning the simplest discrete elements and their interconnections provides the transformation design team the greatest options. Like Legos, simple components can be combined and reconfigured to adjust to a dynamic and changing business environment. Small and agile systems simply have a higher capacity for resiliency.

Key to developing a dynamic environment is a strong connection to the overall goal of the community. Often this goal is referred to as the “burning platform” to signify the highest priority. If one imagines looking out across a multitude of oilrig platforms in the Gulf of Mexico, attention is naturally drawn the one that is currently on fire. The same process holds true in the executive suite. Rarely is change proposed without a specific goal in mind and in the executive suite these are measured by Key Performance Indicators. To remain competitive a business must also be profitable. While organizations, and each Business Unit will have multiple metrics, identifying the top priorities will focus the implementation and provide a measure for scoping the Tactical Implementation Plans (TIPs) to those tasks that will have the greatest impact.
The transformation team, in conjunction with the executives, must clearly define the objectives and goals of the change initiative by developing a list of the key items and themes that need to be addressed. For example, if the burning platform is an increasing loss of market share, and the suspected reason is poor delivery performance, the two primary Key Performance Indicators would be Percent of Market Share and On-time Delivery. Because everything is connected to everything else, there are multiple facets to both of these primary metrics. While the belief that lower Market Share is a result of poor on-time delivery, reduced market share could also be the result other contributing factors such as sales and marketing, new product introduction, quality, and customer service. Likewise, poor on-time delivery can be a result of engineering changes, issues in the supply chain, inventory shortages, inadequate tooling, machine availability, production scheduling, rework, and/or logistics.

The objective is to identify the high level elements and their supporting processes on the future state map so that the interconnections can be clarified. This listing provides the change team with a framework, or map, for moving forward. In our example above, a possible overall vision is “Become the world leader in innovative widgets” while the site-level objectives could be reduced to easily understood and operational goals such as “Increase Market Share by 5% in 12 months” and “95% on-time delivery in 3 months with 99% on-time delivery in 9 months.”

While a flexible structure is necessary to establish an environment for creative solutions to emerge, clarity on the operational objectives provides focus for the efforts and a clear understanding of how success will be measured.
Where do we start? – Priorities and Consensus

“Mystery. You’re always surrounded by them. But if you tried to solve them all, you’d never get the machine fixed.”

-- Robert M. Pirsig, Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance.

Prioritization is probably the most difficult component of a transformation project because invariably there are more good, valid, and useful projects than there are time and resources to complete. It is for this reason that in the previous step the primary and supporting key performance indicators were clearly identified and agreed upon. By focusing on “moving the needle” on the primary metrics, the objective of the prioritization step is to ensure that the transformation activities that are undertaken, are directly linked to the burning platform issues.

It is important for the change team and the site leadership to evaluate the burning platform as a symptom of a larger systems problem that requires systemic and systems thinking to resolve. Designing the future state from a systems perspective provides the higher-level perspective that will sustain the organization though the liminal time during the implementation phase where the old system is no longer functioning and the new processes are not yet in place. Without this system-wide understanding of the interconnections between all of the components the draw towards simple solutions and mitigation strategies can derail the transformation process.
During the prioritization process the main workstreams are defined. A workstream is defined as a high level task or project that directly supports the site-level metrics. Because there are multiple factors that contribute to a single key performance indicator, each transformation will have multiple workstreams. In the example used above, the Diagnostic and may have discerned that the greatest problems in the organization were:

1. A lack of real-time operational data linking production flow with customer demand
2. Material shortages on the production floor
3. Machine utilization
4. Excessive rework

Since attempting to solve all of the pressing problems concurrently disperses both energy and resources, the main workstreams must directly map to burning platform issues and focus the transformation efforts. Structuring the workstreams in this way allows the scope to be clearly defined and “with clarity of vision [comes] clarity of purpose and action.” From a logistical perspective, it is important that the subject matter experts, those within the organization with deep knowledge of the issues, are not split across multiple workstreams.

The design team, in conjunction with the site leadership must prioritize the top three or four items that they believe will either:

a) Have the greatest direct impact on the site-level metrics or,

b) Be the greatest facilitator for future improvements.

Workstreams that map to the above issues are:
• Sales, Inventory, and Operations Planning
• Material Management/Supply Chain Operations
• Shop Floor Optimization
• Quality

In addition, each transformation should have a workstream dedicated to the organizational dynamics that includes facilitating communication across workstreams and the organization as a whole.

Without this process of prioritization and selection of the high impact projects the project risks losing direction and having the feeling of “throwing everything at the wall to see what sticks.”

The outcome of this step of the Organizational Change Process is the definition of the primary workstreams that will structure the tasks and resources needed to complete the objective. Clarity and consensus in the workstream definition process keeps the organization from experiencing the feelings of Rainer Maria Rilke’s image of “a man looking out his window at summer’s end, having been busy with everything except the one harvest that mattered.”

185
Who’s in the sandbox? – Assigning the Deployment Leadership

“Take any step toward our destiny through creative action (it may be as simple as lifting a pen over a blank sheet of paper), and we know intuitively that we are giving up whatever cover we had. Tiptoeing is like the unwitting souls of classical myth who blundered into Pan on the mountainside, we have ventured into the sacred temenos of our own desiring and startled a god. The universe turns toward us, realizing we are here, alive and about to make our mark. We hear the wild divine elements in the world hold their breath, waiting for our next move, our next word, but at last the center of real attention, we turn quietly and take a step back, into the shadow of the trees, and, it is hoped, a quieter life. Having backed away from the moment, we try not to be found. We hope we can remain quiet and not be discovered. We know through long experience that having followed our personal passions we not only warmed ourselves around that flame but were drawn mesmerically to the possibility of total failure at its center. A center that holds the promise of a new life but seems to be ready to burn up most of our present life to achieve it.”

-- David Whyte

The process of assigning the leadership teams, to deliver on the workstream objectives identified in the previous step, is the point where the preverbal rubber meets the road. Ideas are wonderful but transformation cannot exist solely in the conceptual realm. Transformation is an active alchemical process and, as David White notes in the quote above, the fire and passion necessary to see it through is both mesmerizing and
terrifying. The task of the transformation leadership is to lead by example and, as Stephen Larsen notes in *Mythic Imagination*, “the goal is not to change the world, but ourselves, and then the world is renewed.”

The realm of organizational change is mythic in its dimensions and the communal quest of the site is no less than a hero’s quest. The journey is to venture into the unknown in search of new ways of being together so that the community as a whole can reach the overarching objectives of the organization.

As a result of the mythic dimensions of transformational change, traditional thinking about organizational structure does not provide an adequate description of what is needed. To fully appreciate and understand the dynamics, archetypical behaviors provide a better grasp on the subjective dynamics occurring only slightly below the surface. Leadership then, is in the position of holding the behaviors of the Guide. As Larsen notes, “In the guide, we find one who not only knows the terrain, the pathways and obstacles, the wonders and the terrors, but who offers the companionship of a living presence with whom we may confer as the journey unfolds its challenging – and not always predictable – features.”

The task of the guide, or guides in this case, is to hold the overall vision by managing the scope and direction of the project. As guides, rather than Guru’s, the leadership team must be willing to enter into the transformational process with the site offering context and meaning to “experiences that otherwise would seem random, chaotic, and fragmentary.” It is not the position of the leadership to magically deal with problems encountered in the work teams, but rather, to facilitate the teams to find their own solutions and allow the problem solving to unfold as a self-healing process.
Self-healing is a byproduct of an effective learning community. However, as Peter Senge notes, there are common dysfunctions that arise which make the learning difficult. Senge calls these “organizational learning disabilities” and being able to recognize these behaviors as the organization embarks upon transformative work will aid in identifying potential hazards along the way. Senge describes these learning disabilities in detail in his book *The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization*. Here is a synopsis:

1. **“I AM MY POSITION”**
   
   When people in organizations focus only on their position, they have little sense of responsibility for the results produced when all positions interact. Moreover, when results are disappointing, it can be very difficult to know why. All you can do is assume “someone screwed up.”

2. **“THE ENEMY IS OUT THERE”**
   
   The “enemy is out there” syndrome is actually a by-product of “I am my position,” and the nonsystemic ways of looking at the world that it fosters. When we focus only on our position, we do not see how our own actions extend beyond the boundary of that position. When those actions have consequences that come back to hurt us, we misperceive these new problems as externally caused.
   
   “The enemy is out there,” however, is almost always an incomplete story. “Out there” and “in here” are usually part of a single system. This learning disability makes it almost impossible to detect the leverage we can use “in here” on problems that straddle the boundary between us and “out there.”

3. **THE ILLUSION OF TAKING CHARGE**

   *All too often proactiveness is reactiveness in disguise.* Whether in business or politics, if we simply become more aggressive fighting the “enemy out there,” we are reacting – regardless of what we call it. *True proactiveness comes from seeing how we contribute to our own problems.* It is a product of our way of thinking, not our emotional state.

4. **THE FIXATION ON EVENTS**
   
   Conversations in organizations are dominated by concern with events. … Focusing on events leads to “event” explanations…. Such explanations may be true, but they distract us from seeing the longer-term patterns of change that lie behind the events and from understanding the causes of those patterns.
   
   Generative learning cannot be sustained in an organization if people’s thinking is dominated by short-term events. If we focus on events, the best we
can ever do is predict an event before it happens so that we can react optimally. But we cannot learn to create.

5. THE PARABLE OF THE BOILED FROG
   If you place a frog in a pot of boiling water, it will immediately try to scramble out. But if you place the frog in room temperature water, and don’t scare him, he’ll stay put. Now, if the pot sits on a heat source, and if you gradually turn up the temperature, something very interesting happens. As the temperature rises from 70 to 80 degrees F., the frog will do nothing. In fact, he will show every sign of enjoying himself. As the temperature gradually increases, the frog will become groggier and groggier, until he is unable to climb out of the pot. Though there is nothing restraining him, the frog will sit there and boil. Why? Because the frog’s internal apparatus for sensing threats to survival is geared to sudden changes in his environment, not to slow, gradual changes.

   We will not avoid the fate of the frog until we learn to slow down and see the gradual processes that often pose the greatest threats.

6. THE DELUSION OF LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE
   We each have a “learning horizon,” a breadth of vision in time and space within which we assess our effectiveness. When our actions have consequences beyond our learning horizon, it becomes impossible to learn from direct experience.

   Herein lies the core learning dilemma that confronts organizations: we learn best from experience but we never directly experience the consequences of many of our most important decisions.

7. THE MYTH OF THE MANAGEMENT TEAM
   “Most management teams break down under pressure,” writes Harvard’s Chris Argyris – a long time student of learning management teams. “The team may function quite well with routine issues. But when they confront complex issues that may be embarrassing or threatening, the ‘teamness’ seems to go to pot.”

   Argyris argues that most managers find collective inquiry inherently threatening. …Even if we feel uncertain or ignorant, we learn to protect ourselves from the pain of appearing uncertain or ignorant. That very process blocks out any new understandings which might threaten us. The consequence is what Argyris calls “skilled incompetence” – teams full of people who are incredibly proficient at keeping themselves from learning.191

   The antidote to these organizational learning disabilities is reflectivity. The process of taking a step back from the day to day operations in order to look inward and discern the internal dynamics that each of us bring to the situation is vital to holding the
vision of the future state. As Whyte writes, “Without silence we become frightened by what is occurring. There is no room for it [new imagery] to grow inside us, and bereft of that spaciousness we feel as if the process is about to take us over.”192

The process of reflexivity is the process of embracing the unknown and resisting the temptation to give in to easy answers. This inner silence of the contemplative traditions is vital to the project’s success. In order to be transformed, rather than simply changed, one must be willing to sit in the fire and yet not be consumed by it. As Arnold Mindell writes, “Creating freedom, community and viable relationships has its price. It costs time and courage to learn how to sit in the fire of diversity. It means staying centered in the heat of trouble.”193 For the leadership team, success is determined by the capacity of each individual to resist the ether/or polarities and hold open space for the unknown solution to enter.

The image of the archetypical guide gives insight into the dynamics of organizational transformation. Like Merlin, the guide must ensure not only that “there is a strong and evolving clarity about who the organization is,”194 but also a strong sense of their own soul’s work. And, as Thomas Moore notes, “Part of finding your soul is to wake up to this habit of thinking like others and go your own way.”195

The process of waking up to your soul is the process of self-actualization and, by definition, this actualization manifests as the ability to “stand apart from the crowd and dare to be unique.”196 It is the willingness to work with the transformative power of conflict and that will allow the leadership to hone the skills of relationship building that will give rise to a community that learns from each other. Any decision, or discussion
about altering existing processes will tug at the interconnected web of organizational relationships.\footnote{197}

The site executive team is responsible for the Tactical Implementation Plan (TIP) that overarches all of the process workstreams. This plan is responsible for monitoring the business level metrics and ensuring that the objectives of the burning platform are achieved. It is important to note that while not every member of the executive team may be assigned a workstream, it is responsibility of all executive members to do whatever is necessary to support the overall objectives of the site. The site executive leadership must model cross-functional cooperation and support, because \textit{the community can only demonstrate what the leadership can model.}

When assigning the workstream leadership “the issue is not who or what position will take care of the problem, but what energy, skill, influence, and wisdom are available to contribute to the solution.”\footnote{198} It is often said that “people will support what they create” and this maxim holds true, especially when an individual’s daily contact and vested interests are included in the decision-making processes. Without strong executive level support resources in both time and capital will be difficult to garner. Lack of executive ownership to the transformation process is a sure sign that there are more ideas, concerns, and interests that need to be brought to the table. Power in a transformative organization does not rest in titles or positions, but rather in the quality of the relationships and the collaborative capacity of the group as a whole.

The outcome of this step is the clear commitment, involvement, and sponsorship of the main workstreams from the site’s executive team.
What does success look like?

“The discipline lies in the ability to recognize the patterns emerging that are germane to the path you want to take. But this demands the courage to choose and to choose wrongly. The more we choose, the more we come to recognize and trust our own instincts, our ‘pure wisdom.’”  
-- David Whyte

At the beginning of the design phase we examined the “Big Idea,” or vision for the future. The transformation leadership team is the initial point contact for this visioning process and provide discovery and design sessions throughout the organization. However, by this stage in the design process, the objective is to bring the executive leadership and workstream sponsors onboard and engaged with the vision of the visioning direction. While ownership of the problems, and the work to resolve them is held throughout the organization, if the executive leadership is not fully committed to the vision of the future state, the transformation team needs to rewind and return to the Big Idea step so that the concerns of the executive leadership are fully addressed prior to moving forward. Full site alignment is necessary if the organization as a whole is to be successful.

For the transformation to succeed, all levels of the organization should be not only comfortable, but also excited about the opportunities that the future state vision holds for the organization. At the end of this step, each sponsor, operating as the workstream champion, should be comfortable presenting the overall scope and direction of their
workstream and its impact on the burning platform targets. In addition, every member of the executive team should clearly understand the overarching long-term objectives, the short-term goals, and be able to articulate how the change will empower the organization. While change can, and effectively does, happen at the grass-roots level, in a transparent and aligned organization, the community as a whole can move forward with greater ease and more support when the overarching goals of the organization are embraced by everyone from the executives to the shop floor.

In order to meet these objectives, detailed work needs to be done to ensure that the workstreams are indeed aligned with the overall vision and that the interdependencies have been identified. To this end, the design team, with advisement from all of the process stakeholders, must outline the goals and objectives for each workstream. For the projects that formed the basis of this work, the format for this analysis was a combination of the A3 and Plan Do Check Act/Adjust tools available from the Lean Institute, modified to meet the site-specific requirements.

A3 refers to a structured problem solving technique where all of the elements are succinctly presented on a single sheet of A3 sized 11 x 17 inch paper. The objective of the A3 analysis is to tell the story of each workstream and provide a documented outcome for the Design phase that answers the following questions:

1. What does it look like?
2. How is it going to help us?
3. How will we know when it is active?
The formal A3 problem solving is begun in Design under the direction of the transformation team and is the primary storyboarding tool for the overall goals and objectives of each workstream. However, the A3 document is an evolving means of communication that will serve as the guiding beacon for the Planning and Implementation segments as well as document the progress made. As the Implementation phase comes to completion at the end of the sixteen-week cycle, the A3 for each workstream allows the project to be evaluated and the long-term actions necessary for sustainment to be identified. A full example of an A3 outline can be found in Appendix A. The elements to be included in the A3 during the Design phase include the beginning are as follows:

**TITLE BOX:**

- Team Members - *List all members of the analysis team.*
- Start Date – *Date of the initial A3 analysis.*
- Customer - *Who is the customer that will be served by this project?*
- Topic – *What project, process, or problem is being addressed?*

**BACKGROUND**

- *Why are we talking about this problem?*
- *What is the business reason for choosing this issue?*

**CURRENT CONDITION**

- *Give the reader an understanding of the current process or situation.*
- *Cite specific observations, procedures, and work standards.*
- *Baseline current metrics such as cost, quality, time to complete, and problem frequency. This will serve as the basis for measuring success.*
- *Include illustrations to describe the findings.*

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

- *Create a problem statement from the above information.*
OUTCOME GOAL AND KPIs

- What specific outcome is required for the business?
- How will success be measured?

DESIRED STATE

- Describe what the situation would look like in the ideal state or desired “to be” future state.
- Include high level targets or goals if applicable.

ANALYSIS

- Define the root cause(s) of the problem and how the cause was determined.
- Clearly link the root cause(s) to the current symptoms and behaviors.
- Outline the current constraints that could prevent resolution of the problem.
- Include diagrams to visually support the analysis process.

PROPOSED COUNTERMEASURE(S)

- Brainstorm possible solutions to the problem.
- What is the best proposal to reach the future state/target condition?
- What alternatives could be considered?
- How will the team choose among the options? What decision criteria will be used?
- How will the recommended countermeasure(s) impact the root cause to change the current situation and achieve the target?

The process of developing the A3 storyboards can be time consuming for the organization, however, without the clarity gained through this process the executive leadership can easily become “out of touch” with how the workstream tasks are contributing to the overall performance of the organization. A3 storyboarding is more than a simple communication tool. Storyboarding in this manner sets the example for open and honest discussions about issues and their potential solutions. The ability to
easily communicate the core aspects of the project not only gains initial commitment and excitement but also provides ongoing documentation of the product status and impact. This level of visibility keeps the current projects “on the radar” and reduces the level of reallocation of resources to other priorities. If resourcing becomes an issue during the life of the project, it is the role of the workstream sponsor to lead a discussion to determine the continuance of the project: *is this in fact, the most effective resolution to this issue?*

The process of storyboarding shifts the mindset of the organization from responding to externally imposed change happening “to” the business, to change that is arising from within the business that has benefit for the organization as a whole.
Design Reportout

While the Diagnostic reportout provided the overarching change story, the Design reportout continues the narrative by focusing on the specific actions and outcomes that will be addressed during the transformation process. The storyboard outlines formed in the previous step form the basis for this reportout. The Design reportout contains the following elements:

1. Summary of the overarching change story as defined in the Diagnostic phase.
2. An overview of the Big Idea vision for the future state including the expected benefits.
3. A list of the key items and themes to be addressed.
4. A description of the prioritization process and outcome.
5. Definition of the workstreams and workstream sponsors.
6. Presentation of the storyboards for each workstream.

The focus of the Design reportout is to provide the larger community with an overview of the identified projects and a clear linkage to how these workstreams will address both the agreed upon quantitative key performance indicators and subjective qualitative measures. A measure of success of this reportout is the enthusiasm generated in support of the proposed efforts. The design phase is about discerning *what* needs to be done, the planning process that follows is about establishing *how* these improvements
will be implemented and *who* or *what group* is responsible for delivering on the identified tasks.
PLANNING

“The content of organization change is one thing, and the process another. The distinction is important because the former, the what, provides the vision and overall direction for the change, and the process, the how, concerns implementation and adoption. Content has to do with purpose, mission, strategy, values, and what the organization is all about – or should be about. Process has to do with how the change is planned, launched, more fully implemented, and, once into implementation, sustained. The kinds of behaviors required for content differ from those required for process.”

-- W. Warner Burke

Up to this point, now 4 weeks into the transformation project, the discussion has been about the content of transformational change and has focused on envisioning a new and brighter future state where all of the protective aspects of the current system are accounted for yet with a spaciousness that invites in a new way of being in the world that also allows for current and future needs of the organization to be met. Now, at the 5th week of the project, we enter the Planning phase and it is here that we move from envisioning the future state to identifying the specific steps necessary to achieve it. As the quote from Burke describes, the skills and behaviors needed for the process of change are different from those utilized in conceptualizing and engaging others with the content of the vision. It isn’t that the visioning stops, because it certainly doesn’t, but a vision that doesn’t have legs can’t go anywhere. During Planning and Implementation, we give the vision legs and ground the new ways into the daily tasks of the organization. This
process is about rolling up the sleeves and getting down to the real work of transformation.

In this sixteen-week transformation cycle, the fifth week is dedicated to the operational planning of transformation process. During this week of planning the specific projects and workstreams defined during Design are refined into specific and measurable tasks staffed by individuals with intimate knowledge of how to implement the desired solution. Where the prior sections have included significant conceptual content, planning and implementation are focused on the how, the process of managing the transformation project.
Assigning Staff

“What was the nature of the answers, the solutions, that Jonah caused us to develop? They all had the same thing in common. They all made common sense, and at the same time, they flew directly in the face of everything I’d ever learned. Would we have had the courage to try to implement them if it weren’t for the fact that we’d had to sweat to construct them? Most probably not. If it weren’t for the conviction that we gained in the struggle – for the ownership that we developed in the process – I don’t think we’d actually have had the guts to put our solutions into practice.”

Eliyahu M. Goldratt, The Goal

The role of the transformation leadership team is to hold space and structure for the process to occur. The framework establishes an environment for the cultural change. If the change team holds too much ownership of the process workers will see the effort as something that is happening to them, not helping them. As the quote above describes, the experience of the going through the process is even more important to the success of the project than the elegance of the final solution. As Wheatly notes, “It is the participation process that makes the plan come alive as a personal reality. People commit themselves because it has become real for them.” Ownership of the process is the byproduct of sharing perspectives, working through the difficult issues, bringing experience and the organization’s tribal knowledge to the table, and allowing each objection to be heard.
Although this process started at the beginning of the transformation, during the planning week specific actions are identified and the timeline for completion is established.

Previously the workstream sponsors were identified from the organization’s executive leadership. During the planning phase the workstream owners and support personnel are recruited and assigned. Appendix B provides a sample Workstream Resource Allocation Matrix that, when used, will identify potential resource constraints across workstreams.

In any organization there is one, or at best a handful of individuals, who hold the majority of knowledge and/or decision making authority. In one site I worked at this was the master production scheduler and what we discovered in the Diagnostic and Design phase was “all roads lead to Drew.” While Drew was extremely capable and a dedicated worker with intimate knowledge of how every aspect of the organization worked, he was also burned out. When it came time to assign resources for the workstreams, Drew
showed up as a mandatory participant in almost every workstream that was identified. What this showed was a clear knowledge constraint that, despite Drew’s heroic efforts, limited the organization’s processing capacity to the bandwidth of a single individual. This was a huge problem for the site in staffing the workstreams.

In subsequent transformations with other clients, I developed this Workstream Resource Allocation Matrix in order to identify these constraints early and to visually display overlapping resources and potential conflicts. The magic isn’t in the matrix, the magic is in the discussions and aha moments that arise when the expertise of the organization is organized in such a way that everyone can clearly discern who has too much on their plate.

Each major project coming out of the prioritization step becomes a workstream and has the sponsorship of someone on the site’s executive team. It is the role of the sponsor to be the workstream champion and lend organizational muscle to the workstream. In addition, each workstream has an owner who is responsible for the overall project management and the daily reporting. Field owners are key members of the workstream team and are responsible for delivering specific tasks. Support personnel are team members who have the specific knowledge and expertise needed to complete the tasks.

The easiest and most efficient way to enlist workstream owners and team members is to capture the enthusiasm generated during the Design reportout. If the Design reportout succeeds in engaging the site, those with vested interests in particular areas will be drawn to making the vision a reality. If, however, the vision shared in the reportout is met with stunned silence and downturned shaking heads, the design team has
missed the mark. The only way to move forward from a poor Design reportout is to backtrack and reevaluate what and who is missing. What other voices and concerns need to be addressed?

The workstream and task owners should arise naturally from their active participation in the Diagnostic and Design process. Without enthusiasm at this point in the process, ownership and commitment to the overall project will not be sufficient for a successful Implementation. Signs that this step are incomplete include low or reluctant participation in the daily meetings and pushback from the organization that the transformation process is too hard, too fast, and too much.

Developing the workstream teams is a recruiting process and when each participant is wholeheartedly committed to the success of the project, challenges that naturally occur will be perceived as new problems to solve rather than signs of inevitable failure. When assigning the team, what I have found is that when deciding team members, enthusiasm and dedication to the process is often more valuable than previous experience. To quote another Mike-ism, “you simply gotta wanna do it.”

Outcome of this step is the identification of the key change agents, their role, and commitment to specific workstream objectives.
Develop the Tactical Implementation Plan – Move it out

“Stop choosing, [the mystic] says, between chaos and order, and live a the boundary between them, where rest and action move together. You can never eliminate the process of chaos from existence, but equally, you cannot completely cover over the calmness that lies at the center of everything. Embrace reality by embracing both. Stop choosing! All very well, we say, ‘but show me.’”

-- David Whyte

While the leadership team brings the framework to the process and experience in seeing how the pieces fit together across the organization, the Business Unit needs to work through how the changes will affect the culture and operations. Involving those who will be doing the work in the planning process increases collaboration, problem solving, and group dynamics. Working in close companion with the executive leadership creates alignment with the overall organizational objectives. In short, it simply makes for better decisions with more buy-in. Just as it is important for the leadership to have excellent group process skills, so will these skills need to be developed in the Business Unit through cross-departmental workstream teams. Everyone will have an opinion and, while it is not necessary for everyone to "get their way", it is important for everyone to have the opportunity to express their opinion and have it considered.

The planning task of each workstream is to develop the Tactical Implementation Plan (TIP) that will structure the activities necessary to complete the implementation and meet the organizational objectives. Workstream teams identify the actions needed to
accomplish the workstream objectives. Empowering the support team, under the direction of the workstream owner, to develop the implementation Plan encourages cross-functional collaboration and ownership of the transformation process. Having those with the responsibility for delivery actively developing the Plan tasks keeps the team from being disengaged from the larger process and the transformation leadership from

The Tactical Implementation Plan is comprised of three sections: header, tasks, and schedule. Figure 2 is a subset of the Plan format displaying the header section on the top of the page. In this section is the title information containing the workstream name, the Executive Sponsor, Workstream Owner, Transformation Team Lead, the Supporting staff, and the key performance indicators that this workstream will use to measure success. The header information provides the overall description of the project and the staffing described previously.

![Figure 2. Plan Header Detail](image)

The second section, running the length of the left side of the form, describes the tasks that will be accomplished during the implementation phase. In this section are the High Level Actions, Sub-actions, the Sub-action owner (also called the Field Owner), and the Sub-action support. High Level Actions describe the main deliverables of the
workstream and the Sub-actions are the detailed steps needed to complete the deliverable. Where the Workstream Owner is responsible for the overall project management, the Sub-action owner, also called the Field Owner, is responsible for the timely delivery of the detailed actions and the coordination of the Sub-action support team included in the fourth column. The Sub-action Support team consists of individuals with the expertise needed to execute the sub-action task.

![Figure 3. Plan Task Detail](image)

The final section of the form is the project schedule. A High Level action begins on the date of the first sub-actions. These actions or tasks, need to be broken into small pieces taking no longer than one week to accomplish. For longer sub-actions, break the task into multiple segments with no single segment spanning more than one week. Keeping the tasks within the one week review cycle helps to ensure the timely execution of the actions by providing the opportunity to address problems early in a formal setting.
For example, in order to reduce the number of part shortages, one site developed a Materials Management workstream with the following objectives:

1. Validate that the online material attributes reflect the correct needs of the business.
2. Ensure the online database accurately reflects the actual work-in-process inventory.
3. Define clear roles and responsibilities for all material purchasing, inventory, and handling responsibilities.
5. Institute supplier metrics to monitor incoming inventory.
6. Develop a process to allow the enterprise resource management system to generate a valid build plan.
7. Relocate finished goods into the shipping area.

Each of these high level actions required weeks of work coordinated across multiple departments and several of these could happen concurrently. In order to create a schedule, these high level items were broken down into several sub-actions. For example, the first item, ensuring the accuracy of the material attributes, was broken down into several sub-actions by scheduling the completion of each data subset as shown in the figure 4 below.
In the projects described herein an Excel worksheet was used to develop the Tactical Implementation Plan (See Appendix C). Other project management software could also be used provided that it contains the elements needed. It is important to note that there is a draw toward over-analyzing this phase of the project. Even with all the planning in the world, you still have to do the actual work.

Schedules should be created so that there is time to complete each task fully and completely. To ensure that the details of the project do not overshadow the overall objective, linkage of each larger task to one or more key performance indicators will keep the project on track.

A sufficiently developed implementation Plan will include all of the major tasks of the workstream, identify dependencies within and across workstreams, and provide a timeline for the delivery of each element. Due to the interrelationship of the workstreams, care must be taken to ensure alignment of the deliverables across the groups. A task on one workstream may be a pacing item for a task on another workstream. For example, the integrity verification of computerized data may exist on a
materials management workstream but may also be a pacing item for report validity on the Sales Inventory and Operations Planning (SIOP) workstream. Without cross validating across workstreams, the SIOP task may be delayed if the materials workstream task is not scheduled to complete in time for the SIOP task deliverable.

All tasks should be written in such a way that they describe the outcome of the task being completed. For example, instead of “verify data integrity,” a more complete description would be “Sales forecast data (order, product/version, quantity, customer due date, destination, and project) is properly entered and verified. Reports that use this data can depend upon their accuracy and timely updating.” Clear communication is vital to insuring that the deliverables are not open to subjective interpretation. Implementation Plans must be written so that when a task is marked complete, it is not only done, but as one of my coworkers would describe, it is done-done. A task is only done-done when there is nothing outstanding. If it can be said that the task is “done except for…” then it is not done-done. See the Implementation phase of this document for more information on workstream status reports.

Good Plan development is dependent upon the organization’s ability to address difficult issues and work through any conflicts that arise. This requires a level of trust in the organization. As Patrick Lencioni writes in his book, *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team*, “Teams that lack trust are incapable of engaging in unfiltered and passionate debate of ideas. Instead, they resort to veiled discussions and guarded comments.” As Lencioni describes, this inability to engage in conversations that bring forth the underlying beliefs and assumptions of the team ensures that the group as a whole be
unable to wholeheartedly commit to the decisions the group makes. This lack of commitment and buy-in will later manifest as an avoidance of accountability and inattention to the results.\textsuperscript{206} When the team dynamics fail, it leaves the members feeling isolated and disengaged from the larger process. Developing the workstream implementation Plan allows the leadership teams to evaluate the group dynamics and make any needed adjustments prior to entering into the Implementation phase.

The outcome of Plan development is to have a final document, ready for presentation, outlining the details of each workstream for the duration of the eleven-week Implementation phase. In addition, the workstream owners should be fully engaged, committed, and excited about executing the Plan they have established. When the team is engaged it will display as a willingness to hold healthy discussions and collaboration regarding the best long-term solutions and a willingness to work through conflict to arrive at a solution that both meets the needs of the organization and is one that the team can execute.

Scope is important during this phase of the project. Just as the potential projects were scaled down to the “doable” projects during the prioritization phase, it is very likely that during the process of developing the Tactical Implementation Plan the team will discover that the work required exceeds the eleven week timeframe of implementation. It is important for each team to scope the workstream so that the tasks can be successfully completed within the allotted time. When tasks exceed the implementation timeframe, it is acceptable to include stretch goals into the implementation and forego the scheduling of these until the next phase of the project. By putting stretch goals onto the formal Plan,
workstreams can identify the next actions to be taken and, should tasks complete early, the stretch goals can then be pulled into the current workstream.
Everybody on Board - Plan Signoff

“A strong vision and purpose acts as a kind of strange attractor, allowing individual creativity while acting as a natural constraint to behavior that is detrimental to the team.”207

-- David Whyte

The Plan reportout is where the proverbial rubber meets the road. Unlike the storytelling style of the Diagnostic and Design reportouts, the Plan reportout functions as the formal project launch. The objective of this meeting is for the executive leadership team to demonstrate their commitment and understanding of their workstream and to empower the workstream owners and support teams to execute the established Plan.

The sites used in this study each utilized the same basic format. After the workstreams completed their implementation plans, and had their plan reviewed by the executive sponsor, a meeting was called for the entire site executive leadership. During this review meeting, each workstream sponsor presented the detailed form covering the salient points with a description of how the high level actions would support the overall site objectives. This pre-reportout meeting served two purposes: 1) to ensure that the workstream sponsor was informed and aligned with the objectives of the workstream, and 2) to inform the remainder of the executive leadership and ensure alignment with the overall site objectives. Once agreement executive leadership has had the opportunity to resolve any concerns regarding the planned implementation, it is then time to schedule the formal signing ceremony.
The Plan reportout consists of an official signing ceremony. All of the implementation plans are printed at least 17 inches wide by however many pages are needed and posted side by side on a wall where the daily and weekly status meetings will be held. This may be the team “war room” or other conference area sufficient to hold the weekly status meetings.

The Plan signoff meeting is chaired by the site’s senior executive and should include the full executive leadership team, all the workstream owners, and all of the support staff. Beginning with the first workstream, each Executive Sponsor provides a brief overview of the main deliverables of their workstream, introduces the staff that will be responsible for delivering on the tasks. Then, along with the site’s senior executive, the Executive Sponsor signs the Plan as a symbol of their commitment to the project’s success. At the sites I have worked with, this has been a celebratory time of much excitement and encouragement. To emphasize the commitment aspect, I asked the executives to sign using a red pen, a not-so-subtle reference to signing in blood. Silly as that may sound, the significance of the gesture was not lost as evidenced by the spontaneous cheers after each signature. Like the christening of a ship, Plan signing is the official launch of the Implementation Phase of the transformation project.
IMPLEMENTATION

“The professional steels himself at the start of a project, reminding himself it is the Iditarod, not the sixty-yard dash. He conserves his energy. He prepares his mind for the long haul. He sustains himself with the knowledge that if he can just keep those huskies mushing, sooner or later the sled will pull into Nome.”

-- Steven Pressfield

The Implementation phase of a site wide transformation will always be specific to the goals and objectives of the individual organization. This is still true, as was the case in the projects that began this study, when the corporate objective is to make all of the Business Units operate with the same internal structure. The reason for this is that each site begins at a different starting point. The objectives outlined in the detailed implementation plan guide the content of the necessary work. What is common across sites are the project management skills and techniques that are a requisite for smoothly navigating the eleven-week Implementation phase. Even the most brilliant design will not implement itself. Therefore, in this section the topics covered will address the project management tools utilized onsite during the Implementation phase of the projects that form the base of this work.

While not an exhaustive list of all the possible management skills, covered in this section are the basic requirements, that when implemented, provide the site with the tools necessary to successfully execute implementation of the project. This is a description of the project management tools utilized during Implementation of the projects I have
worked on. These are the nuts and bolts that hold the project together by providing the structure, accountability, and communication necessary for completion.

There are, however, always challenges that arise during Implementation. Individual opposition and resistance to change is one of the most difficult, and often derailing components of the transformation process. Change is challenging, even good change. How the individual, team, and site work through the personal and organizational shadows is vital to project success. A detailed discussion of resistance is included in Part III.
Daily Progress & Priorities

“Today, two things stand out: the extraordinary level of connectedness of the organizations we are creating, and the interdependent and volatile environments we are operating in. ...This connectivity and volatility mean that we have to manage in a very different way. Keeping pace with the pace of change is essential to success. We can’t do that through our traditional top-down control mentalities, but we also can’t do it with no structure and total chaos. Continually finding the right balance between too much and too little structure will be a key to having the adaptive capabilities to survive.” ²⁰⁹

-- Marv Adams, Ford Motor Company

Although eleven weeks may, on the onset, seem to be sufficient time to complete all the objectives outlined in the Plan, the actual experience of Implementation is that the time easily slips away. There exists, in large and engrossing projects, the tendency to work head down on the task at hand, only to find upon looking up that the whole of ones effort was spent on everything except the task that mattered most.

In order to maintain the project scope and focus, it is important to have every workstream owner status their project at least once a day. And, in my experience, twice a day is optimal. The first site I worked on held daily leadership huddles in the morning and workstream owners reported only in the afternoon. What I discovered with this format was that the workstream owners, the ones whose effort most impacted the success of the project, ended up starting their day with whatever crisis met them when they walked through the door. Because their attention was immediately drawn to the crisis-de-
jour, the tasks of the workstream were inevitably delayed. In subsequent sites the format was adjusted so that the workstream owners meet twice daily, first in the early morning and again in the mid to late afternoon, 7:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. What I discovered is that the early morning focus set the tone for the daily priorities giving the support teams clear priorities that allowed them to meet the established schedule. Afternoon meetings then provided the team with the opportunity to debrief on the activities of the day while making available the remaining several hours of working time for resolving any outstanding items prior the following morning’s meeting. These frequent meetings offered bite-sized time segments that better enabled the staff to appropriately scope activities. It was not uncommon in the morning meeting for a workstream to be challenged on the amount of work it expected to complete that day. Comments akin to “Are you really planning on saving the world by lunch? How are you going to do that?” were offered from others as a way to support the overall project. Likewise, the team would also challenge objectives that appeared too easy or tasks that had lingered several days. These comments sounded like “Seems like that task has been hanging around for a long time. Do you need help?” Challenging a too-simple task would sound like “That task seems pretty straightforward. Can you help me understand the complexities that require all day for completion?” or “What else is going on for you today?” These types of accountability conversations are only possible when each member of the team trusts that the comments come from only a desire to help the overall team objectives and are not intended to scapegoat or assign blame.
At each site the teams will find their own cadence and it is important to work with the owners to discover the level that works best at each stage of the process. Part of the daily review is ensuring that all the components are working smoothly and making adjustments when necessary. This is also true of how the meetings are conducted in terms of frequency, location, and attendance. Daily workstream meetings are brief, succinct, and focused on the operational execution of the Plan. Although led by the transformation leadership, it is the workstream owners that are responsible for the content. In order to facilitate these meetings a 4x6 foot whiteboard was used with the following format marked off with tape:

![Daily Workstream Status]

**Figure 5. Daily Workstream Status**
Each workstream has a separate column that is updated by the workstream owner prior to the morning meeting. In actual practice, the most efficient time to update the board is after the daily brief-out when the requirements for the next day are fresh in everyone’s mind. This allows for the team to leave for the day knowing that the next day’s work is already planned. Any post-brief out changes are easily updated prior to the morning brief in meeting.

Along the top of the board are the names of each workstream with a status of Red, Yellow or Green. Colored dry-erase markers or colored magnets work well for providing a quick visual status. Using the same color scheme as traffic signals, a Green status indicates that the workstream is on schedule to complete all of the Plan sub-actions in alignment with the schedule. Alternatively a Red status indicates that issues have been identified in one or more sub-actions that will delay their scheduled completion. Yellow is used to indicate that issues have been identified but it is not yet clear if there will be a scheduling impact. Yellow is a warning that something is happening even if the outcome is unclear.

The Due Today box is used to document the deliverables for the current day or, should there be no task due to complete, the tasks the workstream will be doing for the day. The Upcoming box functions like the workstream’s radar – it reminds the workstream and informs the site of what is coming up and when, thereby providing visibility to upcoming deliverables. The bottom box is for noting any risks to meeting the Plan and the steps being taken to resolve the problems. These daily updates for each workstream identify the priorities, progress, risks, and risk resolution keeping the
workteams motivated and accountable. Needing to have something new to say each day keeps the project from stalling.

The agenda for the meetings are as follows:

**Morning Brief-in Agenda**

- What are we going to do today?
  - What are the objectives?
  - What does victory mean for us today?
- What can get in the way?
  - Scheduling conflict?
  - What help do we need?

**Afternoon Brief-out Agenda**

- Current Status (Green, Yellow, Red)
- How did we do today?
- Action Plan – if Red/Yellow what are we doing to resolve the issues?
- Top 3 Priorities

These daily briefs are just that, brief. Each workstream has a maximum of two minutes to convey their information. To this end, it helps to provide a script for the team to follow while everyone gets accustomed to the practice. The morning script goes as such:

*Workstream ______ will be working today on _______, _______, and _______. Our victory today will be ____________________. There is a schedule conflict today, which is ___________. We need support from ___________ regarding ___________. Afterwards I would like to touch base with ___________ about __________.*

Likewise, the afternoon brief-out script is:
The status of the __________ workstream is (Red/Yellow/Green). Today we completed __________, ____________, and ___________. We (did/did not) achieve our victory of ___________ because of ____________. We are _____ days behind on High Level action ___________ specifically sub-actions ___________. Our action plan to resolve this is ___________. Our top three priorities are __________, __________, and __________.

Note that in the brief-out script the workstream owner has the opportunity to both identify the challenges that kept the team from victory as well as give accolades to the team members who contributed to the team’s daily success. The brief out is a daily accountability of the team’s actions. Accountability, however, will feel like Dad-on-a-bad-day when the sole focus is on the team’s failings and the contributions are dismissed. Daily accountability is hard work. Give credit where it is due.

Twice daily meetings can, on the onset, appear to be overly burdensome to the workstream owners. However, the effect of bookending the day with these meetings is the creation of ritual space in which to do the work of transformation. The objective of the morning meeting is to set the focus and intent for the day’s activities. The afternoon conclusion meeting is the summary of what was accomplished. By establishing this ritual of morning and afternoon briefings the workstream owners and transformation team maintain alignment throughout the implementation by providing a specific space for issues, concerns, and needs to be addressed in a timely manner. Most Implementation problems arise from un-communicated expectations. Providing this ritual space for expectations to be addressed early and clearly maintains the forward trajectory of the
project. Ending the day assured that the team met its victory for the day, however small, allows the team to feel good about their progress and leave the work at work until the next day.
Weekly Status & Risks

“One of an organization’s most critical competencies is to create the conditions that both generate new knowledge and help it to be freely shared.”

-- Margaret Wheatly

The weekly reportout is the key event of Implementation. This meeting, held each week on the same day, is scheduled for a full hour and replaces that day’s afternoon brief-out. In attendance at this meeting are all of the workstream owners, the transformation leadership team, workstream sponsors, and the executive team. The weekly status meeting is chaired by the highest-ranking site executive. The objectives of this meeting are as follow:

1. Maintain alignment throughout all levels of the organization on the status and expectations of the overall project
2. Assess the progress of each workstream
3. Share successes and challenges
4. Ensure that the activities are producing the desired results
5. Identify and address any risks to the project
6. Course correct when necessary
7. Provide an open forum to answer questions and share insights

Due to the cross-functional nature of the implementation plans and the need for the deployment leadership to have an end-to-end understanding of the business,
workstream owners and sponsors are expected to be in attendance for the duration of the meeting. While it replaces the daily brief-out, the weekly status is a higher-level reportout designed to ensure alignment with site objectives as measured by the key performance indicators.

While the workstream owners report on a daily basis, it is the task of the sponsors to deliver the weekly report. This arrangement maintains the involvement of the workstream sponsors by keeping them current on the activities of their team.

Weekly accountability allows the Deployment Leaders to status their own Plan and storyboards, thus making whatever course correction is necessary to keep the overall site transformation on target.

Prior to the weekly meeting, each workstream is responsible for “pulling status” on their Plan. Pulling status consists of drawing a vertical line on the Plan for the day of each weekly status. (See Appendix D) In the subject projects, the weekly status happened on Thursday afternoon. Figure 6 is an example of the pulling status. When a sub-action is not completed on schedule, the line points back to indicate a missed date. Conversely, an arrow pointing forward indicates that the schedule has been brought in. A Plan status goes to RED when any sub-action is delayed. A GREEN status indicates that the Plan is on or ahead of the planned schedule. Where a workstream can indicate a Yellow status during the daily meeting, Plans have a status of either RED or GREEN.
Figure 6. Weekly "Heartbeat" Status
The agenda for the weekly meeting is as follows:

**Weekly Status Agenda**

- Workstream Status (Red/Green)
- Action Plan if status is Red
- Successes and Challenges
- KPI status
- Insights gained

Priorities for the upcoming week

A sample workstream status could sound like this:

_The Materials workstream is Green again this week. The mid-month slowdown in receipts allowed us to enlist the part-time assistance of two buyers from the purchasing department to help complete the attribute verifications of the high dollar parts. Thanks to Joey and Cindy for pitching in, I appreciate your help. With the additional staffing, we were also able not only to complete the verifications that were due this week but also to bring forward the schedule for next week’s batch. As a result of our efforts, we have seen a 15% overall drop in material shortages on the floor with zero shortages for the parts already aligned with the database. We have learned that we underestimated the time needed to do the system verifications, a problem that will only increase as we move into the larger volume of low-dollar piece parts. In order to meet the Plan schedule we are 1) increasing the staffing on the verification tasks, 2) deferring non-essential and non-Plan projects and, 3) bringing in the start dates whenever possible. Does anyone have questions or concerns?_

The key to an effective weekly status is transparency. When priority is given to the daily tasks, the weekly tasks invariably stay on schedule and when the weekly tasks
stay on schedule, the overall Plan schedule is maintained. While the weekly status meeting doesn’t tell the workstream anything it doesn’t already know, the function of the meeting is to gain a higher perspective on the overall project and ensure alignment with the guiding vision, communication to/from the executive team, and an assessment of the site level metrics. In addition, schedule and staffing conflicts can best be prioritized and resolved when everyone is aware of the larger picture.

Without this weekly touchpoint, the deployment leadership can feel “out of the loop” missing the connections between the activities of the Implementation Plan and the overall objectives of the project. When individuals feel disconnected from the larger vision, cross-functional issues easily go unaddressed and, therefore, unresolved. When site-level key performance indicators begin to stall for “no reason,” chances are that the site has lost the connection between the daily activities and the metrics they are intended to influence.
Weekly Reflection & Skill Building

“The person [or group] who has eaten his shadow spreads calmness, and shows more grief than anger. If the ancients were right that darkness contains intelligence and nourishment and even information, then the person who has eaten some of his or her shadow is more energetic as well as more intelligent.”

-- Robert Bly

Training and skill development is the easiest to skip, and yet one of the single most important parts of the Organizational Change Process structure. It is vital that the skills to run and manage a sixteen-week transformation are transferred to and throughout the Business Unit. During the first sixteen weeks, when the Business Unit is learning the process, it is difficult to fully grasp the administrative and conceptual framework that guides the transformation without formal training. It is insufficient to simply deploy the tools without an overall understanding of the process. Likewise, simply putting a group of people in a room is, at best, a shot in the dark for developing teams. Training the deployment team on the organizational dynamics they will encounter during the transformation process prepares them for success. As was mentioned at the beginning, while no substitute for the experience of traversing the terrain, having a map and being familiar with the local customs makes the traveling richer, deeper, and lasting in its learnings.

There are two components to training: skill building and reflection. Skill building is about honing the craft of leading transformative groups. Skill building addresses
learning the techniques of the midwife to support, guide, and create the safe space for the
new life to enter. Transformation, like birthing, is not without labor and pain. Managed
well, however, the transformation team has the ability to support the site through the
process of delivering the new future state envisioned in the Design phase. Without the
skillful midwifing of the transformation team the project may arrive at the end of the
sixteen weeks lifeless and stillborn, cast aside as simply another failed attempt at
organizational change. Birthing is not without risk. Developing the transformation
midwifing skills significantly increases the odds of delivering a healthy and functional
project.

The skills needed by the transformation team are as follows:

1. Technical expertise in designing systems and processes that meet the need
   of the organization
2. Project structure, tools, and administration
3. Understanding of how each component fits into the overall project
4. Diagnostic skills for problem identification and resolution
5. When and how to effectively course correct

Appendix E contains a sample training outlined that was used on my second
project.

Training for the transformation team has two functions, first to educate the team
and build the skills necessary for them to lead the site project and second, to train-the-
trainer by also encouraging the reflective capacity that will allow the transformation team
to take the role of trainer for the remainder of the site. A good model for developing the skill base is: see it, do it, teach it.

Regular and ongoing training is necessary for the team to not only develop the basic skills but also to remain aligned with the evolving standards of the organization. Without training the team runs the risk of developing the very silos it is seeking to dismantle. Skill building and information are the lifeblood of the transformation project and are vital to its sustainability over time. As Joshua Foer writes in *Moonwalking with Einstein*, “Memory is like a spiderweb that catches new information. The more it catches, the bigger it grows. And the bigger it grows, the more it catches.”212 The greater the memory and knowledge capacity of the deployment leadership, the greater the capacity is for the site to utilize the right tools, at precisely the right time, and for the correct problem. Effective education and training allows the Business Unit to fully utilize the resources available and develop the skills and capacities necessary to lead and execute future transformation projects.
Executive Training & Coaching

“The potent force that shapes behavior in these organizations and in all natural systems is the combination of simply expressed expectations of purpose, intent, and values, and the freedom for responsible individuals to make sense of these in their own way. Organizations with integrity have truly learned that there is no choice but to walk their talk.”

-- Margaret Wheatley

Similar to the weekly team reflection time, training and coaching of the site’s executive leadership provides targeted skill building in an environment where weaknesses and vulnerabilities can be openly addressed and worked through. Transformation is about a new way of managing that is the antithesis of the top-down command and control model that the majority of senior management “grew up with” in their careers. Rather than punishment and reward, power in transformed organizations is about information and using that information to feed the collective wisdom. As Wheatley writes, “We’re working with networks, not billiard balls. We don’t have to push and pull a system, or bully it to change; we have to participate with colleagues in discovering what’s important to us. Then we feed that into our different networks to see if our networks agree.” As with any new skill, this style of collaborative inter-dependent leadership is not necessarily self-generating. Leaders throughout the organization need to be exposed to new concepts, ideas, and ways of working together. Despite the plethora of business books available, executive level jobs do not come with an instruction manual.
It is the role of the transformation leadership to provide the executive and workstream sponsors with the education and training they need to be successful in their roles as champions of the project. Executive training is different, however, from the process training of the deployment leadership. Executive training must be direct, succinct, and operational. Success of the overall project depends upon the effective functioning of the executives for the simple reason that an organization cannot deliver what the leadership cannot model. Site-wide transformation requires trust, collaboration, and accountability. If these capacities are missing in the executive suite they will not be able to manifest broadly in the larger organization.

To this end, the executive leadership training and coaching must include the skills and capacities for them to walk their talk:

1. Effective team and group dynamics
2. Working with conflict
3. Leading through change

Without effective training and coaching, executive leaders may feel left out of the process and that the transformation process is something that is happening to them rather than arising from the greater needs of the organization as a whole. Additionally, without sufficient role modeling of appropriate skills and behaviors, long-term sustainability of the project is jeopardized as the leadership avoids accountability and disengages from the project.
Reassessment & 100 Day Sustainability Plan

“It is important that what is now living within you not to be allowed to decay. Tend what is seeded and nurture it to flowering.”

-- Robert Sardello

The 16 weeks of the first transformation project should address approximately 60% of the total actions necessary to achieve the future state. As Implementation draws to a close, it is time for the workstreams to evaluate what has been accomplished and develop a sustainability plan. Continuing with the skills developed in the Planning phase, the team develops a new Plan to ensure sustainability of the gains already achieved, and to address the remaining activities needed to complete the project. The primary focus of the 100-day Plan is to ensure the continued growth and development of the skills, capacities, and collaborative problem solving developed during the transformation.

The deliverable from this step in the transformation process is the collaborative development of the 100-day formal sustainability Plan that allows the business to embed the culture of continuous improvement. Sections included in this 100-day Implementation Plan address the following items:

1. How do we sustain the gains made in the first eleven weeks?
2. How will we know when we are losing ground?
3. What else needs to be accomplished to achieve the vision of the future state?
During Implementation the workstreams will almost certainly discover the need for adjustment in the existing plan. The 100-day sustainability Plan is the vehicle to include these learnings and insights.
End of Transformation Reportout – Lessons Learned

“It seems to me,” said Edward, “that you won’t have had the proper series of adventures unless you’ve gone through thick and thin.”

Avi, The End of the Beginning

In the children’s story, The End of the Beginning, a snail and an ant take off on a grand adventure that leads them, after many experiences, to the end of the branch. Pondering their current position they ask themselves, are we at the end of the branch or the beginning of the sky? Like the sixteen-week transformation journey, the answer is both, but mostly it is the end of the beginning.

As has been the case in the previous reportouts, the end of the project is a time of sharing. Rather than hanging a banner and declaring the project over, the final reportout is a reflective time to review what worked, what didn’t, and make plans for the future. It is the end of the first wave of transformation, and the beginning of a new way of being in collaborative community. It is a changing of the guards as the initial transformation team leadership steps back handing over the reigns to the site. If the work has been done well the transition will be swift and easy. As an external lead I found this to be a time of mixed emotions. The site staff had done well and risen to excel at the tasks they accomplished. They were eager to take over and it was my job to let go. On both of the major sites I stayed while the team developed the Plans for the second wave but they didn’t need me. They were fine on their own. It was bittersweet as I saw these teams that I had come to know so well move on without me. Teams that once felt like deer in
the headlights had grown into consummate professionals, assured and capable. I wouldn’t have it any other way. The end of the first sixteen-weeks was also the beginning of the next phase of their growth.
PART III: THE BACKSTORY

“The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways: the point, however, is to change it.”

-- Karl Marx, The German Ideology

Mapping to The Inner Counselor Process™

“The fatal metaphor of progress, which means leaving things behind us, has utterly obscured the real idea of growth, which means leaving things inside us.”

-- Gilbert K. Chesterton

Having discussed the context and the process of organizational change, it is time to reflect on the insights gained and to begin the discussion of where this learning moves the discussion going forward.

The Inner Counselor Process™

The model of organizational change as presented in this work is set upon the foundation of The Inner Counselor Process® as defined by Dr. Ann Nunley. *The Inner Counselor Process™ (ICP™) is a transpersonal methodology that uses experiential guided imagery and cognitive-behavioral logic to uncover the source of dysfunctional patterns.* Taking between twenty to forty minutes, the 15-step Inner Counselor Process™ engages an individual in a hypnagogic state of consciousness providing access to the emotional and somatic experience that underpin the issue. Additionally, a
cognitive-behavioral component utilizes Maslow’s concepts of Deficiency Motivation vs. Growth Motivation in order to establish or reestablish positive meaning and direction in life. It is this dual pronged approach within an explicit organizational structure that engages the transpersonal dimensions to shift the individual from Deficiency Motivation to Growth Motivation – a change that results in a transformation within the personality – that distinguishes the ICP™ from other behavioral change modalities.

The ICP™ refers to the dysfunctional reaction and the associated somatic experience as the Old Symbol. With the assistance of the facilitator, an individual connects with their higher wisdom to transform the dysfunctional reactionary patterns of the Old Symbol into healthy and empowered reactions that are then represented by the New Symbol.

Given the nature of guided imagery, the ICP™ asks the individual to describe the dysfunction through the prompts “What does it look like? What color? What shape?” Through the process of depersonalizing the feeling into imagery, the ICP™ incorporates these images, or symbols, as containers for the gestalt of old and new reactionary patterns. It is the stored emotional energy encapsulated within the Old Symbol (image) that provides the “juice”, for the transformational process.

The central themes of the ICP™ include: 1) the identification of the automatic reactionary pattern, 2) identification of the intrinsic need, 3) the protective intent of the current behavior, and 4) the activation of a new and automatic response that allows the intrinsic needs to be met. Central to the ICP™ is that the New Symbol replaces the Old Symbol behavioral patterns yet retains all of the protective intent inherent of the Old Symbol. In other words, the New Symbol is a grown-up and empowered version of the
Old Symbol and since the power of the Old Symbol is transmuted it is thereby
incorporated and available to the New Symbol.

To understand the effectiveness of the ICP™ we must include a brief discussion
of the underlying assumptions that frame the ICP™ work.

Transpersonal Dimensions

The classical understanding of Plato and Aristotle placed humans within the
hierarchy of nature that was referred to as The Great Chain of Being. This classical
understanding places mankind higher than the natural world of rocks and plants, yet
below the level of angels and God. Different levels of The Great Chain of Being are
defined by a classical understanding of the difference in levels of awareness,
understanding, or consciousness. The theory is that an animal has more awareness than a
rock, a human more than an animal, and God is placed at the top of the Chain
representing the highest level of awareness and knowing. While The Great Chain of
Being became integrated with a theological understanding of man’s relation to God and
the natural world, the concept of external awareness as comprised of distinct levels gives
rise to the understanding of internal levels consciousness within an individual.

As the metaphors of language demonstrate, a person of dim wit and devoid of
humor is considered to have the personality of a rock, a person with the tendency toward
identification with physical prowess is considered a beast, and one whose compassionate
nature exudes the wisdom of the ages is considered an angel or a saint. Each of these
metaphors identifies a level of external awareness that others perceive. The assumption
is that a rock is ambivalent to the surrounding environment, a beast is focused on primal
and physical self-based needs, and that the angel/saint has a higher perspective that

Figure 7. Drawing of the Great Chain of Being from Didacus Valades, *Rhetorica Christiana*
In the identification of internal levels of consciousness, natural world awareness including base needs for safety and survival is akin to the subconscious, the human level awareness including the interpersonal maps to conscious awareness, and Divine awareness including inspiration, insight and creativity equates to the super-conscious.

![Figure 8. Lower, Middle, and Higher Unconscious](image)

The Italian Psychoanalyst Roberto Assagioli (1888-1974) developed a more comprehensive description of consciousness through his development of Psychosynthesis. While Freud and Jung made distinctions between conscious awareness and impulses arising from below the level of awareness, Assagioli defined three levels of the unconscious, the Lower, Middle, and Higher Unconscious also called the Super-conscious. See Figure 8. The Field of Consciousness is the sum total of what is within normal conscious awareness and resides within the Middle Unconscious (Figure 9).
What we as humans are aware of includes the Self, or the “I”, that is both within the field of awareness and also aware of itself as being separate and distinct.

1. The Lower Unconscious
2. The Middle Unconscious
3. The Higher Unconscious or Super-conscious
4. The Field of Consciousness
5. The Conscious Self, or “I”

Figure 9. The Field of Consciousness

Sigmund Freud proposed that, “the surface, or manifest, level of life is but the top-soil of mental activity. Much of it happens at an unconscious level.”215 Freud (1856-1939) focused his Psychoanalysis work pioneering the understanding of psycho-sexual development and the role of the Lower Unconscious in the manifestation of symptoms and problem behavior. Alfred Adler (1870-1937), a contemporary of Freud, also sought to understand the role of unconscious motivations gives credit to Freud “for explicating the purposefulness of symptoms and for discovering that dreams were meaningful.”216 Where Freud’s Psychoanalytical approach centered on an individual’s repressed
(unconscious) psycho-sexual trauma, Adler’s focus included the larger family constellation, the child’s perception, and the child’s struggle to find a place of significance within the family dynamic. Adler addressed the communal nature of development by recognizing that a child’s behavior is formed as a result of adaptations made to the surrounding environment and social acceptance. *It is these childhood survival adaptations including their emotional and somatic components that are represented in The Inner Counselor Process™ as the Old Symbol.*

According to Adler, experiences are perceived through a lens that allows the individual to draw meaning from experiences based upon their cognitive ability to organize, understand, and predict events. Adler’s understanding of the *experiential subjectivity* is important in this discussion because it points to the development of the Imaginal Structures that define an individual’s perception of reality. Within the ICP™, the Old Symbol includes the adaptive behaviors and resulting Imaginal Structures that come from this Lower Unconscious.

A Contemporary of Freud and Adler was Carl Jung (1875-1961).

Jung’s description of the personal unconscious is similar to Freud’s, but more extensive. In Jungian theory, an individual’s personal unconscious [Lower Unconscious] contains not only material unacceptable to one’s ego and superego and therefore repressed, but also material unimportant to the psyche, temporarily or permanently dropped from consciousness [Middle Unconscious]. It also contains undeveloped parts of one’s personality not yet ready for or admitted to consciousness, as well as elements rising from the collective unconscious [Higher Unconscious].

The Collective Unconscious was the term Jung used to describe the “vast, hidden psychic resource shared by all human beings.” This collective unconscious is trans-personal, meaning that it exists beyond the boundaries of a single individual yet is
available to all. In addition to the concept of this vast reservoir of communal knowledge and experience, Jung also used the term *archetype* to describe an organizing principle and “dynamic nucleus of energy… [that] propels a person’s actions and reactions in a patterned way.” Jung viewed archetypes as energetic pathways flowing from the collective unconscious to the conscious and manifesting in specific and predictable behaviors. We will look further at the role of archetypes and their associated scripts in the discussion about resistance to change.

Figure 10. Assagioli’s Transpersonal Self

Assagioli asserted that the Transpersonal Self exists at the level of the Higher Unconscious and is necessary “to achieve a harmonious inner integration, true Self-realization, an right relationships with others.” When, in the ICP™, reference is made to the Higher Self, the reference is to Assagioli’s Transpersonal Self through which the
Higher Unconscious and the Collective Unconscious is accessed. It is from this Transpersonal Self and the Higher Unconscious that the New Symbol emerges.

The Inner Counselor Process™, in its original form, is designed to assist individuals in their psycho-spiritual development. The distinction between the therapeutic models of Psychoanalysis, Adlerian Psychotherapy, and Jungian Psychotherapy is that the therapeutic model seeks behavior change as a result of awareness alone. Transformational models, such as Psychosynthesis and The Inner Counselor Process™, grapple with “past wounding and dysfunctional patterns, then continue into deep exploration of the personality and then moves toward contacting and expressing one’s deeper sense of authenticity and life meaning.”223 Unlike behavior modification, issues of authenticity, meaning, and purpose within these transpersonal models are characteristics of a higher order consciousness consistent with Divine revelation. In other words, therapeutic or step-change is change within the rules and transformational-change changes the rules.

Transformation can be either large or small – it is not the size of the change that is the determining factor, but rather the quality. Where the step-change of therapeutic modalities modify behavior in the presence of the old patterns, transformational change, resulting from modalities such as the ICP™, render the old patterns irrelevant thereby allowing the energy, previously encapsulated within the old pattern, to be integrated within a new and self-sustainable behavior.

It is important to note that The Inner Counselor Process™ does not impose an external “fix” but rather operates with the understanding that the answers already exist
within the individual. The Inner Counselor Process™ uses the High Self or Transpersonal Self as the agent of change. A full outline for The Inner Counselor Process™ can be found in Appendix H. The question is then, how in a group or organizational setting, can the higher levels of consciousness be accessed to mine the collective wisdom?

Mapping to the Organizational Change Process

In the Organizational Change Process explained in Part II, the structure of The Inner Counselor Process™ was used to frame the group experience of organizational change. The OCP format for collective change utilizes a sequencing similar to that found in the ICP™ yet modified as to be accessible as a group experience. While using altered states of consciousness is not necessarily appropriate in a business setting, the Organizational Change Process utilizes the cognitive-behavioral structure of the ICP™ while substituting interactive group exercises and problem solving techniques such as games, mind-mapping, and value-stream mapping to provide the experiential component of the process. Tables 1 & 2 map the steps of the ICP™ with the OCP©. An overview of the full organizational change process is included in Appendix F. The central theme of both group and individual growth is the process of utilizing the energy and protective qualities inherent in the old patterns and subsuming these old patterns within a more comprehensive and highly functional new pattern. Unlike behavior therapy that utilizes techniques consistent with the scientific method to change behavior⁵²⁴, both The Inner Counselor Process™ and the Organizational Change Process are grounded in a transpersonal foundation that is more closely related to Gestalt therapy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Function</th>
<th>ICP™ Step</th>
<th>ICP™ Action</th>
<th>OCP© Step</th>
<th>OCP© Action</th>
<th>OCP© Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the automatic reactionary pattern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish a Place of Peace</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Statement of where you are</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is the issue and feeling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is it safe and advisable to address this issue?</td>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>Define the symptoms and behaviors that result from the current state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Go to a recent time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Let these feelings carry you to an earlier time</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Uncover the source of the current behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Describe the Old Symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncover the protective intent of the current behavior</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>Uncover the protective intent</td>
<td>Payoff</td>
<td>What does it get for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: ICP™ to OCP© Mapping Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of the intrinsic need</th>
<th>ICP™ Step</th>
<th>ICP™ Action</th>
<th>OCP© Step</th>
<th>OCP© Action</th>
<th>OCP© Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What do you truly WANT and NEED?</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>What do you need?</td>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>Does what you currently do get you all that you need?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The OCP© includes the ICP™ steps 6, 7 & 8 but switches the order.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ask for a New Symbol</td>
<td>New Idea</td>
<td>Imagine a new way of doing business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Commit to the qualities and protection of the New Symbol</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Key ideas/themes to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bring the two symbols together</td>
<td>Prioritize</td>
<td>Prioritize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experience the New Symbol absorbing the Old Symbol</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Assign deployment leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Advice from the New Symbol</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Develop A3s to outline goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>Assign workstream owners, field owners, and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Experience the New Symbol in action</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Develop Tactical Implementation Plan to cascade change throughout the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Energy Exercise Mapping Part 2</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Daily workstream progress and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share</td>
<td>Weekly workstream status and risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>Weekly team reflection and skill building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Align</td>
<td>Executive training and coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td>Develop 100 day sustainability plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: ICP™ to OCP Mapping Part 2
Utilizing the foundation of holism and field theory, the ICP™ and OCP emphasize the dependence on context for understanding behavior and experience.\textsuperscript{225} Gestalt theory, following the tradition of Freud, Adler, and Jung, focuses on the awareness process\textsuperscript{226} to facilitate behavior change. However, rather than substituting one behavior for another, The Inner Counselor Process™ and the Organizational Change Process facilitate the emergence of the new behaviors using a “transform and include” model described by Ken Wilber. The transform and include process allows the protective energy to transfer across behaviors thereby increasing the power of the new pattern. Additionally, it is the inclusion of the stored energy that provides the sustainability necessary for the new responsive behavior to manifest at the same automatic and subconscious level as its reactive predecessor.

Wilber maintains that “the self moves from impulsive needs to safety needs to conformist needs to autonomous needs, and each time it does so the needs of the previous stage tend to be replaced by those of the higher stage.”\textsuperscript{227} Characteristic of these higher stage needs is the desire for growth and self-actualization. Maslow describes, “so far as motivational status is concerned, healthy people have sufficiently gratified their basic needs for safety, belongingness, love, respect and self-esteem so that they are motivated primarily by trends to self actualization (defined as ongoing actualization of potentials, capacities and talents, as fulfillment of mission [call, fate, destiny, or vocation], as a fuller knowledge of, and acceptance of, the person’s own intrinsic nature, as an unceasing trend toward unity, integration or synergy within the person).”\textsuperscript{228}

Like the ICP™, the Organizational Change Process utilizes awareness to discern the pattern and secondary gain but differs from traditional behavior modification because
it transforms this cognitive understanding resulting in a shift from Deficiency Motivation to Growth Motivation. For example, an individual or group complies with a change in order to maintain employment they are operating from Deficiency Motivation whereas an organization that initiates change as an enabler for new opportunities is operating from a Growth Motivation. While this shift at the onset may appear subtle, the impact of the underlying motivation is a major factor in sustainability as growth behavior endures regardless of deficiency fulfillment. Additionally, by including the protective intent of the old pattern, the ICP™ and OCP establish appropriate growth based response patterns that will aid in fulfilling the core intrinsic needs.

Within the ICP™ the Old and New Symbols arise from the experiential component that is unique to the individual. In working with groups, however, the awareness of these behavioral patterns arise from shared experiences. How then, can this group gestalt be leveraged to facilitate organizational change?

As an organization begins to look within at the behaviors and adaptations that currently define it, re-visioning the dysfunctional patterns is a process not unlike identification of the “old” and “new” symbols of The Inner Counselor Process™. Using the process structure of the ICP™, the OCP leverages the insights from this re-visioning to establishing a clear change trajectory. When using the ICP™ based Organizational Change Process methodology with groups in a business setting, I have substituted the term symbol with metaphor, story, or narrative to encompass the shared group experience. While the language differs, the underlying ICP™ structure remains intact.
Metaphor and Story as Collective Agents of Change

The historical modalities covered in Part I focused on the objective tasks that comprise an organizational change initiative from five different vantage points: people, process, process and people, context, and environment. To address scientific and objective aspects of organizational change is in alignment with the way business has historically operated and is a familiar strategy for change management. What the traditional methodologies rarely address, if at all, are the interior or psychological aspects.

In 1916 Carl Jung wrote his initial paper on the topic of active imagination entitled *The Transcendent Function* that set forth his foundational concepts about the nature of the psyche and the role of the unconscious. Even at this early date, Jung was exploring the role of narrative and story in framing one’s understanding of reality. Jung’s use of active imagination arose from his attempt to interact with the unconscious to resolve the apparent polarities inherent within the psyche. As Joan Chodorow writes in her 1997 introduction to *Encountering Jung on Active Imagination,*

He found that there is an inborn dynamic process that unites opposite positions within the psyche. It draws polarized energies into a common channel, resulting in a new symbolic position which contains both perspectives. ‘Either/or’ choices become ‘both/and,’ but in a new and unexpected way. The transcendent function facilitates the transition from one attitude to another. 229

Jung studied and wrote extensively about the individuation process that allowed a person to hold polarities by entering into the archetypical and mythological aspects of their life. When working with groups, it is this role of story and active imagination that can serve as the vehicle to transmit the shared vision necessary for organizational alignment. In his book *Mirror and Metaphor,* Robert Romanyszyn asserts that the
metaphor or story refigures and reflects back to us the relationship between persons and their psychological life that allows us to “listen beyond the official language.”

In the same way that the Old and New Symbols of The Inner Counselor Process hold the gestalt of the automatic reactionary pattern (Old Symbol) and the more appropriate response patterns (New Symbol), the mythos of the organization is the script acted out by the characters or figures in the organization. Identifying and understanding the story-quality of the organization allows access to the deeper dimensions of the group’s psychological life. An imaginal understanding recovers the internal metaphorical reality that exists alongside the external reality and serves to inform the experience.

Each individual within an organization perceives the daily activities through the lens of their own experience and the narrative about its meaning. I propose that it is the multiple interpretations of an event that is the root cause of resistance to change initiatives and that these interpretations align with archetypical patterns.

When competing narratives exist in an organization, motives are questioned and alignment becomes impossible because individuals experience different realities. Although these realities are different from ours, they are just as real from the other’s perspective and “we have to take their statements to be as honest and true as ours, if we wish to understand their convictions and our own.”

As Romanysyn notes, “In the natural attitude of daily life we live on an empirical level with things, with others, and with our own bodies, which means we take these realities matter-of-factly as matters of fact.”

In order to change how situations are perceived we need to turn our attention to what is living energetically within the environment. Since the psychological elements are
not visible, we identify the energetics by studying the conceptual system through language and the actions that result from thoughts. We discern the conceptual models by identifying the metaphors. A metaphor is not a description of what is, but rather is similar to the experience of looking into a mirror and seeing what is reflected back. As Romanishyn notes,

A metaphor is no more a matter of what the eye sees than it is a matter of what the mind thinks. It is no more a question of perception than it is a question of conception. A metaphor neither discovers a fact which is already there, nor creates an idea out of nothing. On the contrary a metaphor embodies mind and minds the body. It brings mind to eye and incarnates mind.234

In effect, metaphors give us a holistic view of the subtle energies present within an organization in the same way that narratives are the containers of the group gestalt. Metaphors provide access to the conceptual structures that define everyday realities, inform behavior, and guide interactions with others.235

Organizational reality is reflected through shared metaphors. To exemplify this, Romanishyn uses the metaphor of a mirror. A mirror has two distinct properties, physical and experiential. Referring to the difference between the explanation of a mirror and the experience of the mirror, Romanishyn argues that the experience is profound because we interpret the reflected image as having depth and dimension in the same manner it is interpreted on this side of the mirror.

The reflection is not a flat projection lying on the surface of the glass, but the experience of a distance. Indeed, if I stay with the experience a bit longer, then I notice that this distance of the reflection is like the distance between myself and another. In other words, the reflection is not on the glass any more than it is in the mirror. On the contrary, it is like a ghostly other who inhabits that place over there.236

… What confirms this experience is the fact that in seeing the reflection I never look into the mirror as much as I look through it, or beyond it. In fact, the mirror
itself as an instrument of projection disappears to become a medium or a pivot or an axis through which the reflected and the reflection can communicate.237

Although always present, the narratives that reflect the underlying beliefs of an organization are generally transparent in day-to-day operations. Just as we see our reflection everywhere in our daily lives, it isn’t until something catches our attention that we notice the image. Something must be disrupted, changed, or put out of place for the reflection to bypass the brain’s automatic filtering. We notice not so much what is, but what is different. In this way, the metaphorical reflection is a remembered reality238 and that recovered memory can be shared through story. What we experience in the reflection are not the physical attributes, but characters in a larger story. As Romanyshyn notes, “The reflection is not the person but a figure in a tale, and yet the person who is re-figured in that way is the one who lives the story.”239 The mirror reflects back the physical attributes but it is the interpretation of those attributes that, when woven into the story, give the image meaning that is both subjective and objective.240 Romanyshyn writes, “The reflection does not matter: it is unimportant and immaterial. The experience of the reflection, however, does not let go of us so easily, and it is the reflection itself which refuses to be dismissed in this fashion.”241

Through the process of identifying the active metaphors and narratives, groups can reinstate the mythological character of the organization and thereby activate the mythic power necessary to effect alignment. The experience of the metaphor dismisses the natural tendency to disregard the image and thereby accept the primacy of one’s personal narrative as the only true reality. Shared metaphors allow for shared experiences within the landscape of active imagination and it is these shared experiences
that have the capacity to bridge the divide between self and other. When, as Romanythyn notes, “through the use of metaphor and story, we are able to substitute an idea for an experience, we create the space necessary for new insights to emerge.”

An organization is experienced not in the metaphors as much as it is through them. As David L. Miller writes in the forward to Romanyshyn’s book, “The function of reflecting by and in metaphors reveals the shadows and twilights in enlightened knowledges. It produces a humility of knowing in the face of the real obscurity of imagined clarity.” It is, therefore, through the use of shared metaphors that the individual experience of the Old and New Symbols may be leveraged to effect structural, behavioral, and psychological change through the process of active imagination.
Resistance

“Protest is when I say I don't like this. Resistance is when I put an end to what I don't like. Protest is when I say I refuse to go along with this anymore. Resistance is when I make sure everybody else stops going along too.”

-- Ulrike Meinhof

When it comes to change either at an individual level or within groups, the elephant in the room is resistance. C. Otto Scharmer in the book Theory U, describes resistance as, “the force that keeps our current state distant and separate from our highest future potential.” In other words, resistance is the common description of the Gatekeepers that, as we discussed earlier, attempt safeguard what is already known and familiar by limiting experience. As Scharmer describes, “Resistance comes from within. Resistance has many faces and tends to show up where the weakness is greatest. Resistance can operate with stealth and strike largely unrecognized by its victims.”

Resistance is normal, so normal as to be easily disregarded until the behaviors begin to significantly erode the progress of the transformation. Understanding the signs and symptoms of resistance aids in navigating the hazards that are always present within transformational landscape.

The Inner Counselor Process™ uses feelings and internally arising symbols to address the phenomena of resistance. However, this individualized approach is not always appropriate or an available option when working in a group setting or business environment. In order to effectively navigate within a group environment and disarm the
landmines of resistance, one must develop the skill of discerning feelings through the exhibited behaviors.

As a consultant, the most frequent requests for professional advice I receive center around the issue of conflict. Conflict is a perceived difference in needs manifesting as resistance behavior. In order to understand how to work with conflict, we must understand how resistance behavior tracks to the underlying needs.

**Behaviors**

Miller and Rollnick are two well-respected psychologists whose research in the field of addiction led them to develop an evidence-based approach to psychological inquiry called Motivational Interviewing. Distinguishing between change talk and resistance talk, Miller and Rollnick identify specific resistance behaviors and group them into four categories: Arguing, Interrupting, Negating, and Ignoring. Although Miller and Rollnick’s work addresses the client-therapist relationship, individuals manifest these same behaviors during the organizational change process. These three categories are comprised of multiple observable behaviors. Quoting from Miller and Rollnick, these are:

1. *Arguing.* The client contests the accuracy, expertise, or integrity of the counselor.
   
   1a. *Challenging.* The client directly challenges the accuracy of what the counselor has said.
   
   1b. *Discounting.* The client questions the counselor’s personal authority and expertise.
   
   1c. *Hostility.* The client expresses direct hostility toward the counselor.
2. *Interrupting.* The client breaks in and interrupts the counselor in a defensive manner.

   2a. *Talking over.* The client speaks while the counselor is still talking, without waiting for an appropriate pause or silence.

   2b. *Cutting off.* The client breaks in with words obviously intended to cut the counselor off (e.g., “Now wait a minute. I’ve heard about enough”).

3. *Negating.* The client expresses an unwillingness to recognize problems, cooperate, accept responsibility, or take advice.

   3a. *Blaming.* The client blames other people for problems.

   3b. *Disagreeing.* The client disagrees with a suggestion that the counselor has made, offering no constructive alternative. This includes the familiar “Yes, but …,” which explains what is wrong with suggestions that are made.

   3c. *Excusing.* The client makes excuses for his or her own behavior.

   3d. *Claiming impunity.* The client claims that he or she is not in any danger (e.g., from drinking).

   3e. *Minimizing.* The client suggests that the counselor is exaggerating risks or dangers, and that it “really isn’t so bad.”

   3f. *Pessimism.* The client makes general statements about self or others that are pessimistic, defeatist, or negativistic in tone.

   3g. *Reluctance.* The client expresses reservations and reluctance about information or advice given.

   3h. *Unwillingness to change.* The client expresses a lack of desire or an unwillingness to change, or an intention not to change.

4. *Ignoring.* The client shows evidence of ignoring or not following the counselor.

   4a. *Inattention.* The client’s response indicates that he or she has not been following or attending to the counselor.

   4b. *Nonanswer.* In answering a counselor’s query, the client gives a response that is not an answer to the question.
4c. *No response.* The client gives no audible or verbal reply to a counselor’s query.

4d. *Sidetracking.* The client changes the direction of the conversation that the counselor has been pursuing.

### Barriers

C. Otto Scharmer in his book *Theory U* identifies resistance behaviors, referring to them as barriers. Scharmer defines these barriers by identifying the voice with which they speak.

- **VOJ (Voice of Judgment):** Old and limiting patterns of judgment and thought. Without the capacity to shoot down or suspend the VOJ, we will make no progress toward accessing creativity and never reach the deeper levels.

- **VOC (Voice of Cynicism):** Emotions of disconnection such as cynicism, arrogance, and callousness that prevent us from diving into the fields around us.

- **VOF (Voice of Fear):** Fear of letting go of the familiar self and world; fear of going forth; fear of surrendering into the space of nothingness.

To Scharmer’s list I would also add:

- **VOS (Voice of Silence):** Passive-aggressive attempts at control through covert actions and back-room negotiations.

### Strategies

Additionally, the National Institute of Health in the UK identifies three levels of resistance. The NIH categories are an important part of the puzzle because they address resistance strategies. These levels are:
Level 1 – Information based

This resistance is based on information: facts, figures and ideas. This involves thinking, rational action, presentations, diagrams, and logical arguments.

Level 1 resistance may stem from a lack of information, disagreement with the idea itself, a lack of exposure or simply confusion. Don’t make the mistake of treating all resistance as if it were Level 1; different types of resistance need to be addressed in different ways.

Level 2 – Physiological and emotional reaction to change

Level 2 is a physiological reaction to the change. People’s response to proposed change is often based on fear: that they will lose face, friends, control or even their jobs.

… Imagine talking to your staff about a proposed restructuring. People ask you level 1 questions: ‘How much will it cost?’, ‘When will it begin?’, ‘What’s the timeline?’. Then you mention that there is a slight possibility that this could result in downsizing. Suddenly, two thirds of your team drops to level 2.

At this point it is a waste of your time speaking to the rational mind: your team are now responding from a different part of the brain. When they are working from level 2, people perceive the situation as dangerous and prepare for fight or flight – even when they aren’t aware of it.

Level 3 – Bigger than the current change

This is deeply entrenched stuff and is greater than the ideas at hand. People are not resisting the idea – they may love it – they are actually resisting you. They may resist because of their history with you, or they may oppose who you represent (e.g., management). Some traditional management – employee relationships are level 3. In these divisive relationships, no idea is judged on its own merits: the level 3 relationship almost guarantees that people will oppose your ideas.

Dealing with this level of resistance demands that you begin to rebuild relationships before presenting new ideas. Or, at the very least, your change management strategies must include ways of building bridges whilst you plan and implement.
Each of these definitions addresses a component of resistance. Miller and Rollnick focus on the behavior pattern, Scharmer identifies the voice, and NIH defines strategies of resistance. Linking these together we begin to see some patterning.

### Table 3. Resistance Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory U Barriers</th>
<th>Miller/Rollnick Resistance Behaviors</th>
<th>NIH Resistance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Judgement</td>
<td>interrupting (talking over, cutting off)</td>
<td>Level 1 - Information Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Fear</td>
<td>arguing (challenging, discounting, hostility)</td>
<td>Level 2 - Emotional/Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Cynicism</td>
<td>negating (blaming, disagreeing, excusing, claiming impunity, minimalization, pessimism, reluctance, unwillingness to change)</td>
<td>Level 3 - Bigger than the current change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Silence</td>
<td>ignoring (inattention, nonanswer, no response, sidetracking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of Affect and Archetypes

While the matrix in figure 11 describes and categorizes resistant behavior, it doesn’t address the underlying elements that precipitate the behavior. While Parts I and
II focused on the context and process of transformative organizational change, yet to be addressed are the questions, what is being transformed? and what is it being transformed into? In my master’s essays written in 2008, I addressed these questions by defining the relationship between the up and downdraft affects identified in the ICP™ integration chart proposing that the alchemical process of the ICP™ transmutes affect into an associated telos. Telos, the Greek word for “end,” is a term used by Aristotle to convey a purpose, goal, or capacity. In the group transformation experience, affect is also transformed and the resulting telos is then propagated throughout the organization manifesting in the form of new behaviors and overall higher level functioning.

In the case of group and organizational change, one affect arising early in the change process is that of fear. Donald Nathanson, in his book Shame and Pride, defines fear as part of a category of affects resulting in responses he refers to as “overmuch.” Nathanson describes this experience in infants:

Watch the face of an infant when too much seems to be going on at once, when information is pouring in to that central assembly system at a rate less than what is needed to produce surprise but greater than that optimal level capable of triggering interest. Quickly the baby begins to stare with fixed gaze at or just to the side of (a bit away from) whatever might be the source of the stimulus. All over the body individual hairs may begin to stand on end. While the face becomes cold, pale, sweaty, and uncharacteristically immobile, much more is going on inside. Fear will race the engine, speeding up pulse and respiration, amplifying attention and cognition at a fearful rate. Nearer the upper range of terror will appear additional somatic experiences, such as gripping sensation in the chest. The more adult the individual, the more knowledge and experience are brought into play to become part of fearful thinking – yet always accompanied by the staring face of fear.

As Nathanson notes, adults have the added dimension of prior experience and the initial fear “brings reminiscences of frightening scenes, which cascade upon our consciousness at a rate guaranteed to produce increasing amounts of fear. Too many
memories of too many dreadful situations may shift us from the discomfort of a scare to a
direful mood, especially when some of these images represent unsolved terrors of the past.
By linking memory to the affect of fear, Nathanson defines the conditions for
the development of the old reactionary patterns.

Where fear is triggered by external events for which the cause is unknown, Freud
distinguished fear from anxiety by defining anxiety as having a known source.
Within the discussion of resistance, the behaviors demonstrated are identical regardless of the
conscious awareness of the source. As we progress in the process of mapping affect to
behavior, the term fear will be used to denote both fear of an unknown source and anxiety
resulting from a known source.

The relationship between fear and the fight-fight response arising from the oldest
parts of the brain has been widely researched, however, unlike this simplified one-to-one
relationship, naming the affect does not provide a direct linkage to the variety of
resistance behaviors. As fear of change is a central theme in organizational
transformation, the affect of fear will be used as illustration.

Resistance behavior is always an attempt to slow down the pace of change.
Considering the four groups outlined by Miller and Rollnick, I propose that the type of
resistance behavior manifested is determined, not simply by the affect, but by the affect as
modulated by the archetypical pattern that is currently active.

Carolyn Myss, a contemporary writer, has identified four archetypal patterns
common across all individuals. Myss refers to these patterns as the survival archetypes
of the Child, Victim, Prostitute, and Saboteur.
Myss writes that these archetypes
“represent the issues, fears, and vulnerabilities that cause us to negotiate away the power
of our spirits within the physical world. …All four archetypes influence how we relate to material power, how we respond to authority, and how we make choices.”

Each of the four survival archetypes has a unique signature that can be used to identify the underlying pattern of behavior. For example, central to the Child archetype are issues around dependency and responsibility. Adaptations developed in childhood that shaped individual beliefs regarding the behaviors necessary for survival are held within the Child archetype. The Child also is the container for wonder, innocence, play, and learning through experience.

When the Child cannot get what it wants it will feel sorry for itself, and it is here that the Victim archetype may first become activated. While the archetype may manifest as seeking sympathy, the Victim is the keeper of personal boundaries and self-esteem. As Myss notes, “The lessons associated with the Victim archetype demand that you evaluate your relationship to power, particularly in your interactions with people with whom you have control issues and need to construct personal boundaries.”

The Victim archetype is closely aligned with the Saboteur archetype that “usually makes itself know through disruption”, Myss notes. “The Saboteur is the mirror that reflects your fears of taking responsibility for yourself and for what you create.” Operating under the belief that safety exists where there is no accountability, the Saboteur is fearful of change, especially change that requires accepting ownership of one’s actions.

One strategy to ensure safety in the physical world is to solicit the Prostitute archetype. As Myss notes, “The Prostitute thrives most bountifully in subtle ways and in ordinary, everyday circumstances. It comes into play most clearly when our survival is
threatened. Its core issue is how much you are willing to sell of yourself – your morals, your integrity, your intellect, your work, your body, your soul -- for the sake of physical security." The Prostitute negotiates. However, when the pull to negotiate is confronted, the Prostitute archetype can be the personal champion that fiercely challenges us to address situations that are toxic to our soul.

Empowering and Disempowering Scripts

Archetypes are simply patterns, and as such they are neutral. Archetypes can, however, manifest in either an empowered version that serves as a guide to fulfilling one’s life purpose, or in a shadow version that disempowers. Myss refers to this dual expression as the light and shadow aspects of an archetype – those that help and those that hinder the fulfillment of our spiritual development. Nunley also refers to this dual expression when she identifies the updrafts and downdrafts associated with intrinsic needs. Speaking from the perspective of affect theory, Nathanson collaborates this duality by describing how affect manifestation shifts with the overlay of either shame or pride.

Nathanson identifies nine innate affects and groups them into positive, neutral, and negative. The two positive affects are interest-excitement and joy, the single neutral affect of surprise-startle, and the negative affects of fear-terror, distress-anguish, anger-rage, dissmell* 264, disgust, and shame-humiliation. Nathanson argues that the affect of

* Nathanson uses the term ‘dissmell’ to convey “the sense of some interference with the act of smelling” noting that, unlike all the other senses, olfaction connects directly to the amygdala bypassing the pre-processing function of the cerebral cortex. Physical response to noxious odors is automatic and accompanied by the desire to distance from the offending smell.
shame is distinct because shame is not self-arising. The affect of shame can only exist within the context of another affect. Understanding the role of shame is important in the discussion of change resistance because shame regulates the spontaneous affect thereby down-regulating authentic response. According to Nathanson, shame is triggered when there is an impediment to the originating affect. Beginning with an example of shame in response to the positive affects, Nathanson writes,

The affect program for shame-humiliation is triggered in those common situations when an impediment occurs but whatever had been a competent stimulus for interest, or enjoyment remains a competent stimulus for those affects. In other words, shame affect is a programmed response to an impediment to preexisting affect when there is every reason for that preexisting affect to continue! Shame affect is a highly painful mechanism that operates to pull the organism away from whatever might interest or make it content.

In the presence of positive affects, the overlay of shame will dampen the exuberance in favor of a more socially acceptable response. This dampening effect also holds true in relation to the negative affects. The announcement of company layoffs will invariably initiate the affect of fear in at least some of the employees. The direct response to the fear affect is a fight-flight response. To run away and hide or to directly challenge management is not necessarily appropriate in the middle of an all-hands meeting. Recognizing, even at the subconscious level, the embarrassment that the direct response would cause, shame is triggered to down-regulate the fear response. Nathanson explains,

This cognitive shock, this transient inability to think, lasts but a moment before it is replaced by a flood of new thoughts as, quickly, we become aware that we have been “hit” by an affect. As if in swift compensation for its brief failure, our cognitive apparatus now makes access to its script library to find and organize all information relevant to shame affect; one attempts to see what script this new experience fits, or whether a script must be changed. Such is the cognitive phase of shame, the period during which feeling begins to blend into emotion. By and
large, it is the history of our prior experiences of shame and the importance to us of these painful moments that will determine the duration and intensity of our embarrassment.268

The experience of shame is uncomfortable at best and intolerable at the extreme. At the other end of the axis is the feeling of pride. Nathanson identifies pride as the successful attainment of a wish or want through the process of planning, taking action, and accompanied by amplification of the positive affects of excitement and joy.269 Nathanson identifies an axis where shame and pride exist as the polarities. Affects for which there is an active shame script will active defensive down-regulating strategies that are not activated in the presence of pride scripts. It is my belief that it is the presence of shame or pride that is the determining factor in the expression of the innate affects and the form of the expression is modulated by the archetypical pattern that is currently active.

The scripts that the cognitive function seeks in order to understand the feeling, fall into two categories: acceptance in the presence of pride, and defense in the presence of shame.270 Nathanson has organized the four major patterns of defensive scripts into what he refers to as the compass of shame. The points on Nathanson’s compass are: withdrawal, avoid, attack self, and attack other.271 The scripts that comprise the compass of shame are employed for the purpose of making us feel different272; they are
the learned coping mechanisms and automatic response patterns that provided protection when there was no alternative response available.

**Figure 11. Nathanson's Compass of Shame**

To link this discussion back to the issue of resistance, let me connect my understanding of the entire process from affect to behavior. As issues of control and self-advocacy are at the forefront of any organizational change process, the description will start with the affect of fear and proceed through to the resistance behaviors as defined previously by Miller and Rollnick.

The starting point is the trigger for the fear affect. What triggers the fear is less important than the fact that it does. How the affect is modulated is dependent upon the active archetype. For the sake of discussion, we will use a mandated organizational change as the trigger for the fear affect and explore the progression of the behaviors through the four survival archetypes.

The Child archetype will attempt to repeat or reenact patterns from childhood perceiving authority figures as parents and coworkers as siblings. If there is a shame overlay, the Child may attempt to withdraw from the situation or conflict by “being good” in an attempt to align with the authority figures. By citing existing policies and procedures or removing itself from conflict, the Child attempts to “not make waves.” The commonality of these behaviors is that they are all forms of the Voice of Fear. When challenged, the Child will respond by arguing through challenging, discounting, and hostility. This behavior represents the pre-verbal automatic response patterns that are
emotional and psychological. In effect, the Child throws a temper-tantrum. What the Child seeks is a security blanket and the assurance that everything will be OK.

When withdrawal is not an option, and a temper-tantrum is ineffective, the Child begins to feel powerless and victimized by the situation. This triggers feelings of low self-worth that is a characteristic of the shadow aspect of the Victim archetype. When the Child cannot get its needs met, the Victim archetype attempts to gain the sympathy of others by complaining. *Too much, too fast, and no one values my opinion* are all statements originating from the Victim archetype. The Victim speaks with the Voice of Judgment and manifests in behaviors that interrupt. Talking over and cutting off conversations are attempts to maintain the victim status by avoiding responsibility for its actions. The strategy of the Victim is to use information-based arguments as proof of victimization: *Yes, but I can’t do this because they haven’t done what they were supposed to.* When dealing with the Victim archetype one feels as if sucked into a black hole.

Without someone to blame, the Victim archetype losess power. When the attack-self method is ineffective an alternative to attack someone else. Attack Other is a strategy of the Saboteur archetype and comes in Voice of Cynicism. The Saboteur archetype is both self-destructive and undermining of others. In a business environment the Saboteur is inattentive to detail, fails to communicate, fear mongers, withholds information, and is oppositional. The Saboteur justifies its actions by negating behaviors: blaming, disagreeing, excusing, claiming impunity, minimalizing, pessimism, reluctance, and an unwillingness to change.273 The Saboteur poisons an organization because the Saboteur perceives the problem as being bigger than the current change.
Eventually sabotage strategies will fail as others recognize the patterns and begin to discount the validity of the Saboteur’s arguments. It’s deal-making time.

The Prostitute archetype attempts to control the situation by negotiating with ulterior motives. Operating quietly in the shadow, the Prostitute runs a covert operation aligning with the most powerful in exchange for safety. The Prostitute avoids confrontation doing nothing that would draw attention. The Prostitute uses the Voice of Silence by missing meetings and not following through on assignments. Inattention, non-answers, no response, and sidetracking are all ignoring behaviors. Like the Saboteur, the house filled with mirrors, the Prostitute avoids and deflects.

Decoding Behavior through Modulating Archetypes

Not all of the archetypes are necessarily activated in response to an individual affect trigger. The archetypes that will activate are dependent upon what is currently living within the transformational landscape of the organization, group, department, or individual. The survival archetypes operate as a team and when one strategy fails another
will rise to take its place. However, when the archetype-behaviors are identified, and the underlying needs are met, the progression through the archetypes can be arrested. A summary on the following diagram maps (Table 2) the fear affect with a shame overlay to the behaviors of the modulating archetypes:

**Table 4. Fear Affect Behaviors with Shame Overlay and Modulating Archetypes**

If shame was the only overlay to the affects, change of any kind would be exceedingly difficult. Thankfully, the telos of fear is courage and the light aspects of the archetypes, combined with the updrafts from the ICP™ integration chart, are activated by the overlay of pride. With the pride overlay, the Child responds to the fear affect with competence and the Voice of Belonging. Still working at the emotional and psychological level the behaviors that manifest are those of connection, inclusion, reconciliation, forgiveness, playfulness, excitement, and courage.

With the overlay of pride, the Victim is confident and speaks with the Voice of Confidence to discern what works and what doesn’t. Using information-based strategies, the empowered Victim shares information, makes decisions, exhibits flexibility, has a sense of worthiness, and can use clowning as a type of self-based humor. With the pride overlay, the Victim archetype is watchful for signs of danger.

As the Saboteur and Prostitute are concerned with issues greater than the current change, the pride overlay enables the manifestation of behaviors that further project success and create a climate of continual improvement that can span beyond the immediate challenge. Pride activates the Saboteur’s light aspects that include mentoring and the Voice of Advocacy. Motivating through coaching, mentoring, creating harmony,
With a pride overlay, the empowered Saboteur empowers others to reach their goals. The empowered Prostitute is unafraid of being seen and actively engages others through listening, taking the lead, advocating, and participating in difficult conversations. Table 3 shows the matrix with a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modulating Archetype</th>
<th>Pride Overlay</th>
<th>Voice of ...</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Change Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Voice of Belonging</td>
<td>Connecting (inclusion, reconciliation, forgiveness, playfulness, excitement, courage)</td>
<td>Emotional/ Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Voice of Confidence</td>
<td>Discerning (sharing information, making decisions, flexibility, worthiness, clowning/self-based humor)</td>
<td>Information Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saboteur</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Voice of Advocacy</td>
<td>Motivating (coaching, mentoring, harmony, consensus, synergy, empathy, situational humor)</td>
<td>Bigger than the current change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitute</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>Voice of Choice</td>
<td>Engagement (listening, taking the lead, advocating, engaging others, participating in difficult conversations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Fear Affect Behaviors with Pride Overlay and Modulating Archetypes
Shame and pride are measures of competency and, as a result, of self-worth and ultimately self-actualization. As adults, the workplace is where we have the opportunity to grow. Organizational transformation is a learning opportunity both for the organization as a whole and for the individuals that comprise the group. The work of transformation requires dedication, attention, and intention – the same characteristics attributed to spiritual growth and development. Each task undertaken, every challenge accepted, writes another chapter of the internal narrative about who we are and what we bring to the table. As Nathanson writes,

Success – at any age – tells us something about our size, our skill, and our growing degree of independence from those who previously have performed these tasks on our behalf. In normal development, independence is inextricably linked with pride. It is our measure of competence. Failure – at any age – tells us something about our size our skill, and our dependence on others. It is a measure of incompetence, and therefore a major stimulus to shame.274

Shame and pride are, in effect, allies in the growth process. The more conscious we become of the underlying needs that drive behavior, the greater contribution we can make to the overall growth and success of the groups and organizations we are a part of.
Where it goes from here

“We need to give each other the space to grow, to be ourselves, to exercise our diversity. We need to give each other space so that we may both give and receive such beautiful things as ideas, openness, dignity, joy, healing, and inclusion.”

-- Max de Pree

Dysfunction, both in organizations and individuals, is an opportunity for rewriting the old scripts of the Imaginal Structures. When the world is viewed from a place of shame, the tools of imagination and creativity become unavailable. Rewriting the old scripts creates a sense of pride, competence, and confidence that we can handle whatever comes our way – it enables telos to emerge. _We heal organizations to the extent that we heal the dysfunctional patterns that comprise the organization_. When individuals have the skills, resources, processes, and means to be successful in their work, competency and self-worth increase and workers develop pride in both their work and the organization as a whole. An organization operating primarily with a pride overlay will exhibit the behaviors of a world-class organization.

This work has looked at the context, process, and underlying resistance to organizational change. There is, however, much that still needs to be explored to fully understand about how archetypes modulate affect response. I believe that it is the addition of archetypal patterns into the cause-effect equation that will give richness and dimension to the ongoing study of who we are as humans in community. Understanding
the patterns that drive behavior and the triggers that activate these patterns continues to be an ongoing inquiry. The Age of Reason provided tools to measure external cause and effect with great efficiency. With a firm grasp on quantification and the physical world we can send a man to the moon and explore the stars. The greater the understanding of our internal processing and the subtle workings of subjective meaning making, the more accurately and effectively we can mine the treasures hidden within the depths of consciousness.

_The only work that will ultimately bring any good to any of us is the work of contributing to the healing of the world._

-- Marianne Williamson
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Current Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Target/Goals/Desired State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Root Cause Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Select the Best Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Build the Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Implement Monitor &amp; Adjust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Measure &amp; Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Learn &amp; Continue the Cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Company: |
| Team Members: |
| Customer: |
| Topic: |

**Start Date:**
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# APPENDIX B
## Workstream Resource Allocation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstream Name</th>
<th>Workstream 2</th>
<th>Workstream 3</th>
<th>Workstream 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMO</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops/IT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Marketing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purch/Logistics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMO</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workstream Name</td>
<td>Workstream 2</td>
<td>Workstream 3</td>
<td>Workstream 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMO</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops/IT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Marketing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purch/Logistics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates allocation for the respective workstream.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-action</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Tactical Implementation Plan (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstream Name</th>
<th>Executive Sponsor</th>
<th>Transformation Team Lead</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>6-Jan-14</th>
<th>12-Jan-14</th>
<th>19-Jan-16</th>
<th>26-Jan-14</th>
<th>2-Feb-14</th>
<th>9-Feb-14</th>
<th>16-Feb-16</th>
<th>23-Feb-14</th>
<th>2-Mar-14</th>
<th>9-Mar-16</th>
<th>16-Mar-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**APPENDIX C**

**Tactical Implementation Plan**
APPENDIX D
TIP Heartbeat Status
## APPENDIX E

### Sample Team Training Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill 2</th>
<th>Transformation Training Plan</th>
<th>Level Needed</th>
<th>Number of Trainings</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Expected Train Date</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Still</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid: Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High: Senior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample Team Training Schedule Details

- **Skill 2:** Transformation Training Plan
- **Level Needed:** Low: Junior, Mid: Manager, High: Senior, All Staff
- **Number of Trainings:** 1
- **Trainer:** Still
- **Expected Train Date:** TBD
- **Audience:** All
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Symptom of this step being skipped or incomplete</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>State the <strong>WHERE</strong></td>
<td>Identify the <strong>QUANTITATIVE reasons</strong> for change</td>
<td>Quantitative reasons provide the basis for data driven Key Performance Indicators.</td>
<td>Group/Organization fails to see how the metrics reflect their daily activity.</td>
<td>A clear &quot;statement of fact&quot; that addresses the objective business reasons for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Define the symptoms and behaviors that result from the current state</strong></td>
<td>Identify the <strong>QUALITATIVE reasons</strong> for change</td>
<td>Identification of the symptoms gives the organization an opportunity to &quot;air the dirty laundry&quot; by taking a close look at the qualitative ways the dysfunction manifests. This step provides a baseline of the culture by identifies the current mental models.</td>
<td>Difficulty in understanding the &quot;meaning&quot; of the metrics. Failure to recognize why the change is important to them.</td>
<td>Leadership can openly and honestly discuss the process and structural causes rather than personalizing the symptoms. Engagement from all members of the team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work to uncover the source of the current behavior</strong></td>
<td>Place a context around the current process</td>
<td>Context is important because it fills out the story. Numbers tell &quot;what&quot;, content addresses the &quot;why&quot;. Dysfunctions are adaptations to prior problems. Understanding why the adaptation is in place normalizes the behavior, reduces blaming, and allows focus to move to the solution.</td>
<td>Justification for the current dysfunctional methods. Identification of the symptoms gives the organization an opportunity to &quot;air the dirty laundry&quot; by taking a close look at the qualitative ways the dysfunction manifests. This step provides a baseline of the culture by identifies the current mental models.</td>
<td>Resistance to change Using other people/departments as the reason change can not be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>What does it get for you?</td>
<td>Articulate the <strong>payoff and gain</strong> from the current state</td>
<td>We get product out the door. It gets corporate off our backs. Firesighting creates heroes. Leaders need to recognize why the change is important to them.</td>
<td>Lack of ownership and clarity in taking the next step.</td>
<td>Ability to determine if the current process is based on fear (this happened before and we don't want it to happen again), or function (we did this because we needed...).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you currently do get?</strong></td>
<td>The individual or organization must clearly identify why the current system isn't getting them what they need.</td>
<td>The individual or organization must clearly identify why the current system isn't getting them what they need.</td>
<td>Ongoing justification for keeping status quo.</td>
<td>Ongoing justification for keeping status quo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify the gaps</strong></td>
<td>Identify the gaps between the current state and the future state.</td>
<td>Identification of the gaps opens the space for possibility of the new state to take root.</td>
<td>Reverting back to the prior state even after successful changes have been made.</td>
<td>Definition of what homeostasis looks like. Homeostasis is the set point, the default behaviors and patterns that will surface as soon as individuals (or organizations) feel stress. Knowing what to look for is vital to being able to recognize the small changes that precipitate larger regressions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagnostic Phase**

**APPENDIX F**

---

**Developing Change that Sticks**

© Katherine Hunter, June 2013

Page 3 of 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Symptom of this step being skipped or incomplete</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Idea</strong></td>
<td>Imagine a new way of doing business. What does it look like? What attributes does it have?</td>
<td>The goal is to blend the individual narratives into a compelling collective narrative that aligns the organization across departments. This allows for the development of the mission &amp; vision statements, the compelling reason to move forward.</td>
<td>No one (and no department) is &quot;the one&quot; all by themselves. Each part is both unique and part of the whole, but it is the relationship - the departments in community that fuel’s transformational change as opposed to step change.</td>
<td>Lack of engagement. Poor alignment to the overall vision.</td>
<td>Visioning board or other tangible display of what the new state will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
<td>Develop a list of the themes that need to be addressed. Identify the high level elements of the future state map. Listing the items provides a framework for moving forward.</td>
<td>Increase capacity 30% Employee Satisfaction 100% On time in full to promise</td>
<td>Lack of focus</td>
<td>Burning Platform / Measures for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prioritize and pick the top 3 or 4 items.</strong></td>
<td>Identify the top needs for the future state map.</td>
<td>Working on everything is overwhelming and disperses both energy and resources.</td>
<td>Cell redesign Material Availability SIOP Standard Work</td>
<td>Losing direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lead</strong></td>
<td>Assign deployment leadership from the executive committee (GM and direct reports). Empower the leadership to lead. The community can only demonstrate what the leadership can model.</td>
<td>Sales, Inventory &amp; Operations Planning - Operations Employee Turnover - HR Upstream Process Reengineering - Program Mgmt</td>
<td>Lack of Executive Ownership of the process</td>
<td>Workstream Sponsors Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sell</strong></td>
<td>Develop storyboards to outline goals and objectives for each of the top items. Tell a story.</td>
<td>Provide a documented outcome of the Design phase.</td>
<td>What does it look like? How is it going to help us? How will we know when it is active? (Key Performance Indicators, performance boards)</td>
<td>Sponsors feeling &quot;out of touch&quot; with the workstream tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recruit</strong></td>
<td>Assign workstream owners, field owners, and support personnel</td>
<td>Elist workstream owners and task owners. Transformation can not be mandated, it must arise from within the organization.</td>
<td>Workstream owners and task owners actively participating in diagnostics, brainstorming, and problem solving steps.</td>
<td>Lack of group ownership Lack of TIP owner participation in daily reportouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design Reportout</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Why</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Symptom of this step being skipped or incomplete</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Develop Tactical Implementation Plans to cascade change throughout the organization</td>
<td>Workstream teams identify the tasks needed to accomplish the workstream objectives.</td>
<td>Empowering the workstream owners and site to develop the plan encourages cross-functional collaboration and ownership of the transformation process.</td>
<td>Workstream owners and task owners working in close alliance with the leadership team to develop the plan.</td>
<td>Workstream owners fully engaged, committed, and excited about executing the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Daily Workstream Progress and Priorities (Leadership Team Chair)</td>
<td>To keep workstreams on task and on priorities</td>
<td>Realtime updates for each workstream identifying priorities, progress, risks, and risk mitigation keep the workteams motivated and accountable.</td>
<td>Loss of focus, Uncommunicated expectations, Project slows or stalls</td>
<td>Attendance log for each meeting with action items and risks identified for followup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Weekly Workstream Status and Risks/Mitigation</td>
<td>Higher level reportout to ensure alignment with site objectives/Metrics</td>
<td>Reporting out to the executive management keeps them involved and participating in the transformation. Weekly involvement allows the Deployment Leaders to status their own storyboards and thus make whatever course corrections are necessary to keep the overall site transformation on target.</td>
<td>Deployment leadership feels &quot;out of the loop&quot;</td>
<td>Heartbeat status line posted, Risk Register updated, Workstream metrics updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Weekly team reflection time and skill building</td>
<td>As the face of the transformation, the leadership team (transformation leads and analysts) need to lead by example. This includes the development of skills through mastery of the transformation framework, teambuilding, coaching/mentoring, and conflict management.</td>
<td>1hr, 2x week development sessions led by the Division Leads</td>
<td>Lack of alignment to evolving standards, Silos within the team, particularly around workstreams.</td>
<td>Organization is able to fully utilize the resources available and has the skills and capacities necessary to lead any subsequent project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Executive Training/Coaching</td>
<td>Training, skill and team building, transfer of knowledge to the site</td>
<td>The organization can not deliver what the leadership can not model.</td>
<td>Disengaged leadership team, Leaders feel &quot;out of the loop&quot; and that change is happening TO them, Insufficient role modeling of the skills behaviors needed to sustain the transformation, Lack of accountability, Inability do deliver results</td>
<td>Site leadership fully engaged, prepared (skills, capabilities and capacities), and committed to ongoing sustainability, Formal sustainability plan that allows the business to embed a culture of continuous improvement, Regression to prior dysfunctional patterns of behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tactical Implementation Plan Reportout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Weeks 6 - 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Training/Coaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INTEGRATION CHART**

From the INNER COUNSELOR © Ann Nunley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SURVIVAL and IDENTITY QUALITIES</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP QUALITIES</td>
<td>COHERENT QUALITIES</td>
<td>RADIANT QUALITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Active Self)</td>
<td>(Reciprocal Self)</td>
<td>(Transformed Self)</td>
<td>(Transcendent Self)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy: Masculine-Positive Pole</td>
<td>Energy: Feminine-Negative Pole</td>
<td>Ideal Qualities INTEGRATED</td>
<td>Ideal Qualities Radiating outward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SELF ACTUALIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
<th>FREEDOM</th>
<th>CREATIVITY</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>CONNECTION</th>
<th>ACCEPTANCE</th>
<th>Reciprocal LOVE</th>
<th>Unconditional PEACE</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Unconditional LOVE</th>
<th>JOY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL INNER QUALITIES</td>
<td>PERSONAL INNER QUALITIES</td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL INNER QUALITIES</td>
<td>GROUP INNER QUALITIES</td>
<td>COHERENT INNER QUALITIES</td>
<td>RADIANT INNER QUALITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Safety/Strength</td>
<td>1-Assertiveness</td>
<td>1-Reciprocity</td>
<td>1-Harmony</td>
<td>1-Integrity</td>
<td>1-LOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Abundance</td>
<td>2-Freedom</td>
<td>2-Sincerity</td>
<td>2-Gratitude</td>
<td>2-Self-knowledge</td>
<td>2-JOY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Courage</td>
<td>3-Creativity</td>
<td>3-Honesty</td>
<td>3-Gratitude</td>
<td>3-Compassion</td>
<td>3-Lucidity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Flexibility</td>
<td>4-Openness</td>
<td>4-Appreciation</td>
<td>4-Commitment</td>
<td>4-Commitment</td>
<td>4-Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Stamina</td>
<td>5-Control</td>
<td>5-Connection</td>
<td>5-Trust</td>
<td>5-Trust</td>
<td>5-Oneness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Vitality</td>
<td>6-Worthiness</td>
<td>6-Acceptance</td>
<td>6-Balance</td>
<td>6-Balance</td>
<td>6-Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Stability</td>
<td>7-I'm OK</td>
<td>7-Respect</td>
<td>7-Justice</td>
<td>7-Justice</td>
<td>7-Illumination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Grounding</td>
<td>8-Confidence</td>
<td>7-Respect</td>
<td>7-Justice</td>
<td>7-Justice</td>
<td>7-Illumination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT YOU NEED**

RESPONSIVE experience and expressions of ideal qualities.

**TO LIVE** (self to Life) | **TO INDIVIDUATE** (self to self) | **TO CONNECT** (self to another) | **TO EXTEND** (self to others) | **TO TRANSFORM** (self to Self) | **TO TRANSCEND** (Self to Universal)

**COPING reactions stemming from fear-anger, shame-blame, & guilt**

HOW YOU FEEL or REACT

**OLD SYMBOL CHARACTERISTICS**

1-Root | 2-Sacred | 3-Solar | 4-Heart | 5-Throat | 6-3rd Eye | 7-Crown

ey, Revised: February, 2007
Let your mind take you to a peaceful place. A place of beauty where you feel totally safe. Imagine the surroundings and colors. Hear the sounds. Breath the fragrances. Describe this place. In this place you feel calm, safe, strong, and centered. Invite your ("High Self") to be present and to be your guide for this journey. I will invite my (High Self) to be present as my guide.

Outline

What is the issue and feeling you wish to explore? (Feeling = emotion plus physical sensation)

Ask your ("High Self") if it is safe and advisable to address this issue and feeling at this time. (If not, ask to be shown an appropriate issue to address at this time). Are there additional wise and loving guides who would like to be present to help you with this issue?

Go to a recent time when you experienced this issue. Where are you? What is happening? What emotions do you feel? What sensations are part of those emotions? Where in your body are these feelings the strongest? (Inquire about core areas: throat, heart, stomach).

Let these feelings carry you to an earlier time. Ride the feelings back through time. Where are you? What is happening? How old are you? What emotions do you feel? Where in your body do you feel these emotions the strongest? What sensations are part of those emotions in your (locations?)

What do you truly NEED and WANT? If you could cry out and say, "I need!" "I want!" what would you ask for? (Dialog to arrive at intrinsic needs).

Be fully present in that experience. Feel the emotions and sensations in your (restate locations). Imagine that you can pull these feelings out and see them - let them take form. Describe their form. Do they have a color? Does this form have an attitude? This ("Old Symbol") represents your old coping pattern.

How did the ("Old Symbol’s") emotions, sensations, and attitude help you cope when your needs were not met? Can you thank the ("Old Symbol") for providing this response? Ask the ("Old Symbol") if it is willing for you to find a better way to cope so you can get what you truly need.

Fully sense your needs. Ask your ("High Self") to show you a New Symbol - someone or something that symbolizes the qualities and values that will protect you and completely fulfill these needs.

Will this ("New Symbol") commit to help you with this issue? Will you commit to the qualities and protection of the ("New Symbol")?

Bring the two symbols together. Have the ("New Symbol") show the ("Old Symbol") how its qualities will BOTH protect you and fulfill your needs. Will the ("Old Symbol") allow its form and its coping pattern to be completely absorbed and changed by the ("New Symbol") so you can get what you need?

Experience the ("New Symbol") completely absorbing the ("Old Symbol"). Is the ("Old Symbol") completely absorbed and transformed by the ("New Symbol")? (Dialog until this is complete). How does the (New Symbol) look now? (there may or may not be a change)

The ("New Symbol") has some advice that you need to hear right now. Listen and speak the advice out loud. Do (other guides - if there are any) have advice?

Be aware of the original issue and feelings. Feel the (New Symbol’s) qualities of (name qualities with location of each). Empower these qualities by asking them to provide you with a specific response to a specific situation in the next 24 hours. Describe the situation and your response.

Give the ("New Symbol") a place of honor within yourself and in your Place of Peace. Thank yourself, (any guides) and yourself (High Self). Complete the Energy Exercise and Healing Prayer.

ITE: Parenthetical phrases direct the facilitator to supply SPECIFIC information.
## APPENDIX I
Fear Affect Behaviors with Shame Overlay and Modulating Archetypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Modulating Archetype</th>
<th>Shame Overlay</th>
<th>Theory U Barriers</th>
<th>Miller/Rollnick Resistance Behaviors</th>
<th>NIH Resistance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Withdraw</td>
<td>Voice of Fear</td>
<td>Arguing (challenging, discounting, hostility)</td>
<td>Level 2 - Emotional/ Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Attack Self</td>
<td>Voice of Judgement</td>
<td>Interrupting (talking over, cutting off)</td>
<td>Level 1 - Information Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saboteur</td>
<td>Attack Other</td>
<td>Voice of Cynicism</td>
<td>Negating (Blaming, disagreeing, excusing, claiming impunity, minimalization, pessimism, reluctance, unwillingness to change)</td>
<td>Level 3 - Bigger than the current change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prostitute</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td>Voice of Silence</td>
<td>Ignoring (inattention, nonanswer, no response, sidetracking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX J

Fear Affect Behaviors with Pride Overlay and Modulating Archetypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Modulating Archetype</th>
<th>Pride Overlay</th>
<th>Voice of ...</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Change Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Voice of Belonging</td>
<td>Connecting (inclusion, reconciliation, forgiveness, playfulness, excitement, courage)</td>
<td>Emotional/ Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Voice of Confidence</td>
<td>Discerning (sharing information, making decisions, flexibility, worthiness, clowning/self-based humor)</td>
<td>Information Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saboteur</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Voice of Advocacy</td>
<td>Motivating (coaching, mentoring, harmony, consensus, synergy, empathy, situational humor)</td>
<td>Bigger than the current change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prostitute</td>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>Voice of Choice</td>
<td>Engagement (listening, taking the lead, advocating, engaging others, participating in difficult conversations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>