

“Go and face the strange changes”

David Bowie

THE BASICS OF CHANGE

By Al Condeluci, PhD

Introduction

Understanding change has been a challenge to humankind from time in memorial. One of the many reasons for the struggle is that change is a paradoxical phenomenon. On one hand change is inevitable. We are bound to change and often have no control around it. In a simple way, time marches on. Minutes change to hours, hours into days and the clocks of time push us to places we may not understand and don't really want to travel to. In spite of our reluctance's, we must move on. We can't stop the sands of time.

On the other hand and regardless of this constant perpetual motion of change, we are deep creatures of habit and predictability. We long to stay as we are, and once habits begin to form, it often takes heaven and earth to erase their effects. This habitual drive is very important to our sanity and security. We need things to be predictable. Too much inconsistency makes us insecure. When we are out of our habitual domain, we can become testy, or nervous, or unsure. Stop and think about your habitual patterns. Like me, you are probably more comfortable when you are in familiar surroundings, with things that you know and understand. When you find yourself in settings that are not familiar, you can become uncomfortable and out of sorts.

These two realities, the curve that drives change, and the curve that resists change produce a powerful paradox and, in turn, a tension for people and organizations. The tug of war that follows can derail, or totally dismantle any change effort, even a direction that makes cognitively good sense. Often what happens at this juncture of the change curves is that people resist until there is no other way, and then it is usually too late.

Consider changing a personal behavior that you feel may be better for you. One example might be the effort to change dietary patterns so you can ingest better, more nutritious foods into your system. In this example you might cognitively understand all the elements. You know your current diet is not the best it can be. You equally know all the reasons why you should enhance your diet. All of this makes perfect sense. So you set the course for changing your diet. You decide on the foods that are better for you. You begin to stock your cabinets with these

types of foods. You make a goal plan and even enter it into your daily planner. Then you begin to execute your change.

Now all great voyages start with the first stroke of the oar, and your dietary change is no different. The first day goes fantastic. You follow your diet and clearly feel that you are on the road to change and life longevity. Even the second day is good; you're still on track. Then the third day you find yourself spontaneously invited to join some friends after work. In the course of your meeting, your friends order some nachos with sour cream. You look at this food, a favorite to you in your old dietary patterns, but now taboo. You pause and think, "I've really been good up to this point, one nacho won't hurt." So you take the biggest nacho on the dish, and scoop up a huge wad of sour cream and slowly, bite by bite, revel in the taste. Before you know it, you have single-handedly eaten the whole bowl of nachos. In a split second, the rationalization of your behavior sabotages the best-laid plans for change.

This reality of sabotage not only happens in our personal efforts to change, but with our organizations as well. Since organizations are nothing more than a collection of individuals, the same phenomenon occurs. Like people, organizations develop habits, cultures and patterns that drive behaviors. They shape and are shaped by the people who are members of the organization.

Add to this the incredible pace of the world around us. With technology and information access changing almost daily, and with world markets and economies always unpredictable, the only constant is change.

It used to be that individuals and organizations thought they could control their own destiny. The person or company predicated this on the notion that change is fully manageable and determined. This thought today, is all but gone. We live in a time when our destiny is tied to global, and even universal influences, that try as we might, are often out of our control. Further, the assumption that things are predictable, and therefore manageable, has also been quickly replaced. These realities of loss of control and the notion that things are no longer fully predictable changes the way we must think about change.

Certainly there are some things that can be predicted. Today there are many "futurists" who, using observed trends, attempts to predict what might happen in the future. Indeed, some futurists (Corbin, 1999) suggest that the key changes today are moving us from an information culture, to one that is looking to be more spiritual and relational. This type of prediction is based upon things said and observed with people and organizations that are thought to be forward thinking. Regardless, predictions are merely educated guesses. Some have been right, and others have been wrong.

So what do we do? Given the ongoing tension between what we want to do, and our old habits, are we doomed to the status quo? The answer to this question is

not easy. Some individuals and organizations are doomed to fail, and others, not. We are not chained to the status quo unless we want to be! We can influence the change process – but it is not easy.

A Definition of Change

As simple as it might seem, an exploration on any topic mandates a definition first. So what does change mean, how is it defined? The simple dictionary definition finds that change can be a verb or noun. We can effect change or describe a type of change. As this book is about action, the definition of change from the American Heritage Dictionary (third edition, 1992) is stated as:

1. To cause to be different, to transform
2. To give or receive reciprocally; interchange
3. To exchange for or replace with another, usually of the same kind or category
4. To lay aside, abandon, or leave for another; switch
5. To give or receive the equivalent of money in lower denominations
6. To put a fresh covering on
7. To become different, transform, go from one to another
8. To alter
9. To become deeper in tone

This is a basic definition, yet change continues to be a complex phenomena. Change is often thought to be a matter of going from one point to another. It can be clearly physical as well as mental. We can change our scene by traveling from one place to another, as well as changing our mental model from one paradigm to another. We can change our framework or disposition from one perspective to another without moving from the spot we are in. We can change our attitude about something even if the event remains the same.

Change can be both unplanned or planned. With unplanned change the circumstances surrounding the change are outside of your control. Things either within, or without happen to such an extent that the change agent has no or little influence. These unplanned situations are difficult because often the person was not planning for something new, yet they are forced into a new direction.

Planned change, on the other hand, is when the change agent has control or at least is in front of the decision to change. Planned change presents an opportunity for the change agent to be able to think about and to adopt some actions that might guide or influence the change into a direction the agent chooses.

As simple as all this seems to be, to me there are some real definitional start points that are key to an initiation of any type of change. That is:

1. When we **want** to change. This is when we have a desired outcome, but are not yet there. We acknowledge that something new is luring to us but the choice to act on it is ours.
2. When we **need** to change. This is when there is some pressure to move toward the desired outcome. Here we are being advised, or strongly recommended that we make a change.
3. When we **must** change. This is when we have no choice and the change has been forced upon us. This is mandated change and if we do not make a move, there will be serious consequences.

These three delineation's not only frame the intent to change, but are key to the start point for change. They help us to understand the pressure or desire for change. They also relate to the internal or external process that surrounds change. The interesting notion is that regardless of if you *want, need or have* to change, these elements do not make the change any easier. Even in situations where it might be life or death tied to the change, people struggle mightily with the process.

I can think to an experience my mother had with trying to quit smoking. As a lifelong smoker, in an era when smoking was actually encouraged, mom became addicted to the habit. As we children became aware of the ill effects of smoking we started to encourage mom to stop. Now, mom is a bright lady and she knew that the reasons to stop were valid and, in a real way she wanted to change this behavior, but couldn't. As a nagging cough and sore throat gave her further evidence, mom began to recognize that she needed to change, but still struggled. Then came the Doctor's demand that she must stop, or face the specter of throat cancer. This last level finally pushed mom, but not without its consequences.

Now this example, although it flows through the three levels from "want" to "need" to "must", should be adjusted because smoking is an addictive habit and there are chemical elements working against the desired intent. Still, as we begin to explore the notion of change, we will find that habitual actions, even if not chemically stimulated, are equally difficult to move beyond. In a strange way, our deeply rooted patterns are as addictive as a chemical that has been released in our bodies.

These three deliniations relate to organizations and cultures as well. All organizations find the "want", "need" and "must" demands of change. My organization, UCP of Pittsburgh, has been through all of these layers a number of times. During the many strategic planning retreats I have participated in over my 29-year association with UCP, the driving force of the discussion focused on these 3 things. Often, in fact, we would use data, statistics or theories to drive

the exact category of the change. Sometimes our philosophy of services would suggest that we want to change. Then a funding initiative would push us to say we need to change. And sometimes a law would demand that we must change.

In a broader way, the same stratification happens with societies and cultures. A powerful example of this is found with the American Civil Rights movement. The “want” phase was driven by a moral notion that all people are equal. The “need” phase seemed to be fueled by incentives. Affirmative action and other ways to promote social/cultural change have been attempted in the American Civil Rights effort. Finally, there came laws, and legal rulings that demanded that our society change. In spite of these dimensions, one might argue how much the American culture has really changed. In some cases we see civil equality, but most people would agree that we still do not have cultural equality. Gaps still exist that differentiate peoples. The culture has not shifted.

The Structure of Change

Mental Models

As we begin to look at the structure of change related to cultural shifting, it is critical that we spend some time on recognizing the notion of mental models and frameworks that drive our thinking, and then behaviors. In most everything we do, there is a mental model or paradigm that organizes our perspective on that matter. In a simple way, these mental models create our attitudinal constellation about life in general. Think about it now; you have a distinct perspective on the world when you care to reflect on it. This is manifested in how you feel about politics, religion, education, sports, entertainment, the arts, government and the like. To get a better perspective on this, ask the basic question, “How do I feel about _____?” Your answer to this question begins to establish your framework or mental model on this issue.

Now as basic as this seems, many folks do not take the time or energy to really know their frameworks. In some cases they might not have thought about how they feel at all. Of course, some of these things are complex and require deep thought. In another odd way, some of us resist this kind of reflection because we actually have been taught not to frame our own mental model, but to adopt those of others. For a lot of us, our perspectives on religion, or politics might be that which our family, in turn, had been expected from us. Sometimes we seemingly had no choice – that is the way it always had been.

The Brazilian educator, Paulo Freire contends that most of the western methods of formal education do not allow us to be more critical or analytical about these frameworks (1973, 1989). We are taught to passively sit and listen to the teacher

tell us that which we should believe. Then we “parrot” this information back and get our grade or gold star based on our ability to remember, not critically analyze.

The American educator, John Gatto further develops this notion (1992). He contends that the educational system mechanically conditions children in a way that actually turns many of them away from education. The net effect of turning off children to education is that they do not take the time, or have the interest to develop their own critical framework of the world.

Further, the way most of us were raised has significant consequences on how we feel not only about things around us, but about ourselves as well. That is, our mental models of the world are also colored by our own perspectives of who we are. Psychologists call this our self-image, or self esteem. This is made up of the positive and negative thoughts we have about ourselves.

If you stop to reflect on this notion of self-image and esteem, it causes us to consider how our positive and negative thoughts stack up. If a person has more negative thoughts about themselves, they tend to have a poorer self-image of who they are. Conversely, if they have more positive notions, they will have a better self-image.

Experts in self-image suggest that the typical way families raise children have more often focused on negative issues rather than positive. As reported in Chapter 2, Dr Shad Helmstetter (1986) compiled data that suggests that a typical child growing up in an average family in America has been told “no” or what they “could not do” more than 148,000 times before they reach their 18th birthday. This is a staggering statistic that sets a negative precept in personal self-esteem.

I know in my own everyday parenting I get caught in this negative cycle. Not very long ago, my oldest son, Dante, came home from school with his geometry test results. A policy at his school mandates that parents must sign off on tests. He set the test on the table and made a quick exit for his room. As I looked at the test results, I quickly called him back. “Son, look at this test, you missed 8 out of 10 questions! You’ll never get into college with these grades.” He looked at me softly and said: “But Dad, at least I got 2 right.”

My first reaction was to find his negatives, the ones he missed. I think this focus seems natural for most of us as parents. The result, however, is that this preservation on the negative issues, in many ways, stunt the positive self image.

Although this leads to a poor self-image, maybe worse is that it also leads to a negative vision of the world. Peter Senge (1990) summarized this idea of negative vision nicely when he stated:

“Most adults have little sense of real vision. We have goals and objectives, but these are not visions. When asked what they want, many

adults will say what they want to get rid of. They'd like a better job – that is, they'd like to get rid of the boring job they have. They'd like to live in a better neighborhood, or not have to worry about crime, or about putting their kids through school. They'd like it if their mother-in-law returned to her own house, or if their back stopped hurting. Such litanies of “negative visions” are sadly commonplace, even among very successful people. They are the byproduct of a lifetime of fitting in, of coping, of problem solving.” P. 146.

Now all of this is critical to change and ultimately, cultural shifting. We know that people with positive self-images, people who feel good about who they are, find themselves less resistant to change. These people are the ones who will take the risk that change implies. They have the inner strength to handle the unknown and to take chances. If we have a negative self-image, or the people we manage or lead have a poor self-image, the tendency will be to keep the status quo, rather than to try some new approach.

Consultants Ed Oakley and Ed Krug (1994) talk about an 80/20 phenomena that happens in business. Given the notions of self-image and change, their studies have concluded that 20% of the workforce will be open to change or new perspectives. The other 80% will usually resist or reject the new idea, no matter how much sense it makes.

Although I am not sure if my personal experiences with employees in the human service agencies I have worked in or observed would meet this 80/20 principle, I do know that more resist than embrace. Regardless, even if the spread was less, the notion of mental models, self-image and mind-sets become the critical element to consider when we think about change.

In some ways, the 80/20 phenomenon plays out in the greater culture. In thinking about the importance of the gatekeeper in cultural shifting, a similar spread may occur. Certainly the proactive thinkers, as described by Oakley and Krug, have the propensity to be positive gatekeepers. We know that positive gatekeepers are open to new things and willing to take risks. We also know that negative gatekeepers are reactive and resistant people, yet it is my belief that not all of the 80% fall into the active negative gatekeeper category.

The mix of informal expectations of family and then formal expectations of educational systems that focus on memory and parroting do not lead to a full perspective, or analytical perspective on our frameworks or mental models. This, along with typical parenting can lead to negative and resistive results.

These realities then carry over to our organizations. We often hear talk about mission or vision of organizations being critical, but many companies do not really take the time to assure that all of their employees understand and subscribe to the mission or vision. When this happens, the organization

becomes rudderless. It may be able to move forward, but its direction can be compromised.

Another critical aspect that relates to mental models is the concept of circular flow. That is, change is not a phenomenon that is linear, but circular. Things go around an organism and an organization. Those theorists who look at learning organizations capture this concept of flow in the literature. Most notable is Peter Senge in his book, The Fifth Discipline (1990). In this examination of learning organizations Senge speaks to the circular notion of organizational flow by stating:

“Leaders who attempt organizational change often find themselves unwittingly caught in balancing processes. To the leaders, it looks as though their efforts are clashing with sudden resistance that seems to come from nowhere. In fact, ...the resistance is a response by the system, trying to maintain an implicit system goal. Until this goal is recognized, the change effort is doomed to failure. So long as the leader continues to be the “model,” his work habits will set the norm. Either he must change his habits, or establish new and different models.

Whenever there is resistance to change, you can count on there being one or more hidden balancing processes. Resistance to change is neither capricious nor mysterious. It almost always arises from threats to traditional norms and ways of doing things. Often these norms are woven into the fabric of established power relationships. The norm is entrenched because the distribution of authority and control is entrenched. Rather than pushing harder to overcome resistance to change, artful leaders discern the source of the resistance. They focus directly on the implicit norms and power relationships within which the norms are embedded.” P. 88

Senge’s point is not only relevant to the circular notions of organizations, but to the deep impact of mental model and the embedded nature of the prevailing paradigm.

Generations and Change

Another element that must be considered in the context of mental models is the generational aspect that affects the various cohorts of American Culture and Society. Popular exploration suggests there are 5 major generations that constitute our culture. Each of these groups have their own experiences and perspectives that have affected their values and mental models. These generations are:

- **Pre-baby Boomers (pre-1945)** – These folks grew up with the depression and World Wars. They were focused at the high point of Industrialization. They are highly nationalized and bent on loyalty. To them, security is critical and as they came to the fore, the notion of a better future and retirement security was paramount. Though not highly educated, this generation was very thrifty and conservative. This generation became the strongest joiners and are deeply civic oriented. Given the pressures of WWII, they have been called “the greatest generation.”
- **Baby Boomers (1945-1965)** – This generation grew up with the spoils of a devoted and loyal society. They were better educated and began to challenge values and assumptions. The limited world threats allowed this group to be highly career focused. The sheer numbers, some 78 million, baited an intense competition. They became a very consumptive group and threw away more than they kept. Their career drive pushed them to be growth oriented, often at the expense of their families. They were slow to marry and quick to divorce.
- **Generation X (1965-1976)** – This group was the first to promote a sense of life balance. Time became as important as money and although this generation focused on income, they demanded time off. A vital product to the Gen X group was the Sports Utility Vehicle that captured their life style to a tee. They also were the first generation to understand and embrace diversity. They are visual oriented and extremely interactive with media. They are also the children of the divorce explosion and the first to grow up without collective success stories from the nation (i.e. VJ Day).
- **Generation Y (1977-1987)** – This generation was the first to be raised with the school violence and terrorism that is now commonplace. They are technologically focused and savvy. Given their experiences they demand authenticity and honesty. They are self-reliant and much more inclusive than all the other generations. The make-up of their world is vastly different than other generations with changes in families, politics, and institutions that we have seen.
- **Generation Next (1988-1998)** – This most recent generation, called Generation Next, will be an entirely different breed. These folks have been raised in the strongest economy in U.S. history. The affluence and throwaway mentality of Generation Next, however, will create a cluster of workers and leaders with a limited sense of tradition and sacrifice. These folks will be the most diverse and technologically proficient.

This analysis of generations is critical to the notion of cultural shifting. How cultural rituals, patterns, and especially gatekeepers, will be influenced by new generations of players has deep implications for how future cultures operate. Consequently, the fluidity in which future cultures incorporates new people, ideas and products will be the key to cultural shifting.

The Tipping Point of Change

Another recent framework for change is presented in Malcom Gladwell's book, *The Tipping Point* (2000). Gladwell, a writer for the *New Yorker*, has been a student of change and social science. He became interested in how some diseases became epidemics. He wondered if there was anything to learn from epidemiological approach that could apply to social changes. Exploring the variables that change a medical outbreak into a full-blown epidemic, he looked closely at the people and conditions that make for a big change. In his research he found that that the "tipping point" for change is the moment of critical mass, when an idea, or product becomes hot and fully disseminated in the culture. He states:

"We are all, at heart, gradualists, our expectations set by the steady passage of time. But the world of the Tipping Point is a place where the unexpected becomes the expected, where radical change is more than possibility. It is – contrary to all our expectations – a certainty." (pp. 13-14)

Gladwell's thesis is engaging. He contends that there are 3 agents of change that can be applied to social epidemics. He calls these the Law of the Few, the Stickiness Factor, and the Power of Context. All of this is fascinating, but most interesting to me is the reflection on the type of people necessary to change, the Law of the Few. The types of people necessary to create a social epidemic, Gladwell contends, are "connectors, mavens, and salesmen." "Connectors" are people who have a gift for bringing people together. They have well developed acquaintanceships that allow them to initially move an idea. "Maven" is a Yiddish word that means one who accumulates knowledge. These "mavens" are ones who collect information and then look to pass it on. Lastly, "Salesman" are people who have the skills to persuade people toward a product or an idea.

In this notion of the Few, Gladwell looks at all kinds of subtly that can influence the work of "connectors, mavens and salesman." He suggests how people couch their words, the way they use emotion, the approach they take to others can enhance the potency of the message or product and lead it to the Tipping Point of an epidemic.

So the first action here is to get a better handle on our frameworks. In a paradoxical way, some of us do not really know where we are, so change can be compromised from the starting gate. Or worse, we are negative and resistive to anything that is different from the status quo.

Analyzing Change

A critical start point in understanding change and cultural shifting is to analyze and understand the current reality. A good way for doing this is to pause and consider the following three perspectives:

- Look at what has happened – Here we look at the recent past and how the past has influenced what we have done personally, organizationally or on larger scale. This level implies that we are clear and honest about the way the past was and how that has given way to the current reality.
- Look at what is currently happening – At this level we need to explore the present environment and the trends and changes that are occurring. This mandates that we are current and alert to the strides and advances happening within your area of interest.
- Look at what will happen – This third dimension requires that we assess how things will change. Here we need to consider the impact of technology, personnel realities and industry trends and possibilities.

All three of these points of analysis are critical to how we position ourselves when thinking about change and cultural shifting. They require that we are frank about what has happened, be observant about the current advances and then futuristic about what lays ahead. Although these are not easy steps, they are essential in being realistic about the change process. In some ways all 3 elements are available in the data readily available. We just need to dig to find it.

Types of Change

First Order Change - Most people who have looked closely at change agree that there are two distinct orders to change, First Order Change, and Second Order Change. First order change is when we realize we want or need to change, but tinker with this change while still within the context of our current framework. That is, we might want to change something at our office, say the amount of paperwork, so we create an abbreviated format that our staff can use instead. This shortened approach is better than what we had before, but still requires us to do some paperwork. This is an example of first order change. The new format is better but still within the existing framework.

Now with first order change the person or organization is making progress, but is usually not fully satisfying. In many cases, we can fool ourselves into thinking that the first order approach has solved a problem, when it has only adjusted it. This is especially true when the real problem is the framework itself. If the framework is flawed, then first order change is merely cosmetic.

An example I like to use to make this point is the notion of labels that are used in human services. Most people who work in human services would agree that labeling should be minimized, or changed when it creates a negative effect. For example, it was not that long ago, that people who happened to have disabilities were called “cripples.” This term was not only used in common language, facilities that support people with disabilities often used this term in their title. In my own city of Pittsburgh, the facility now known as the Children’s Institute used to be called “The Home for Crippled Children.

As we became more astute to the connotations of the word “crippled”, we decided to make a change. People in human services began to refer to people with disabilities as “handicapped.” We soon realized that this term too, is not acceptable, so we changed again, this time to “the disabled”. Again, some felt that this term was not appropriate, so we really became hip and now refer to “people with disabilities.”

Now I will be the first to admit that the term “people with disabilities” is better than the word “crippled” if you have to use a label. Yet maybe the real issue here is precisely that, the notion of labels. If this is the real core of the problem, then just tinkering with the type of label is nothing more than first order change.

Second Order Change - Obviously, if first order change attempts to adjust the existing framework, then the nature of second order change is to create a new framework. This is where we begin to explore reformation, or even revolution. It calls for a dismantling of the old and a creation of something new. It suggests that the framework is the problem. Of course, for an individual or organization to get to this point means that they are aware and understand the framework. This is a much deeper, and to a large part, uncomfortable place, yet it is critical to cultural shifting.

An example here might be the notion of inclusionary education. Advocates for disability rights in education have called for a halt of special education and the mainstreaming of students with disabilities into the regular schools. This challenge has led to powerful debates and emotional discourse. We know that offset, segregated classes for kids with disabilities not only separates these kids from their typical peers, but it baits stereotypes and perpetuates a myth that kids with disabilities are better off in separate venues. This must change.

Yet to merely place these kids in typical schools is clearly not enough. Indeed, it seems that if we truly want to create inclusion in schools then we have to reform all of education, not just close special education programs. For inclusion to work we must change curriculums, schedules, patterns and the essence of how schools operate. This is second order work, and it is incredibly hard.

There are many reasons why second order change is difficult, but the most prevalent is that it threatens the status quo. When you suggest that something,

anything, be dismantled, all of those who are still a part of the current system are put at risk. The example of educational reform offers a stark lens to think about second order change. One might make the case that we need educational reform for many reasons over and above inclusion of kids with disabilities. We know that the mechanical method of relating to kids, ringing bells, parceling classes, keeping kids in their seats, promoting competition over collaboration, are all reasons for educational reform. We know that we do not need kids to be off school in the summer because less and less kids need to be available for farm work (the reason we did the seasonal schedule in the first place).

All of these reasons might suggest that we need educational reform. Still, we cling to an old and antiquated system; because that's the way we have all ways done it. The devil we know is better than the devil we do not know, and all of the other cliches we use to rationalize staying the same. This is not to mention that we currently have a huge educational industry, with multi-billions of dollars invested in the historic framework. Add to this, a teachers union that will have no part of these new fads.

So we tinker at the edges of the existing educational framework doing this and doing that and in turn, doing nothing. Second order change is hard!

To understand second order change, is to appreciate cultural shifting. When key elements of the culture begin to embrace new things, reformation occurs. As the culture adjusts to incorporate the new person, product or idea, cultural shifting begins.

Cyclical Change - Cyclical change refers to the ups and downs of life. We talk about the seasons changing, but we know that the change will not necessarily last long and that things will go back to the way they were. We can understand cyclical change in relation to the stock market. It goes up and down and sometimes the change can be predicted, other times not. Still, we know that there will be leveling out and corrections that make us feel somewhat balanced with the changes, even though we may not like them. With cyclical change, we need to make adjustment, but can rely on the process coming back to something we understand and can deal with.

Structural Change - On the other hand, structural change is when the events that occur lead to a permanent change. When this happens, the basic structure of what we know has been altered and we need to adjust to the new form. Structural change is when the entire framework is altered or shattered and needs to be rebuilt or redone. Either way, the new structure will have some major differences from the replaced one. This notion of structural change creates a real sense of imbalance, because, until the new structure gets created everything is in chaos. An example of structural change might be when a new government is formed. In my own community this happened recently. Our County (Allegheny County which surrounds the City of Pittsburgh) recently

replaced our Board of Commissioners, which had been making County decisions for the past 200 years, with a new County Executive format. This has led to structural change in County decision-making.

With cultural shifting, structural change can create the backdrop, but may not lead to clear second order change. Still, structural change offers a start point for cultural shifting and can be a good pre-courser to a better culture.

The Flow of Change

As we continue to think about change and cultural shifting, it is important to understand the flow of the change process. Essentially, change can happen one of two ways – from within; or from without. As simple as this might seem, we really need to think this through if we are to understand and manage change.

Many people think that change happens primarily from the outside. That is, the reason for the change is a decision or reason reached by others for us. How many of us have fallen into the trap of thinking we can change people. I used to always be on a crusade to change people. I would try to change people's opinions, or attitudes, or perspectives. My older sisters always remind me that once I headed to college, not only did I become a know-it-all, but was constantly annoying in an effort to change them. It took more years than I care to admit to realize that in most regards it is fruitless to try to change people. Indeed, I can hardly change myself, let alone change others.

Yet the notion that change happens from the outside continues to be embraced. Wives continue to try to change husbands; bosses continue to try to change workers, laws continue to try to change citizens.

The bold fact here is that change is much more of an "inside-out" phenomenon than outside in. This is not to say that change is always inside out. Certainly there are times when outside forces are so strong, or compelling that difficult change can occur. All of us can think of examples when this has happened.

The noted consultant and author, Steven Covey, explores change in all of his work. He states (1990):

"Change – real change – comes from the inside out. It doesn't come from hacking at the leaves of attitude and behavior with quick fix personality ethic techniques. It comes from striking at the root – the fabric of our thought, the fundamental, essential paradigms, which give definition to our character and create the lens through which we see the world." P. 78.

As students of change have looked at this flow of change, most acknowledge and recommend that we use more of an inside out approach to change. That is,

rather than try to force someone to change, it is far better to guide people to create the change themselves. When someone has an internal reason to change, there is a much greater chance that change will occur. Not always, but the odds are usually better from within. This is often referred to as “ownership”. When people feel an ownership to an idea, concept, vision or mission there will be a much greater buy in.

Saul Alinsky, the controversial community organizer who practiced in the Chicago area in the 40’s and 50’s had an interesting take on change. In his career Alinsky worked to change the way poor people were treated in Chicago. Early in his work, Alinsky used to tell people that they were being mistreated and needed to push for change. This approach was rarely successful. It wasn’t until Alinsky got people to realize their plight and become personally invested, that change occurred.

Alinsky also realized the two basic ways that change occurred. From outside – he called this revolution. Or from inside – he called this evolution. He wrote (1960) that both routes to change could lead to success and cultural shifting, but that there were key tradeoffs in the process. With revolution, change was always quicker, but more brutal, and less long lasting. Often with revolution, once those you attempt to change get back on their feet, they strike back, or move things back to the way they were before the change. Think here about political revolution. Usually these efforts are bloody and implosive. In many cases the insurgents get beaten back and thoroughly punished by the power base they attempted to replace. There are precious few examples of long lasting revolutionary change.

The other approach, evolution, Alinsky postulated, was slower, more tedious, but longer lasting. Evolution looks to push and mold the actions of the power elite into a process of change. With evolution, the change is tied to adaptation and cultural success. This shift in the culture is powerful, but the drawback is that it is very slow. Often, before the change can really happen those that push for change get co-opted.

In his work, Alinsky simplified the issue of change by creating what he called the power triangle. At the top of the triangle are the “**haves.**” These are the wealthy, strong, or officially powerful few who hold the cards and often make the rules. To Alinsky, these are the people who must grant or embrace the change for it to be sanctioned.

The middle level of the triangle is the “**have-a-little, want-mores.**” These are the folks who represent groups, or have some vested interest in a constituency and want to see them included or welcomed. These folks can be change-agents or spokespersons for a cause.

The last level of the triangle Alinsky called the “**have nots.**” These largest groupings of people are those that are shut out or disempowered. This group is the lowest level of social stratification of the community. These are the people represented by the middle level of the power triangle.

In this analogy, Alinsky suggested that the change-agent could either go through the system for change (evolution) or outside the system to push a new agenda (revolution). As simple as these notions seem the analogy works. Most communities I know can be analyzed in this framework.

Another legendary change agent, who understood the inside out approach was Miles Horton (1990). All of his career, Horton was interested in the change process. His interest led him to found the Highlander Center in New Market Tennessee. This Center has been a bastion for change over the years. In the 30’s the Center helped the labor movement develop better work environments for workers. By the 40’s and 50’s the Center turned attention to the Civil Rights movement. Rosa Parks, Ralph Abernathy, Martin Luther King, and Eleanor Roosevelt were among the leaders who spent time at the Highlander Center.

Horton knew that people did not need experts to help them change. Rather, he contended, folks just need a chance to think about their situation and then opportunity to talk with others who are experiencing the same thing and come to some conclusions about strategies and actions. This approach is a basic empowerment of people. Horton had great confidence in the wisdom of everyday folks to figure out what they need to solve their problems.

In a way, Alinsky’s and Horton’s perspective on change is a further elaboration of the inside and outside question. The flow of change is as vital as the reason why we promote change in the first place.

The Zones of Change

Following this thesis that inside out change is much more potent than change that originates from the outside, we must begin the process by thinking about the personal elements and working outward through three distinct zones. These zones offer us key elements for understanding cultural shifting and vital points for penetration. The zones can be summarized as:

Secondary

Primary

Personal

The Personal Zone – The most basic and foundational aspect for change is found at the personal level. By the personal zone, I am referring to all elements related to the person attempting to change. This includes personal background, experience, habits, generational influences and exposures that have created the person you are. This includes your hot and cold buttons, the things you are attracted to and the things you cannot stand.

This personal zone is the obvious place to start for considering change. Regardless if you want, should or must change, a successful process is dependent on the ability to know and balance elements of the personal zone. Key questions here to help with personal change might be:

- What do I like to do
- What don't I like to do
- What are my "hot buttons" (things that irritate me)
- What are my "cold buttons" (things that don't make me mad)
- What personal aspects helped with past change efforts
- Who might I rely on to help me
- What is my endurance level (the time it takes to bore me)
- What things relax me
- How might all these ideas relate to my change

Organizations too, have a personal level. If your change goal is to have an impact on an organization or grouping of people, the personal elements must also be considered. In a simple way, the personal elements of a group of people are found in an individual analysis of the people involved. If you have the time, you should get a sense of the same questions listed in the personal zone, but relate these to the collective reality of the group. This could take some work, but is well worth the effort in giving you a better ledge hold for change. If your time is limited, you might shortcut the effort by focusing some analytic attention on the formal and informal leaders of the group. Often these people, and their behavior, drive the collective actions of the group. If their behavior is accurately assessed, a solid start for change can be established.

The Primary Zone – Quite simply, the primary zone is that grouping of people and associations who have a close personal connection with the individual. This would include family, both nuclear and extended, friends and colleagues as well as systems such as churches, fraternal organizations and other points of primary contact. This cluster around the individual is the key supporters and focus of encouragement. If these individuals or small groupings of people get behind the change, success is so much more viable. Ways to identify primary players are:

- Family constellation
- Close personal friends
- Mentors

- Teachers
- Clergy
- Hero's

As with individuals, organizations have a primary zone as well. These include other groupings of people or players that have an allied relationship to your department or team. For example, at my organization, if I am attempting to promote change with staff that provides attendant care, the primary system might be administrative support, clerical support, other agencies who do similar work, family members and folks we serve. Each of these clusters of people represents primary connectors to our attendant care staff.

The Secondary Zone – The last zone around the person is called the secondary one. This final clustering of people are the less direct, but still influential people or systems that relate to the person considering change. The secondary zone represents the policy, procedure, history, rules or regulations, be they formal or informal, which surround the person or organization. These often are the confines of the way things are and have a deep impact on the way things might become. A laundry list of secondary things to consider is:

- Formal structure
- Current resources
- Laws
- Policy
- Procedure
- Government structures
- Regulations
- Bylaws
- Current informal trends
- Current knowledge
- Current paradigms

Again, organizations have had a historical focus on these secondary issues. Given the industrial roots and mechanistic tendencies of most organizations the secondary issues of policies and procedures have reigned supreme. To this end, most companies have felt that if they created a rule or regulation, this would guide the change. Today we know that change is a phenomenon that most effectively happens from the inside out.

Another way to understand these “zones of change” is to think about the their points of assimilation. That is, the way the change impacts all three levels. One way to do this is to think about the following three perspectives:

1. **Micro change** – This is the change and shifting that affects you, your spouse, family, close friends and associates. This relates to when “I” have to change.

2. **Organizational Change** – Here the change affects the primary organizations in your life, your company, church, clubs groups and associations. This relates to when “we” have to change.
3. **Macro Change** – This third perspective acknowledges the broader, cultural systems. Included here are national, international and global aspects that impact change. This relates to when “everyone” must change.

Although cultural shifting is implicit in all three zones or perspectives, the notion of organizational change is how the culture is impacted. Some theorists (Conner, 1992) suggest the following 5 principles in thinking about cultural change:

1. “Realize that control is what we all seek in our lives, and the ambiguity caused by the disruption of expectation is what we all fear and avoid.
2. Are able to exercise some degree of direct or indirect control over what happened during the implementation of change.
3. Can assimilate change at a speed commensurate with the pace of the events taking place around you.
4. Understand the micro implications of organizational or macro change.
5. Face a total assimilation demand from the micro, organizational and macro transitions in your life that is within your absorption limits”. (p.85)

The Change Curve

Another perspective on the flow of change comes from the business notion of the change curve. It is commonly thought that business notions move through three major changes. The first is the phase of **entrepreneurial action**. This is the period when an idea is launched and there is great excitement. The leaders are innovators and new paradigms are being created. For many people this is a highly charged period where dreams begin to be realized.

Once the idea is launched and the product or service is being sought, the second phase begins – that of **growth and development**. In this period, great strides are made as more and more demand for the product or service meet with production and rapid growth. Protocols for development get detailed, and to a certain extent, entrenched.

As the product or service hits a peak, the natural tendency is for the third phase, that of **decline or renewal**, to set in. The product or service is now widespread and probably other competitors have entered the field. The organization is probably in for a decline unless it can find ways for renewal. Experts in organizational change will often focus attention and action on the ways that renewal can occur.

These three phases have been articulated by Lynch and Kordis (1988) and are summarized nicely by Ed Oakley and Doug Krug, in their thoughtful book, Enlightened Leadership: Getting to the Heart of Change (1994). They identify the phases as:

“The Entrepreneurial Phase usually is filled with excitement and energy. Employees and owners alike are caught up in doing whatever needs to be done, in staying close to the customer and in focusing on how to best serve each person with whom they come into contact. Often marked by discovery and breakthroughs, this phase characteristically involves limited capital and “seat-of-the-pants” existence. High energy and enthusiasm make up for lack of experience and inevitable mistakes. The phase is marked by:

- Doing whatever it takes to survive
- Adaptability and flexibility to market needs
- Willingness to take risks
- High motivation and energy
- High level of internal and external communication

The Growth Phase of development begins with marked growth and expansion. In this phase they begin to systematize their methods so their successes can be replicated effectively. Companies typically keep putting more systems, policies, procedures, and processes into place to sustain and control growth in an attempt to hold on to what they have done that has worked. The phase is marked by:

- Market and financial success
- Focus on efficiency and effectiveness
- Development of systems, rules, and procedures
- Shift from entrepreneurial direction to more management control
- Excitement about growth

Later in the Growth Phase, however, those very systems and procedures that have gotten a company successfully to where it is can become barriers to its continued success. Duplication, rigid policies, and assembly-line thinking begin to create boundaries in the organization. Late Growth Phase is marked by:

- Increased boundaries
- Many committees
- Breakdown of communications
- Habit orientation
- Rejection of innovation
- Bureaucratic style

- Threatened by risk
- Low energy

Every growth cycle has a peak. If we remain locked on this curve past the peak, we move into decline. If we hold on to “what we have always done” or “the way we have always done it around here,” we will end up in the Declining or Dying Phase.” Pp. 28-32.

Any of us, who have worked for an organization or for some type of social cause or change can relate to these three phases. New things are often embraced and cause for excitement to those who can see the benefit. Yet the Growth, and Late Growth phases are ones we have all experienced. The real challenge of individual and organizational change success is to move from the growth phase to renewal of our vision. We can move from the status quo to something new, but it isn't easy.

The Roles of Change

When thinking about change, some experts have talked about the various roles that people take in the change process. These roles are clearly defined and have a clear impact on how the change rolls out. In thinking about cultural shifting it is important to consider how any of the following described roles impact the change agent or gatekeeper. The key in understanding the roles of change is to appreciate how the people playing the roles relate. Conner (1992) discuss these major roles as follows:

“Sponsors – A sponsor is the individual or group who has the power to sanction or legitimize change. Sponsors consider the potential changes facing and organization and assess the dangers and opportunities these transitions reflect. They decide which changes will happen, communicate the new priorities to the organization, and provide the proper reinforcement to assure success. Sponsors are responsible for creating an environment that enables these changes to be made on time and within budget.

Agents – An agent is the individual or group who is responsible for actually making the change. Agent success depends on the ability to diagnose potential problems, develop a plan to deal with these issues, and execute the change effectively. The participation of change agents who possess these skills is a crucial factor in the success of any change project.

Targets – The individual or group who must actually change is the target. The term target is used because these people are the focus of the change effort and play a crucial role in the short-and long-term success of the project. To increase the likelihood of success, they must be educated to understand the changes they are expected to accommodate, and they must be involved appropriately in the implementation process.

Advocates – An advocate is the individual or group who wants to achieve a change but lacks the power to sanction it. Recommendations to save money or boost productivity can die an early death if those who generate the ideas do not have the skills to gain support from the appropriate sponsors who can approve their ideas.” (pp106 – 107)

Resistance to Change

In all of this analysis it is clear that change is not easy. As creatures of habit, to go from one approach of behavior to a new place is never easy. As we continue this exploration of change, we would be remiss if we did not dissect the key resistances to change. Know that these resistances play out much more aggressively with negative gatekeepers and neutral members of culture. Although the resistances are present for everyone, the positive gatekeepers have fewer problems with these issues.

Schermerhorn and associates (2000) identified 8 major resistances to change. These are:

1. Fear of the unknown – People tend to be wary of that which they do not know. Change represents an unknown and resistances follow. These unknowns create a formidable obstacle, especially for negative gatekeepers who are looking for the easiest reason not to change.
2. Lack of good information – Often the change agent does not bring forward good information to those intended to follow the change and this lack of information creates resistance. When people are in the dark they cannot make the change.
3. Fear of loss of security – A new direction suggests that the existing direction is stale. This shift creates real insecurity in people. People will go to heroic efforts to avoid insecurity. These efforts lead to staying the course rather than embracing something new.
4. No reasons to change – In many cases of change those on the other side of change do not see or know the reasons why they should change. This lack of knowledge creates resistance. Without a viable reason people maintain the status quo.
5. Fear for loss of power – People do not like to be rendered irrelevant, or lacking skill. Yet, a new direction makes everyone an apprentice. This shift causes resistance. The loss of power is a potent deterrent to change.
6. Lack of resources – Even if the team sees the wisdom or need for change, if they feel they do not have the resources or tools, resistance can follow. The positive gatekeeper needs to assure that other people, especially those neutral members of community have the resources to change.

7. Bad timing – Regardless of the viability of the change, if the timing is not right, resistances can happen. Many a good idea has failed because it was introduced at the wrong time.
8. Habit – Many people know they should adjust or change, and really want to, but the habits of the old ways can create a formidable obstacle and lead to resistance. Negative gatekeepers tend to be people who are much more easily habituated to their present situation.

Liebler and McConnel (1999) offered another perspective on resistance when they identified the following 4 elements of resistance. These are:

1. Lack of Trust – People do not trust the reasons, or strategy or agent leading the change effort. Again, this notion of trust is a key element to change.
2. Different Assessment of the Situation – Here the team sees the situation as different from the decision maker or change agent. This often happens when the team feels less invested in the situation than the leadership might. This idea of investment is another critical point. The change agent must figure out ways to get the team invested.
3. Desire to Protect the Status Quo – Here the team wants to keep things the way they have always been. The devil we know is better than the devil we do not know.
4. Protection of Self-Interest – In this resistance the team sees no benefit of the change to them. Change means that people need to learn new things. Going back to being an apprentice is a strong deterrent to change.

Resistance can come in overt or covert ways. Sometimes it is clear that people are resistant and other times folks are more cloaked in how they resist. Both types are difficult to deal with, but covert change, or sabotage can blind side the change agent.

Regardless, resistance can also manifest around one (or all) of three points. These are:

1. Resistance to the Change – Here people feel that the need to change is not viable and they have no vested interest to follow.
2. Resistance to the Change Strategy – This type of resistance (overt or covert) centers on how the change is being perceived.
3. Resistance to the Change Agent – At this level, the team can understand the reasons as well as the strategy, but have a problem with the person leading the change. This same resistance can pertain to the positive gatekeeper as well.

In thinking about resistance it is critical to make the link to culture and community. As we explored in Chapter 2, all groups, teams, or communities

have both positive and negative gatekeepers. It is often the negative gatekeeper who leads the resistance or creates the actions of sabotage to the change approach.

Conversely, resistance to change can be mitigated by the affirmation of the positive gatekeeper. That is, the wise change agent will look for cultural support to the reason and direction for the change. In this regard they lessen the effect of resistance to the agent by using the positive gatekeeper to promote the process of cultural shifting.

VISION AND IMAGE

Change can happen in many different ways, but most theorists who look at the concept know that vision plays a key role promoting change and helping the culture to shift. This should not be a surprise in that vision offers a start point for anything new. If you want to go from point A to point B, having a vision that charts your course is essential. Maps, for example, establish vision for movement in travel.

There is not a management or leadership theory or book that does not acknowledge the notion of vision as key to any successful, change oriented organization or culture. It seems to be the most foundational of concepts to change. Peter Block (1988) offered the following definition of vision.

“Vision is our deepest expression of what we want. It is the preferred future, a desirable state, an ideal state, and expression of optimism. It expresses the spiritual and idealistic side of our nature. It is a dream created in our waking hours of how we would like our lives to be.” P. 52.

For organizational purposes, vision differs from mission. The mission statement of an organization identifies what it does. The vision statement identifies why it does it. At my organization, for example, our mission speaks to the kinds of services we offer to individuals and families that experience disability. Our vision statement, which is “building a community where each belongs” articulates why we do what we do. In our case, the mission oriented actions set the tone for preparation and action so that folks with disabilities can be active in community. These involvements in community helps to create a place were all people have a role and are valued.

Folks who have studied organizations and change contend that the most successful groups on the change curve are those that can align their mission with their vision. This notion of alignment helps to promote a focus that is essential to organizational and individual change.

According to Oakley and Krug (1994), "Vision inspires us to reach for possibilities and to make them realities. It brings out the best in ourselves and in our organizations. Vision helps men and women rise above their fears and preoccupations with what can go wrong and focus on what can go right." P. 172.

Vision is further defined as the capacity to frame a direction in taking action on a cause. Often vision can be displayed as in a before and after poster. Many advertisers use this method to create a vision for a product that will bait the consumer to make a purchase. All of us are familiar with these approaches, and many of us have used them as the lure for action. Weight loss programs are legion for this method. These graphic illustrations of how things might be if we join weight watchers, or buy a diet suppressant are very convincing.

I am particularly taken with ads for Rogaine, the hair growth drug. TV, magazine and poster ads are everywhere touting the success of Rogaine. As the baby boomers age, and begin to lose their hair, Rogaine is now in great demand. Yet, all these ads really do is create a vision for action. The action, of course, is to have consumers purchase the product.

To create a vision does not always require a visual image. Slogans, titles, names and other words and sounds can conjure up mental images that can drive behaviors. We know that product or company tag lines can build a vision. Think of the many slogans designed to promote actions.

Did somebody say McDonalds?
We do things right
Just do it
Drivers Wanted
Once you pop, you can't stop
UPS – Working at the speed of business
NFL – Feel the power
We're Trying Harder
Have it Your Way
NBA – I love this game

Organization mission statements offer segue to a vision. Many companies pay big dollars to advertising and marketing firms to help frame a vision statement that creates energy. Another method of pushing a vision, however, can be found in organization logos. A logo is a simple picture, illustration or portrayal that captures the organization's thrust. Again, the business of helping produce logos, or to enhance a visual is competitive and expensive.

These ideas of logos and slogans are often designed to produce a company "brand identity". The idea of a "brand identity" is when the product name becomes synonymous with a product industry. For example, the name "Levi's" has been so prominently associated with blue jeans that the two items are almost

interchangeable. The same is true with Xerox. You can routinely hear people ask for a Xerox copy. Or Kleenex, now synonymous for facial tissues.

Another median for vision is music. In the world of advertising, product songs, jingles and other types of music can create a powerful mood that a vision is developed. Anthems, school fight songs, military marches and the like all create a vision of winning. Musical scores that accompany movies are essential to establishing the mood that supports the plot and action.

All of these items are related to vision. The vision sets the tone for individual or organizational action. Vision leads to change.

VISION AND CHANGE

Leading experts in organizational change all acknowledge vision as one of the first critical notions of promoting change. John Kotter, in his successful book, Leading Change, (1996), states:

“Vision refers to a picture of the future with some implicit or explicit commentary on why people should strive to create that future. In a change process, a good vision serves three important purposes. First, by clarifying the general direction for change, by saying the corporate equivalent of “we need to be south of here in a few years instead where we are today,” it simplifies hundreds or thousands of more detailed decisions. Second, it motivates people to take action in the right direction, even if the initial steps are personally painful. Third, it helps coordinate the actions of different people, even thousands and thousands of individuals, in a remarkably fast and efficient way.” (pp. 68-69)

Another vital role driven by vision is the “tension” it causes. That is, if a person or organization has a vision of where they want to be, it becomes obvious that this is not where they currently are. The gap between where they are as compared to where they want to be causes a tension. This tension might cause the person or organization to give up on their vision, or it might push the person or entity towards a creative action to get closer to the vision. This action is what we call change. Peter Senge (1990) refers to this action as follows:

“The juxtaposition of vision (what we want) and a clear picture of the current reality (where we are relative to what we want) generates what we call “creative tension”: a force to bring them together, caused by the natural tendency of tension to seek resolution. The essence of personal mastery is learning how to generate and sustain creative tension in our lives.” P. 142

As vital as vision might be, it is important to realize that if a person's vision is short, or impaired in some way, the vitality of change can be affected. That is, if a person sees a framework the same way, for many years, then a new framework will be structured from the initial vision. What we see is dependent on what we are prepared to see. Similarly, if the vision is too far reaching from the current reality, the distance may lead to failure to change far enough. This is why strategic planning efforts always start with a thorough analysis of the internal and external environments. To have vision move from one point to another is predicated on baiting the new vision.

An example here is close to home for me. At UCP of Pittsburgh, as with most rehabilitation agencies, the framework for vision was based on a medical or treatment based model. That is, most of our early programs were structured from the perspective of helping a client fix their deficit or enhance functionality. To do this we felt we needed to assess individual's problems. Given this paradigm, all of our early strategic planning and program action was tied to this premise.

In the course of my work, however, two themes began to push my thinking. One was the fact that UCP couldn't really help fix disability deficits. We could not make people with significant disabilities become significantly different than they were. As much as we wanted to help people become vital parts of the community, to attempt to change people with disabilities through the use of a classic medical model did not produce this result.

Concurrent with this reality, was a changing world where people with disabilities were becoming more militant and frustrated with how they were perceived and treated by rehabilitation organizations. The civil rights effort was drifting into the era of disability rights. Folks were demanding to be treated differently.

Both of these growing perspectives were uncomfortable to us. Our intent was good, but our outcomes were missing the mark. This frustration began to push us to challenge our framework. Initially this was difficult. My first reaction was not to see the framework as the problem. Folks just do not want to admit that, as the cartoon character Pogo once said: "I have met the enemy and he is us." Yet this reality became more and more clear.

Once we got to this point, no matter how painful, we were ready to craft a new vision. We had become more prepared to see a different vision for our agency and the work that we do. In many ways my book, Interdependence: The Route to Community, (1991, 1995) was a thorough articulation of this vision shift from a medical/treatment model, to a broader vision of community and interdependence.

In looking at vision and change, psychologist Robert Rosen, in his book, Leading People (1996), suggests that five critical vision elements exist. These are:

1. Painting the Whole Picture – Leaders see the whole organization, thanks to their singular vantage point. Successful leaders make the whole greater than the sum of its parts. They take charge of the organization and feel a sense of obligation and responsibility for making things happen. To come close to this ideal, he must share his vision with others, enlist their ideas and support, and help people see where they fit in. p. 32.
2. Creating a common purpose – Every organization needs a North Star, a purpose to believe in, something that inspires and stretches the workforce. It gives the organization stability, a foundation, and a reason for being. p 40.
3. Engaging in Outcome Thinking – There are two aspects of vision. In one part, the leader stands before her people and paints a picture of the possible. But if she stops there, nothing will ever be accomplished. The second part of vision is just as important as the first. Here the leader focuses on outcomes, on the execution of the vision. She imagines and implements the doable, and creates results. p. 49.
4. Navigating the Change Process – The successful leader understands the complexity of change. He is a change agent that mobilizes his workforce. He creates a vision that is clear, compelling, and shared by others. People then must step up to the plate – understand the challenges and take responsibility for solving them. P. 56.
5. Building a High Performance Culture – The ultimate challenge of any leader is to create a world-class organization, one that is both highly productive, and able to withstand competitive assault. All policies, systems, and rewards must support the vision and goals. And the climate must inspire people to achieve extraordinary results. p. 66.

CONCLUSION

Cultural shifting is about change. The more we come to know about the change process and how this flow is tied to culture, the easier it is to be in front of the change cycle. The key person to change is the gatekeeper or a change agent responsible for promoting a cause. In this regard these people become leaders of change.

“When we try to bring about change in our societies, we are treated first with indifference, then with ridicule, then with oppression. And finally, the greatest challenge is thrown at us; we are treated with respect. This is the most dangerous stage”

A.T. Ariyaratne