ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT
A CATALYST FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

Beth Applegate

Applegate Consulting Group

Abstract

This article is based on a framework for assessing and working with mental models and utilizing the exploration of 'dominant' worldviews to increase individual and organizational competency to identify, assess and shift worldviews to foster social change. The author describes her methodology and results during the data collection, data analysis, data feedback, and intervention phases of a consultation with a client. She reviews literature on white privilege, mental models, power, and cultural competency. The author reflects on implications of the engagement for the client, herself and the discourse on the role of OD as a catalyst for social change.

Keywords: Social justice, social change, worldviews, racism, cultural competency theory, organization development theory, mental models, feminist psychology, social identity, intersectionality theory, polarity management theory, feminist theory movement building theory, white privilege theory, values

Mental Models: the Personal Is Political

Worldviews and personal belief systems are shaped by mental models that filter information and limit a person's capacity to understand the workings of the world. Like values, these mental models are influenced by religion, race, age, gender expression, sexual orientation, class, and culture. All people subconsciously carry a repertoire of mental models that determine what they see, the interpretations they make, and the conclusions they draw about everything (Senge, Roberts, Ross, Smith, and Kleiner, 1994).

Mental models or thought patterns determine our behaviors, and strongly influence the success or failure of our efforts to change and shape and give meaning to reality. Most of them function outside people's conscious awareness; that is, the assumption that one holds an accurate and relevant view

of reality is most of the time unquestioned and taken for granted. Those who disagree, by default, are considered to be wrong or misguided (Zweig & Abrams, 1991; Adams, 2008).

According to the Grassroots Policy Project, a 'dominant worldview' includes a vision of society that follows five interconnected themes:

(1) Rugged individualism. The individualism as the heroic, rugged, go-it alone individuals of popular myth, the "lift yourself up by your own boot straps" individualism that is popularized in stories about the American Dream;

(2) Limited role for government. Anti-government themes and images are used to cast suspicion upon all government efforts at addressing social, economic or environmental needs. Government is inefficient, and wasteful – unless its purpose is to maintain social and economic order or to advance U.S. interests through military or police;

(3) Competition and the market (or 'market fundamentalism'). As an aspect of social relations, competition is seen as a natural force that separated out the winners from the losers. We each are free to make choices about what is best for ourselves. If someone is a loser in our economy, then they only have themselves to blame;

(4) Racism. The social construction of race and its use in subordinating people of color in all spheres of life is co-existent with the history of this continent and the United States;

(5) Sexism and homophobia. Although in various ways these themes have an equally long history, they have played an especially important role in the dominant world view in the past 30 years (Grassroots Policy Project, 2009).

Across fields and disciplines, researchers, OD practitioners, political organizers and social justice educators and the Academy have only begun to realize the importance of learning how to bring 'dominant' world views and mental models to consciousness and then to make intentional choices about whether to believe their meanings (Klein, 2001). And, unfortunately, there continues to be a paucity of inter-disciplinary inquiry and dialogue about what each field and discipline have in

common in order to strengthen our collective work toward systemic change for social justice.

The 'dominant worldview' and underlying mental models that prevail at the beginning of the 21st century are so far working to "preserve the status quo and hindering the sustainable initiatives that most people now *know* are necessary to preserve a choice-rich human presence on the planet" (Adams, 2008). For example, one of the most compelling dominant mental models that have been instilled in the U.S. white public is Internalized Racial Superiority defined as, "the complex multi-generational socialization process that teaches white people to believe, accept, and/or live out superior societal definitions of self and to fit into and live out superior societal roles, defined as Internalized Racial Superiority, is so widespread that we generally don't think about it" (Crossroads Ministry, undated).

For example, the U.S. government used laws and policies to establish a system of advantages and rewards. These successfully institutionalized racism, ensuring that white people benefited over people of color. A prominent example is the U.S. Constitution. The founding fathers drafted a document based on equality, liberty, the rights of men, and the pursuit of happiness. At the same time, this document excluded native peoples, women and defined African Americans as real estate (counted as three-fifths of a person for purposes of taxation) (Jensen, 2006).

During the New Deal, government-sponsored programs and policies continued to support white privilege and racism. These included the Social Security Act, which was set up primarily to benefit white male workers during the Depression. While many people with jobs could contribute to Social Security, millions more were not eligible. Among them were people of color who earned too little to participate (Kivel, 2002; Adams, Bell and Griffin, 1997; McLemore and Marcus, 1992; Said, 1993; Zinn, 1980; Leary, 2005).

The unprecedented transfer of wealth from the U.S. government through programs like Social Security the GI Bill and the practice of red lining, a discriminatory practice involving lenders which refuse to lend money or extend credit to borrowers in certain "struggling" areas of town. Redlining became known as such because lenders would draw a red line around a neighborhood on a map, often targeting areas with a high concentration of minorities, and then refusing to lend in those areas because they considered

the risk too high. The whole system of invisible and unearned assets still benefits white people today (Kivel, 2002; Adams, Bell and Griffin, 1997; McLemore and Marcus, 1992; Said, 1993; Zinn, 1980; Leary, 2005).

Peggy McIntosh, in her seminal work: "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies", defines white privilege as,

> "The unquestioned and unearned set of advantages, entitlements benefits and choices bestowed on people solely because they are white. Generally white people who experience such privilege do so without being conscious of it. Examples of privilege might be 'I can come to a meeting late and not have, my lateness attributed to my race;' 'Being able to drive a car in any neighborhood without being perceived as being in the wrong place or looking for trouble;' 'I can take a job without having co-workers suspect that I got it because of my racial background.' I can send my 16-year old out with his new driver's license not having to give him a lesson on how to respond if

police stop him" (Peggy McIntosh, 1988).

In the 21st century, modern racism has been defined as "the expression in terms of abstract ideological symbols and symbolic behaviors of the feeling that people of color are violating cherished values and making illegitimate demands for changes in the racial status quo" (McConahay, Hardee & Batts, 1981). The negative affect that accompanies these working assumptions and beliefs does not change just because of changes in law and practice. Rather the affect has to be submerged given the changes in what is viewed as legal and acceptable in current society (Batts, 1983).

In our recent history the 'dominant' worldview has framed news stories that touched on race like the O.J. Simpson trial, the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and more recently the news coverage of the confirmation process of Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor. Melissa Harris-Lacewell, Associate Professor of Politics and African American Studies at Princeton University, in her keynote address to the Applied Research Center's bi-annual Facing Race conference in September 2010 noted, "the rules of the

"reductionist post racial" game, mean "expect public punishment for asserting equality". The game rules allow Senators to "accuse her of racism, mispronounce her name while she cannot do the same" and yet "Sotomayor was praised for her dignity and rationality in the face of open hostility' (Harris-Lacewell, 2010). Another recent 'dominant' worldview media story, the incident involving Harvard Professor Henry Louis Gates Jr., illuminates what sociologist Joe Feagin calls the "white racial frame" with which most whites view racial matters (Feagin, 2001). Tim Wise, a prominent anti-racist writer and activist recently wrote, "[the white racial frame] says, among other things, that as long as you are respectful to police, nothing bad will happen to you (thus, if something bad does happen to you it was likely your own fault), and secondly, that there can be no racism involved in an incident unless the person being accused of such a thing clearly acted with bigoted and prejudicial intent" (Wise, 2009). The mainstream media reported since Gates yelled, and Crowley is not an 'old fashioned racist', the case is closed so far as the 'dominant' world view is concerned. At the 2010 Facing Race conference, Melissa Harris-Lacewell, challenged one of the assumptions in

the "white racial frame" stating, the Gates case demonstrated that, "simply because things are different does not mean that they are better" (Harris-Lacewell, 2010). She further noted that when analyzing the incident with Louis Gates Jr., through a privilege and power lens, because Gates is among the best and the brightest of Harvard, "your respectability will not save you. You can no longer be safe and equal even if you earn your citizenship through good behavior" (Harris-Lacewell, 2010).

OD Roots and Values

This article is a result of a number of questions I have been thinking about for many years. (1) How can the central ideas of OD founders and the historical influence of the progressive left intentionally inform OD practice in the 21st century as a catalyst for systemic change for social justice? (2) What core values, progressive worldview[6], core competencies and

---

[6] **Progressive Worldview** refers to reclaiming freedom, by connecting it with the social nature of self-hood and fulfillment. Freedom is linked to our inter-dependence and shared destinies. It can encompass the freedom to participate fully in creating the conditions of our daily lives, as participants in a vibrant civil society. It can be linked to having access to the resources that make such participation possible for all of us – health and wellbeing, education, good jobs, personal autonomy, access to common resources, including culture, art, and more. In this world view freedom is associated with the notion that

critical cultural competent[7] OD frameworks do OD practitioners need to hold in order to be able to answer the question: Organization development; to what end? With the answer: As a catalyst for systemic change and social justice.

OD is a field of social action and is an area of academic study. OD practice and theories have come, and continue to come from a variety of fields and disciplines and the gradual integration of the applications of management science, anthropology, biology, spirituality, psychology, sociology, feminist theory, power analysis and community and political

---

one person's freedom is diminished as long as others are not free. Grassroots Policy Project.

[7] **Critical Cultural Competency** analyzes systemic issues of privilege, power, and oppression and asks the question "towards what end?" (D. Finnerty, 2008). Critical Cultural competent practitioners use a variety of tools such as system theory, power equity group model, and action research to undercover root causes at the organizational cultural level. These tools become means to managing different social identities in ways that not only support people in being capable of functioning effectively in the context of cultural differences and critically incorporate the socio-political history and realities into the organizational cultural (Cross, T.L., Bazron, B.J. & Benjamin, M.P. 1996). The potential advantages of critical cultural competency for organizational or group performance are maximized, while the potential disadvantages of multiculturalism or diversity frameworks are minimized.

organizing frameworks, and models and philosophies of how change occurs.

The editorial board of the *Practicing Organization Development: the Change Agent Series for Groups and Organizations*, asserts, "OD is values-based system-wide process based on behavioral science knowledge. It is collaborative, and is concerned with the adaptive development, improvement, and reinforcement of strategies, structures, processes, people, culture, and other features of organizational life" (Hultman and Gellerman, 2002). Kurt Lewin (1946), one of the founders of the field, developed the action research model as a way to address social problems through research informed by action, and action informed by research. This sequence shapes the arc of OD consultation, which typically includes scouting, entry, diagnosis, planning, action, evaluation and termination.

Our roots are in the notions of human potential and development, empowerment equity, democratic processes and the importance of the use of self as a key to the practice of OD. While many readers may find individual resonance with the values described, the field of OD has not ratified a single set of uniform values or ethical principles to guide the behavior

of the professionals in the field; inform prospective clients what to expect; or establish ethical principles which are based on values shared by members of a profession (Freedman and Zachrison 2001). However, two primary OD institutions, the Organization Development Network (ODN) and the Organization Development Institute (ODI) have developed a list of OD Values and Ethical guidelines. Over a ten year period, ODN and ODI worked to specifically "establish ethical principles which are based on values shared by members of a profession" and involved approximately 2000 practitioners in its development. Currently, ODI is the only certifying mechanism in OD, but this is not universally recognized throughout the field.

My Core Values, Theory of OD Practice and Philosophy of Change

OD Practitioners hold a wide variety of visions and missions, personal and professional values that involve advancing more just, democratic, environmentally sustainable and humane organizations. When I think about the boundaries and context of the field of OD, I believe it is inextricably linked to advancing social justice, equity, democratic processes and

empowerment values. I'm clear that I work in the field of OD in an effort to create a better, healthier society and improve the human condition. The mental model, which frames my role with client systems, is rooted in three commitments:

1. To support client systems in their efforts to become healthier; and
2. To increase client systems' consciousness about the historical context of societal – isms affecting their health, and
3. To increase client systems' ability and willingness to make choices that advance system health and promote social justice by recognizing the interconnectedness between the individual, organization and society.

The theory of change that I employ builds upon the sociological theory of intersectionality which seeks to examine how— various socially and culturally constructed categories of identity such as gender and race interact on multiple and often simultaneous levels. The theory of intersectionality holds that the classical models of oppression within society, such as those based on race/ethnicity, gender, religion, class,

etc., do not act independently of one another; rather, forms of oppression interrelate creating a system of oppression that reflects the "intersection" (Szynanski, 2010).

My theory of change is further influenced by my core value that my freedom is diminished as long as others are not free. I have been influenced by over a decade of experience in my role as a political organizer and as an advocate of the "in-between spaces and intersections" of disciplines and sectors and the role of OD in movement building strategy[8] .

Finally, I strive through my OD work to challenge oppression and privilege and make visible the underlying assumptions that produce and reproduce organizational, societal and global structures of domination. As a result, client systems are more prepared to engage in alternative possibilities, create equitable organizational change processes, and make more informed choices that advance fair organizational structures and systems, promoting racial justice and social responsibility. Here in lies my theory of practice.

OD as a Catalyst for Systemic Social Change

The stated client-goal of my engagement was to create a long-term strategic direction for the national advocacy organization. We involved the client in a co-creation process of a well thought-out planned change process. There were clear consultation objectives identified during the contracting phase by the client: (1) the board and staff leadership explicitly chose to engage in a culturally competent strategic planning

---

3 **Movement Strategy** includes six foundational set of beliefs: (1) values and convictions about who they are as an organization, what they stand for and what kind of world they are trying to create; (2) Developing long-term strategies that are not focused on specific issues but on a broader transformative agenda; (3) Incorporating the development of 'critical consciousness' into their leadership development work so that more leaders have a deeper understanding of their organization's vision and strategies; (4) Consciously linking the range of issues that emerge from their leaders to this broader worldview; (5) Expanding entry points for people who want to be engaged in the organization by moving more of the "action" out of the center of the organization and into decentralized structures; and (6) Opening leadership structures at the core of the organization to expand the number and diversity of people determining the future of the organization. Investing more in issue-related coalitions and forgoing long-term strategic partnerships with other organizations. Zemsky, B., & D. Mann. Building Organizations in a

Movement Moment. Social Policy, Spring-Summer.

process[9], that is a strategic planning process that is, "a planning process for building relationships, without dominance, that lead to just outcomes and accountability" (Applegate, 2008). The process included the reexamination of the current organizational policies, practices and programs, their core values, vision, and mission, through a systemic lens of power, privilege, and oppression in order to develop long-term goals by the full board and staff and community stakeholders; (2) own, analyze, and share openly, knowledgeably, and compassionately both thoughts and feelings about the intersection of systemic privilege, power, and oppression in the organization as well as the different and overlapping individual cultural biases ; and (3) agreement to utilize Action Research as the overarching theoretical framework. Additionally, we created shared expectations about the outcomes of our work together, began negotiating the structure of the engagement, clarified mutual roles and interest, and confirmed

---

[9] **Cultural Competent Strategic Plan** utilizes action research, power analysis, and movement building strategies, to support the client in an ongoing and ever-deepening practice of building genuine relationships that lead to just outcomes and accountability without dominance within and outside organizational boundaries (Applegate 2009).

mutual commitment (Williams et al., 2000). We identified key stakeholders who would need to be involved to ensure organizational accountability to the community.

We began our engagement with data gathering in order to address both the presenting as well as uncover the underlying issues. Our data gathering included: 1) a document review of all existing vision, mission and core values statements, policies, practices, and programs; 2) a survey designed for each segment of stakeholders; and 3) separately facilitated focus groups with each segment of stakeholders.

The next phase was data analysis. The central task of the data analysis phase is to make meaning of the data that has been gathered. This involves "organizing and sorting data in light of increasingly sophisticated judgments and interpretations" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 130). We reviewed our goals for the meeting: (1) to present data and give stakeholders the opportunity to validate that data before it was used in future interventions and decision-making processes, and (2) to generate ideas and analysis around the self-identified consulting objectives of the client.

Based on the analysis of the data and the client self-identified goals,

we created a series of intra and interpersonal, group and organizational interventions including an analysis of organizational practices and policies, a series of trainings, utilization of Adam's Mental Models framework and an examination of the three levels of individual focus within an organization based on the Power Equity Group model. *Revealing and changing mental models* Pierce's work relative to the Power Equity Group model has defined three primary areas of individual focus which individuals play out in groups (Pierce, 1998):

Intrapersonal focused individuals are autonomous and highly individualized – they enter a group concentrating on themselves and their needs. Members of the organizations realized that when they choose this focus, they tend to withdraw within themselves for comfort or survival, connect to the group in a quiet private fashion, think in terms of what they need, and may or may not share these needs with others. **Interpersonal** focused individuals are rooted in their connection with others – their sense of being comes from their one on one relationships. Organizational members learned that when they choose this focus, they seek out someone they can bond with for comfort and support before engaging

with the group as a whole. In this mode, their work in a group is based on insuring strong connections with others. **Group** focused individuals are intent on viewing and tracking the group as a whole – they are strongly influenced by the movement of the group – how it feels and operates. Members of this organization observed that when they choose this focus, they pay attention to what is happening within the group, what they want to see happen, and assume a leadership role to make that happen. In this mode they tend to be consistent 'scanners' of the dynamics occurring in the group and are affected by these dynamics and the emerging group identity.

Through our work with the client system organizational members began to identify that differences in their level of focus can complement the organizational, coalition and movement capacity building work as well as complicate the way they view themselves, their role in the group, and their internal and external partnerships. Further they began to understand that the fundamental differences that result from these three distinct levels of orientation can lead them to misinterpret and judge the actions and thinking of others. As they became aware of their differences in focus the client began to

exhibit more flexibility in their styles, and reduced the opportunity for misunderstanding, conflict and tension in the overall "culturally competent" strategic planning process.

Mental models for systemic change for social justice are paradigms that value, and generate, respect for one's self, respect for other people, and respect for our earth. Operationally, mental models are intrinsically both personal and social.

To illustrate how prevailing 'dominant world view' and default mental models most often reinforce the status quo, making successful change difficult or impossible, I utilized a framework with my client system developed by John Adams (Adams, 2000a, 2000b, 2004, 2006) consisting of six dimensions of thinking: time orientation, focus of response, scope of attention, prevailing logic, problem consideration, and life orientation.

The group used a variety of exercises to reveal 'dominant' world views and prevailing mental models. Adams's six dimensions model footnoted in this article helped us explore the versatility of the mental models of the organization and its stakeholders, better understand the organization's comfort zone, and identify which 'dominant' world view and mental

models needed to be reframed in order to support systemic change for social justice. These processes resulted in demonstrable change in the participants' personal and organizational espoused mental models and a solid understanding of the good grasp of systems theory and an understanding of the application in the organization on the impact on the whole system as parts begin to change. Time will tell whether or not long-term action on behalf of the organizations will be sustainable and congruent with the espoused reframed mental models and a new understanding of the various systems within the organization which resulted from our work.

Case 1. Time Frame: Short Term vs. Long Term
Assessment

The data gathering had revealed that our client's typical day-to-day activities had increased significantly over the past few years and staffing levels had increased, but infrastructure planning lagged behind. The organization identified as a movement building organization. It was operating without approved strategic or operational plans. Because longer-term strategic aspirations had not been established, staff were constantly

struggling to meet existing fund-raising, program, and policy commitments—and were not able to engage in the long-term thinking and disciplined engagement necessary to create systemic change for social justice or a sustainable organization.

Change Goal

Based on the data analysis, the goal co-developed with the organizational leaders and community was: close the gap between their particular organization's focus on itself and the implementation of its short-term mandate and reframe the need to engage leadership and community members in long term strategies that are not focused only on the organization or specific issues but rather on systemic change for the long term (Zemsky and Mann, 2008).

Tools and Exercises

Fixes That Backfire is an exercise from *Fifth Discipline Fieldbook* (Senge, et al., 1994, pp. 125–129). We shared the story below (Senge, et al.) and then adapted a series of questions to raise awareness of and to reveal the prevailing mental models about time and utilized a modified world café design to facilitate multiple rounds of discussions based on the guiding questions.

How many times have you heard the saying, "The squeaky wheel gets the oil?" Whoever or whatever makes the most "noise" will often grab our attention. Now imagine someone who knows nothing at all about mechanics—and who, told hastily to grab oil, mistakenly picks up a can of water and splashes it on the wheel. With great relief, she'll hear the squeaking stop. But after a brief time, it will return more loudly as the air and water join forces to rust the joint. Once again, before doing anything else, she rushes to "fix" the problem—reaching for the can of water again, because it worked the last time. (pp. 125–129)

Often, although people are aware of the longer-term negative consequences of applying a quick fix, the desire to immediately alleviate pain is more powerful than consideration of delayed negative effects. But the relief is temporary, and the symptom returns, often worse than before; unintended consequences snowball over a period of time, continuing to accumulate as the expedient solution is repeatedly applied.

Reflection questions Included:

- How does the "fixes" story help you understand the unintended consequences of focusing on only what begs for immediate attention?
- How does the story help you identify the real problems that the organization faces regarding the focus on time?
- How can you minimize the undesirable or unintended consequences created by attending primarily to short-term organizational priorities or problems instead of longer term movement building and systemic change for social justice?

Outcome

Our work with this client produced insights in three key dimensions. First, they adopted as a new core value, "*critical cultural competency is a way of being—a way of viewing the world and showing up in all aspects of your life*" (St. Onge, (Ed.): Applegate, Asakura, Moss, Rouson, Vergara-Lobo, 2009).

To ensure that critical cultural competency became a way of life for the organization, it was essential to examine the organizational culture. We must see how this culture is shaped by individual mental models that filter all external information and unconsciously shape our understanding of how the world works. Board and staff leaders and community participants concluded that critical cultural competency is built over the long-term; it is not a "quick fix." Realizing that they faced an ongoing, iterative process, people began to think in five-year cycles for internal organization competency building and a much longer time frame for movement building and systemic change for social justice. This shift became a new way for the organizational leaders to think about the timeframe, resource needs for the longer term.

By the end of our contract, our initial efforts were viewed as the launch, or first cycle, to be followed by a practice and institutionalizing cycle and a final cycle where genuine breakthroughs would likely begin to occur.

A second dimension of critical cultural competent organization is *being able to hold and value multiple perspectives.* As Proust observed, "The real voyage of discovery consists not of finding new lands but of seeing the territory with new eyes." Intellectually the cognitive concept often sounds easier to "hold true" for clients, then it

actually is for them to master through practice individually let alone the group or organizational levels. As a result of our work the client system embraced the idea of "one mission, multiple perspectives" and pledged to hold it lightly and commit to the journey of practice. Again, Time will tell whether or not long-term action on behalf of the organizations will be sustainable.

Third, critical cultural competency implies systemic change for social justice. Although this organization was deeply rooted in racial equity and social justice, those ideals were not fully realized. White privilege and racism persisted. This provided an opportunity to live out its espoused values by building critical cultural competency. Through the combination of facilitation of small affinity groups, educational brown bag lunches, and skill building in the concept of use of self and system theory, the organization was able to successfully reframe the need to engage leadership and community members in long term strategies that are not focused only on the organization or specific issues but rather on systemic change for social justice for the long term.

Case 2. Focus and Response: Reactive vs. Creative

Assessment

Following the data gathering the client set a goal to move its leadership team, Board and community members beyond the polarization created by "either/or" thinking about power, privilege and oppression, and systemic change for social justice. Members instead wanted to develop "both/and thinking" that embraced multiple realities.

This organization was hierarchical in structure, and did not allow for constructive questioning; nor did it create an environment that fostered responsibility, learning or innovation.

Change Goal

In addition to the ongoing affinity groups, brown bag lunches and skills training, we served as "critical friends" and coaches to the leadership team, Board and staff and community members to help them understand their individual cultural biases in the context of the larger external system of power, privilege, and oppression. We trained all stakeholders in peer coaching and action learning so that they could establish organizational norms that would support them in the journey

toward establishing a more inclusive, respectful learning organization. The client also expanded their external engagement entry points for people who wanted to participate in the organization and expanded the number and diversity of people supporting the organization in its goal to impact systemic change for social justice through coalitional and development avenues.

Tools and Exercises

The following OD, social justice educator tools and exercises helped the organization move toward this goal.

Individual Cultural Location.

Culture was defined, for the purposes of this exercise, as the behaviors, norms, attitudes and assumptions that inform a group of people who are joined by common values, myths, and worldviews. We asked each person to consider where they have a connection to different cultures and to write down a name for this culture as well as some of its attributes. Then as a whole group we made meaning of the data gathered and applied it to the goal of expanding entry points for people who want to participate in the organization and expand the number and diversity of people supporting the organization in its goal to

impact systemic change for social justice.

Creating Common Agreements.

Additionally, we developed an exercise, Creating Common Agreements, to reexamine the mental models underlying both a hierarchical structure based on positional power—the "do as you're told" culture—and the lack of individual and collective responsibility within the organization. We built on previous exercises to help the leadership team better understand their individual cultural biases within the larger societal and organizational system of power, privilege, and oppression.

Outcome

The exercises helped bring to the surface the organization's 'dominant' world view and mental models and created a space for the leadership team members to express their values and desires. The common agreements that resulted reflected a set of culturally competent norms for the leadership team and the organization and established a foundation for creating innovative norms for the organization's future work. Members of the organization moved forward by aspiring to a new construct: building a respectful and critical culturally competent learning

community. *Respectful* includes characteristics such as active listening without prejudging or becoming defensive, and not withholding, shutting down, or demonizing others when difficult issues are raised. *Learning* means "leaning" into individual issues— even when feeling discomfort—as a means to becoming an ally obtaining feedback. Learning also means the willingness to make mistakes, own them, learn from them, and apply those lessons. In other words, people embraced their identities as lifelong learners (Senge, et al.). The client revised its Board, Executive Director and staff performance evaluations to include information on how well individually, groups and the organization as a whole upheld the written Common Agreements established in the culturally competent strategic planning process.

Conclusion

None of us can experience any external reality without screening it through an elaborate set of internal mental and emotional filters that we bring to an experience in order to shape and give meaning to it. It is important to remember that most of us have only vaguely begun to realize what we can control. However, OD theory and interventions can support clients begin

to take ownership and responsibility for the mental models they bring to life's raw material. OD practitioners can support client systems begin to recognize the perceptions they select to view the experiences that form the core of their organizational life. OD practitioners can provide tools to evaluate the interpretations given those experiences by making them explicit and in supporting the client in selecting only from those perceptions and interpretations that empower the individual, groups, organization and society in the never-ending polarity management efforts to facilitate healthy change processes in our client systems. OD practitioners can also provide tool provides questions and tips for the consultants to unpack privilege, power, and oppression through a self-reflective process based on Action Research based questions developed by Maggie Potapchuk[10] of Potapchuk and Associates and Beth Applegate of Applegate Consulting Group for a training we will co-present at the Organization Development Network Conference in October 2010, entitled: *Understanding Privilege and Racial*

---

[10] Thank you Maggie for taking the leadership on developing these culturally competent Action Research based reflection questions and for your openness to my suggestions and feedback. To learn more about Maggie's work - http://www.mpassociates.us.

Equity: Sustaining 21st Century Organizations During Difficult Economic Times.

Pre-Entry

1. Reflect on your different group identities (gender, race/ethnicity, class, sexual orientation etc.)

- Assess your awareness, with others, of your privileges, as well as the stereotypes and biases of your different group identities.

- Think about how your internalized racial superiority may come up in your interactions with individuals, groups and this client.

2. Reflect on your awareness of different types of power and your skills to identify these dynamics on the individual, group, institutional and structural level.[11]

3. Reflect on your knowledge of structural racism and your skill level to identify how it manifests.[12]

Entry and Contracting

1. What, if any, are the differences between how the presenting issues are being defined by different racial/ethnic identity groups within the organization? Are the differences between how the different groups define the problem known to each other? Have they discussed their differences in perceptions and experiences?

2. In terms of negotiating the contract, what power differentials (other than the sponsor/supervisors/consultant role) and privileges do you need to be aware of with the person or people who you will be reporting to and collaborating with?

3. What observations were made during this interaction regarding race, power

---

[11] **Power Analysis Framework** consists of the following central values, assumptions and beliefs; (1) Power is the central question; (2) Power relationships in society are unequal; (3) Systemic oppression, in particular economic and racial oppression, exists and must be challenged; (4) Capitalism is a system of domination and oppression; (5) Systemic change is necessary to address inequity; (6) Raising consciousness leads to social change; and (7) Strong analysis is critical to effective action. Sinclair, Z., Russ, L., Lubeck, S., Infante, P., Tran, NT., & Ernest, M., 2007. Reflections on Organization Development through the Lens of Social Justice Change Methodologies. Movement Strategy Center.

[12] **Structural Racism is** an analytical framework that identifies aspects of our history and culture that have allowed the privilege associated with 'whiteness' and the disadvantage of 'color' to endure and adapt over time. It points out the ways in which public policies and institutional practices contribute to inequitable racial outcomes. It lays out assumptions and stereotypes that are embedded in our culture that, in effect, legitimize racial disparities, and it illuminates the ways in which progress toward racial equity is undermined. Karen Fulbright-Anderson, K. Lawrence, S. Sutton, G. Susi, and A. Kubisch, Structural Racism and Youth Development Issues, Challenges, and Implications. New York: The Aspen Institute.

and privilege? What is your assessment at this stage of the organization's climate and culture regarding their support and commitment to an inclusive and equitable work environment? Their knowledge of power and privilege issues? Their confidence/comfort level talking about inequities, power and privilege issues? Openness to change?

Data Gathering and Analysis

1.How will the data be gathered and reported back to the client system? Are the assessment tools culturally competent? Multilingual? How will the data gathering process address the privilege, inequities and power issues?

2. How are equity and power issues discussed by the full group? by identity groups? Between staff and board? With constituents? (patterns, process, climate)

3. How are ideas and/or concerns given credibility within the organization? What are the racial/ethnic identities and staff roles of the individuals who may provide creditability to an idea or concern?

Data Feedback Tips

1. People have different mental models and world views about how the world works and why things are as they are. Those different perspectives have to be included in the information you gather. In addition, existing data has to be considered with a critical eye, since it will reflect prevailing power dynamics (that is, who is counted, what is considered success, what missing data are considered important or unimportant, etc.) If you accept information at face value, you may unintentionally end up drawing conclusions that reproduce a mindset that reinforces racial inequities and structural racism.

2 In sharing data, an important responsibility is making sure people who view the data understand an institutional/structural analysis of these differences exist in the organization and how they might be corrected. The reason this is so important is that, without a context for viewing the data, people will create their own explanations. Those explanations may or may not be based on facts.

3. Observe reactions to your assessment when you present them to different groups. Share information in single race groups and in mixed groups, and in multi-generational, multi-racial/ethnic and multi-class groups - each reaction will tell you something important about what you have found, what's missing and how to present information to various groups.

Action Planning and Implementation Stage

1. Reflect, again, on your privileges, as well as the stereotypes and biases of your different group identities and how it may come up as you move into action planning and implementation. To avoid a "father/mother knows best" scenario, what do you need to check regarding ego, process, power and privilege?

2. How will the action planning process address privilege, inequities, and power issues present in the organization?

3, How does the action plan and implementation process ensure there will be staff and organizational capacity building of the skills, knowledge and processes necessary to create and sustain an inclusive and equitable work environment?

Evaluation and Reflection

1. Assess your interaction with the client: What were the privileges and power issues present? How did your different group identities play out in the interaction? When did you collude? What were the barriers that stopped you from intervening? When did you intervene? Was it effective? How did you create transparency in the contracting process?

2. If you worked on a team for this consulting project, discuss: What were

the privilege and power issues present? How did your different group identities play out in the interaction with the client? With each other? When did you collude? What were the barriers that stopped you from intervening? When did you intervene? Was it effective? How would you rate your transparency of communication within the consulting team? with the client?

3. Reflect on the feedback from the client. What do you need to change next time? What worked well based on their perceptions? What are the areas do you need to grow and develop increasing your knowledge and improving your skills to address privilege, power and oppression?

Using Adam's six dimension framework to examine their mental models, the leadership team, staff, Board and community members became aware of the individual and collective mental models by which they were filtering information and inhibiting their understanding of how the world works, especially in relation to power, privilege, and oppression. Through the various culturally competent strategic planning interventions, the stakeholders in this progressive, advocacy-model-based organization acquired the awareness, confidence, and skills

necessary to raise questions about decisions faced by the organization. Moreover, they became more conscious of their process of making choices, and of the importance of choosing whether to continue to believe the 'dominant' world view and operative mental models or develop new ones, thus bringing their own mental models more into alignment with the values espoused by each organization. While the OD theory and interventions we choose supported the organization take small steps toward incremental individual and group level social justice; in this case study, the timeline for lasting internal organization competency building was too short to result in systemic change for social justice.

The field of Applied Behavioral Science through organizations like NTL Institute have a long-standing tradition of creating space for inter-disciplinary inquiry and dialogue between scholars, practitioners and researchers. The NTL Institute has recently launched an on-line practitioner journal, *Practising Social Change* as a partner publication to their scholar's journal, JABS. This new journal is intended to be a collaborative and reflective meeting place for scholar-practitioners and practitioner-scholars in Applied

Behavioral Science 'who seek to work at their developmental edge: curious, conceptual thinkers charged with supporting change in work relationships, in teams, in communities or in the larger society, and who may be able to learn from the experience of others in different parts of the world" (Nadler, 2010).

The field of Applied Behavioral Science is well positioned to bring to the fore the tradition of inquiry and dialogue in service of social justice, and healthy individuals, groups, and organizations in the world and could serve in a catalyst role through an inclusive and rigorous examination of the following: 1) the central ideas of key architects in the field of OD and the influence from the progressive left on the role of OD in action research; 2) the re-envisioning of our core values through a 'progressive' world view; 3) the identification of new core competencies, culturally competent OD frameworks and methodologies steeped in a 'progressive ' world view; 4) the intentional expansion of the traditional spaces where OD scholar-practitioners convene to include collaboration with sister social justice organizations, researchers, scholars, educators, activists, movement builders, nonprofit thought leaders, and socially responsible for-profit leaders, social

entrepreneurs, etc. about what each field, discipline and sector have in common in service of social justice.

References

Abrams, J., & Zweig, C. (1991). *Meeting the shadow*. Los Angeles: Tarcher.

Adams, J. D. (2000a). Six dimensions of a sustainable consciousness. *Perspectives on business and global change*, *14*(2), 41–51.

Adams, J. D. (2000b). *Thinking today as if tomorrow mattered: The rise of a sustainable consciousness.* San Francisco: Eartheart Enterprises, 2000.

Adams, J. D. (2004). Mental models @ work: Implications for teaching sustainability. In C. Galea. (Ed.), *Teaching sustainability* (pp. 18–30). Sheffield, England: Greenleaf Publishing.

Adams, J. D. (2006). Building a sustainable world: A challenging OD opportunity. In B. Jones & M. Brazzel (Eds.), *Understanding organization development: Foundations and practices* (pp.

335–352). San Francisco: Pfeiffer/John Wiley and Sons.

Adams, J.D. (1992). The brighter the light, the darker the shadow. *Vision/Action*, 11(2), 8-11.

Adams, M., Bell L., Griffin, P. (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A source book.* New York and London: Routledge.

Allen, T. (1997). *Invention of the white race I & II*. London and New York: Verso Books.

Alinsky, S. D. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A practical primer for realistic radicals.* New York: Random House.

Applegate B. (2002) Allies for Democracy, *OD Practitioner. 34 (4) pages 23-27.*

Applegate, B. & Puentes, S. (2009). "Diversity and Inclusion: The Next Step in Social Responsibility." for ASAE and the Center for Association Leadership Associations Now magazine Ideas Into Action, page 11.

Applegate, B. (2008). Challenges and opportunities in nonprofit capacity building, *Nonprofit World Journal*, 26 (3), published by the Society for Nonprofit Organizations.

Applegate B., Illif, H., Kloth, C. (2005). "Organization Development and Social Change – A Practitioner's Dialogue," OD Network 2005 Conference Proceedings.

Applegate B. (2005). "Racial Equity as a Prism for Effective Consulting," Alliance for Nonprofit Management Enhance Newsletter.

Batts, V. (1998). No. 2: Modem Racism: *New melody for the same old tunes*. Cambridge, MA: Episcopal Divinity School.

Bell, E. & Nkomo, S. (2001). *Our separate ways: Black and white women and the struggles for professional identity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Benne, K. D. (1959). Some ethical problems in group and organizational consultation. *Journal of Social Issues,* XV(20), 60-67.

Brown, L. B. (1987, Summer). OD and social development. *Organization Development and Change.* Retrieved October 5, 2008 from www.aom.pace.edu/odc/newsletters/SUM87.htm#od

Butler, S. (2006). *Conversations that matter: Making whiteness visible*. White Privilege Conference Workshop.

Chang, H., Salazar, & D. Leong, C. (1994). *Drawing strength from diversity.* Oakland, CA: California Tomorrow.

Chang, H., Salazar, & D. Leong, C. (1997). *Community building and diversity*. Oakland, CA: California Tomorrow.

Capitman, J. (1980). *Symbolic racism theory criteria for individual differences measures of prejudice and the validity of the feeling thermometer* (Ph.D. diss., Duke University).

Clark, C. & O'Donnell, J. 1999).*Becoming and unbecoming white: Owning and*

disowning a racial identity. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Crossroads Ministry. (n.d.) *A strategy for building anti-racist collectives.* www.crossroadsantiracism.*org*

Dovidio, F. & Gaertner, S. L., (Eds.), (1980). *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Duke University.

Epstein, S. (1987). Gay politics, ethnic identity: The limits of social constructionism. *Socialist Review, 17*(3-4), 9-54.

Feagin, J., (2001). *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations.* New York and London: Routledge.

Freedman, A., Zackrison R. (2001). Finding Your Way in the Consulting Jungle: A guidebook for organization development practitioners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pfeiffer.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: The Seabury Press.

Frye, M. (1983). *The politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory.* Freedom. CA: The Crossing Press.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: an introduction.* New York: Longman.

Grassroots Policy Project (2003). *Building political power.* Retrieved on June 25, 2009 From www.grassrootspolicy.org

Grassroots Policy Project (2007). *Theories of power for activists.* Retrieved on May 1, 2008 from www.grassrootspolicy.org

Grassroots Policy Project. *Using worldview to build power.* Retrieved on June 10, 2009 from www.grassrootspolicy.org.

Greiner, E. & Schein, V. (1989). *Power and organization development: Mobilizing power to implement change.* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley OD Series.

Hardiman, R. & Jackson, B. W. (1997). Conceptual foundations for

social justice courses. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 16-29). New York: Routledge.

Helfand, J. & Lippin, L. (2006, April). *Understanding whiteness and unraveling racism.* White Privilege Conference. Professional Development Institute.

Hinson, S. & Bradley, A. (2006). *A Structural Analysis of Oppression*. Retrieved on June 1, 2009 from www.policyproject.org.

Johnson, A. (2005). *Privilege, power and difference*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Johnson, A. (2006). *Unraveling the knot of privilege, power and difference*. White Privilege Conference. Workshop.

Jensen, R. (2006). *The heart of whiteness: Confronting race, racism and white privilege.* San Francisco: City Light Books.

Jones, B. & Brazzel, M. (Eds.) (2006). *The NTL handbook of organization development and change: Principles, practices and perspectives.* Part six, pages 456-467. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Kivel, Paul. (2002). *Uprooting racism: How white people can work for racial justice*. Gabriola Island, BC, Canada: New Society Publishers.

Klein, D. (with Morrow, K.). (2001). *New vision new reality: A guide to unleashing energy, joy, and creativity in your life*. Ellicott, MD: Hazleden.

Lacewell -Harris, M. (2010). *Race Talk in Real Time: Teachable Moments for the Masses and the Movement.* Facing Race Conference. Keynote address.

Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leary, J. (2005). *Post traumatic slave syndrome: America's legacy of enduring injury and healing.* Portland, OR: Uptone Press.

Leary, J. (2006). *Post traumatic slave syndrome*. White Privilege Conference. Keynote address.

Lopez, I.H. (1999). *White by law: The legal construction of race*. New York: NYU Press.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. New York: Crossing Press.

Love, B. (2006). Amazing grace how sweet youth sound: Strategies for youth empowerment and liberation. White Privilege Conference. [Keynote address.]

Margulies, N. & Raia, A. P. (1988, Winter). Some reflections on the values of organizational development. *Organization Development and Change.* Retrieved October 5, 2005 from www.aom.pace.edu/odc/newsletters/WIN88.htm#where.

Marshak, R. J. (2005). Organization development as a profession and a field. In M. Brazzel & B. B. Jones (Eds.), *The NTL handbook of organizational development and change.* San Francisco: Pfieffer/Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Marshak, R. J. (2005, Spring). Is there a new OD? *OD Seasonings 1*(1). Retrieved May 9, 2005 from www.odnetwork.org/publications/seasonings/printer_marshak.html.

McConahay, J., Hardee, B. & Batts, V. (1981) Has racism declined in America?, *Journal of Conflict Resolution 2 (4), 563-79.*

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies, working paper #189.* Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1992). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In M.L. Andersen and P.H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

McIntosh, P. (n.d.). *Unpacking the white knapsack.* www.augustana.co/rdx/eng/activism/backpack.htm.

McLemore, S.D. (1993). *Racial and ethnic relations in America*, 4th Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Nadler, F. 2010. Retrieved June 13, 2010 from personal email correspondence.

OD Values. Retrieved August 18, 2009 from http://www.odnetwork.org/aboutod/credo.php.

Parker, R. & Smith, P. (2006). *Revealing the invisibles of white privilege*. White Privilege Conference Workshop.

Pasmore, W. A. (1987, Summer). OD and social change: The creek is high and rising. *Organization Development and Change.* Retrieved October 5, 2005 from www.aom.pace.edu/odc/newsletters/SUM87.htm#od

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pierce, J. (1998). *The Power Equity Group: A guide for understanding equity and acknowledging diversity*. Maine: Newdynamic Publications.

Potapchuk, M. Leiderman, S. and Bivens, D. (2006). *Flipping the script: White privilege and community building.* Available at: www.capd.org.

Said, E.W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

Schaffer, J. (1978). *Humanistic Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Seashore, C. N. (1975). In grave danger of growing. *Social Change, 5*(4).

Seashore, C. N., Shawver, M. N., Thompson, G., & Mattare, M. (2004). Doing good by knowing who you are: The instrumental self as agent of change. *OD Practitioner, 36*(3), 55-60.

Senge, P. M., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., Smith, B. J., & Kleiner, A. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: An exploration of profound change in people, organizations, and society.* New York: Random House Pub.

Sinclair, Z., Russ, L., Lubeck, S., Infante, P. Trung Tran, N. and Mark, E. *Reflections on organization development through the lens of social justice change methodologies*. Retrieved, December 1, 2008 from www.movementstrategycenter.org.

St. Onge, P. (Ed.) [Contributing Authors: Applegate, B., Asakura, V., Moss, M., Rouson, B., Vergara-Lobo, A.] (2009). *Embracing cultural competency: A roadmap for nonprofit capacity builders.* Minnesota: Fieldstone Alliance.

Szynanski, D. and Stewart, D. (2010). Racism and Sexism as corollaries of African American Women's Psychological Distress. Retrieved, June 12, 2010 from Journal of Sex Roles.

Tannenbaum, B. & Davis, S. (1994). Values, man, and organizations. In W. L. French, C. H. Bell & R. A. Zawicki (Eds.), *Organization development and transformation.* Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Unger, P. (1995). Contextual analysis in ethics. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *LV*. Retrieved February 2, 2005 from www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/philo/faculty/unger/papers/ethics.html.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wijeyesinghe, C. & Jackson, B. (Eds.), (2001). *New perspectives on racial Identity development. A theoretical and practical anthology.* New York:_New York University Press.

Wildman, S. (1996). *Privilege revealed: How invisible preferences undermine America*. New York: New York University Press.

Williams, J., Gallant, S., Rios, D., & Braxton, E. (2000). An overview of entry and contracting. Developed for NTL Institute.

Wirtenberg, J., Backer, T., Chang, W., Applegate, B., Lannan, T., Conway, M., Abrams, L. & Slepian, J., (2007). "The Future of Organization Development in the Nonprofit Sector," *OD Journal* [Third Special Issue of "Best Global Practices in Internal OD], 25(4).

Wirtenberg, J., Backer, T., Chang, W., Conway, M., Abrams, L. & Slepian, J., (2007, Summer) The future of organization development: Enabling sustainable business performance through people. Organization *Development Journal*, 25(2), 11-22, special edition. [Applegate, B. is a contributor to this article]

Wise, T. (2006). *Disasters, natural and otherwise: What hurricane Katrina tells us about race, class and privilege in the US*. White Privilege Conference. Keynote address.

Wise, T. (2009). *Denial is a river, wider thank the Charles: Racism and implicit bias in Cambridge*. Retrieved on August 10, 2009 from www.redroom.com.

Zemsky, B & Mann, D. (2008) *Building Organizations in a Movement Moment,* Social Policy, Spring - Summer 2008. pp 9 - 17. Retrieved on December 5, 2008 from www.buildingmovement.org.

Zinn, H. (1980). *A people's history of the united states*. New York: Harper and Row (updated and revised edition, 1995). Perennial Library.

Table 1 Working with the Left Side Focuses

Focus	Messages that reinforce this focus	Questions to bring focus here	Positive value of focusing here	Result of overuse of this focus
Short Term	Don't fix it if it ain't broke. Just do it.	What needs attention now? What are your immediate priorities?	Establishing priorities. Acting with efficiency.	Lose the big picture. Overlook long-term consequences. Put bandages on symptoms.
Reactive	Do as you're told. If it feels good, do it. Life's a bitch and then you die.	What is the established policy, procedure, or practice? What has been done before in this kind of situation?	Consistency Responsiveness Loyalty	Stuck in a rut. Unable to flow with change.
L/ocal	Look out for "number one" You've got to expect that from a _____!	What makes you different or unique? What is special about this situation?	Survival Protection Maintaining position	Loss of perspective Ethnocentrism Loss of diversity
Separation	The best way to understand it is to take it apart. A place for everything, and everything in its place.	What are the relevant facts in this situation? What do you get when you "crunch the numbers"?	Convergence Specialization Rationality	Fragmentation Low synergy Get lost in minutiae
Blaming	It's not my fault! All right, who's to blame here?	What are your reasons for your actions? What's wrong with this picture?	Judgment, law, and rule enforcement	Win-lose polarization Risk aversion
Doing-and-Having	What's in it for me? Faster, cheaper, better!	What is the most cost-effective thing to do? What's the bottom line?	Financial performance and material comforts	Attachment to possessions Loss of human sensitivity Burnout

Table 2—Working with the Right Side Focuses

Focus	Messages that reinforce this focus	Questions to bring focus here	The positive value of focusing here	The result of overuse of this focus
Long Term	Create a vision. Plan ahead.	What do you anticipate? Where are we headed? Where do we want to go?	Anticipation Prediction Possibilities Contingencies	Lose timely responsiveness. Ignore pressing realities.
Creative	Take responsibility for yourself. You can be anything you want to be.	Is there a different or better approach? What would you do about this situation if you had a magic wand?	Innovation New ideas New directions	Overlook proven processes. Reinvent the wheel
Global	Look at the big picture. Let's think about the consequences of this decision.	What's best for the organization as a whole? How can you make a difference in the world?	Comprehensive view. Inclusiveness Value of diversity	Idealism Loss of initiative or drive. Inattention to detail.
Systems	Solving one problem almost always creates others. "The whole is more than the sum of its parts"	Who are the key stakeholders? If we take this action, what consequences can we predict?	Divergent Holistic Finding key interrelationships	Equate models to reality. Get lost in the clouds of complexity or theory.
Learning	"Let one who is without sin cast the first stone." Here's another learning and growth opportunity.	What can you learn from this experience? How might you benefit from letting go of that grudge?	Ease of exploration. Seeking growth and learning.	May be taken advantage of. Self-sacrificing Loss of discipline