

Leading change: think before you leap

By Marvin Faure, Ben Clayton-Joly, Michael Newman and Stephen Okunowo, *The Enablers Network*

Abstract

Three quarters of change initiatives are known to fail. We believe there are three common reasons for this, which are often combined and are often overlooked. The first is in the choice of process: too often leaders adopt a top-down or expert-led process in situations where a stakeholder-engagement process would have a better chance of success. The second is a failure of leaders to adapt their communication to their audience, resulting in mutual misunderstandings and recriminations. The third is a lack of psychological or cognitive diversity in the teams tasked with conducting the changes, leading to poor decisions.

We explain the theory underpinning these three causes of failure, and illustrate them with four case studies drawn from our personal experience.

Introduction

Leading change is a constant challenge for leaders. The research is unequivocal¹: three quarters of change processes fail. This is not news, so why does it keep happening, in spite of all the evidence?

In answering this question, we look at examples of both successful and unsuccessful change efforts. We tease out the reasons why leaders took their decisions, and how, with the benefit of hindsight, they might have done better.

We show that, contrary to what one might think, many of the failures in change initiatives actually take place in relatively straightforward situations, where cause-and-effect can be determined and one would expect failure to be less likely.

Many leaders begin by misreading the context. The last two to three decades have seen sharp increases in the levels of volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA) in the business environment. When the old cause-and-effect relationships break down, decision-making processes and leadership heuristics that worked well in the past are no longer effective.

The *Cynefin*² framework, developed by David Snowden and his colleagues at IBM Business Services in the 1990's, has become an essential tool for leaders trying to respond to the challenge of VUCA. The framework has gone through numerous iterations and now divides the operating environment into five possible domains: **Clear**, **Complicated**, **Complex**, **Chaotic** and **Confused**³.

The **Confused** domain is both the centre and the starting point: you are always in this domain until you have clearly determined which of the other four domains is most appropriate to describe your situation.

In the **Clear** and **Complicated** domains the systems and situations are ordered, meaning there are clear relationships between the parts and cause-and-effect linkages. The essential difference between these two domains is that in the Clear domain the problems and solutions can be understood by anyone, whereas in the Complicated domain they can only be fully understood by experts. Much of organisational life takes place in these two domains: many business processes such as accounting are in the Clear domain, as is routine maintenance and the majority of assembly work on production lines. In the Complicated domain, we find tasks or processes that require deep expertise, such as new product industrialisation and civil engineering projects.

In the **Complex** and **Chaotic** domains, the systems and situations are unordered and unpredictable: there are many moving parts with unclear, non-linear relationships and no *a priori* discernible cause-and-effect linkages. Predicting outcomes is impossible, and the only way forward is to multiply the experiments and see what works. More and more of organisational life is now taking place in these two domains: decisions in the time of Covid-19 were initially in the Chaotic domain and have now largely moved into the Complex domain; many decisions or changes that rely on people's behaviour are in the Complex domain.

The *Cynefin* framework makes clear the vital importance of understanding the operating environment before taking decisions. The leadership style, tools and processes that work well in one domain generally do not work well in another. In particular, it is well understood that attempting to apply an approach that would normally be effective in an ordered situation to one which is Complex will almost always lead to failure. It seems less well understood, however, that failure to apply the right approach in the apparently simpler Clear or Complicated situations is equally likely to lead to failure.

So what typically goes wrong in these situations? We believe there are three major causes of failure.

The first is the choice of process. In line with our own observations and experience, Makoto Nagaishi and Gervase Bushe argue in their recent paper, *Imagining the Future through the Past: Organization Development isn't (just) about Change*⁴, that many failures in change management are due to the persistent use of change processes that rely on a top-down, or expert-led process, in situations where success requires much deeper stakeholder involvement. Failing to involve people in decisions that affect them not only runs the risk of rejection on principle (e.g. NIH, or Not Invented Here), but also the very real risk that the decisions will be sub-optimal at best and perhaps even inapplicable. It is not because expertise is required to understand some aspects of the situation that the process should necessarily be expert-led. We build on Nagaishi and Bushe's argument, showing how top-down or expert-led processes led to failure in situations where a more inclusive stakeholder-engagement process might have obtained better results.

To the fateful choice of process we add two other potential causes. The first is the common failure of leaders to adapt their leadership and communication style to the audience and the situation. Regardless of the choice of process, leadership communication is fundamental to success. Not only is your viewpoint, as an executive, very different to that of a front-line employee, but also you will have spent many hours thinking about, debating and crafting the strategy. Is it reasonable to expect people at lower levels to understand and accept all this on the basis of a short speech or presentation?

The final issue we consider to be a significant cause of failure is a lack of cognitive diversity in the leadership and/or project teams. There is a wide variation in cognitive styles: the ways different people prefer to interact with others, to take in and evaluate information, to reach decisions and to accept ambiguity. Well understood and well managed, this variation is a source of strength and high performance. Poorly managed, it can lead to misunderstandings or even substantive disagreements between

people, as well as to blind spots. Teams composed of people with similar cognitive styles fall easily into the trap of groupthink.

We have found the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to be a useful tool to shed light on these communication challenges and help people to resolve their differences. For those who are unfamiliar with the MBTI, you will find a brief introduction at the end of this article.

Definitions

Before going on we must first define what we mean by technical or adaptive change, and by expert-led or top-down processes as opposed to stakeholder-engagement processes.

The table below contrasting technical challenges with adaptive challenges has been adapted from Nagaishi and Bushe’s paper:

TECHNICAL CHALLENGES	ADAPTIVE CHALLENGES
Easy to define	Difficult to define
Require changes of a technical nature to operational processes or procedures	Require changes in values, beliefs, relationships and mindsets
People accept the changes once they understand the technical solution	People will generally resist changing their values, beliefs, relationships and mindsets
Can often be solved by experts, independently of the everyday actors or users	Can only be solved by involving the stakeholders
Requires specific change in limited areas	Requires broad change, often across organisational barriers
Implementation is often rapid, through changes to rules or procedures	Implementation takes time and may require experiments
Technical problems tend to stay solved until something else changes	The changes may create new problems that will require further work
EXAMPLES FROM MANUFACTURING	
How do we reduce re-work in the machining department?	How do we reduce accidents?
How do we decrease set-up time to machine a specific part?	How do we move from one 8h shift per day to working 24x7?
EXAMPLES FROM OPERATIONS	
How do we reduce the DSO (days of sales outstanding) in accounts receivable?	How do we adopt a more customer-centric culture?
How do we optimise the loading process for our delivery trucks?	How do we improve motivation in the Operations department?

Table 1: Technical vs. Adaptive Challenges

Expert-led or top-down processes

These are change management processes that have little or no direct involvement of the direct actors, the people who do the work (if employees) or who are directly affected by it (if customers, suppliers or other external stakeholders). Expert-led processes are usually the most efficient way to solve technical challenges. If technical expertise is required, the project is managed by one or more experts. If no technical expertise is required, the changes may simply be decided by management and announced in a top-down process.

Stakeholder engagement processes

These are change management processes that, by definition, involve a wide cross-section of the stakeholders, meaning all groups that are directly affected by the changes (and sometimes groups that are indirectly affected by them). Giving such groups a voice provides many advantages in the face of an adaptive challenge: improving the range of innovative solutions examined; improving the robustness of the solutions; and improving the probability that they will be widely accepted.

Four case studies

We have brought together a number of case study examples from our direct experience. The examples range the full gamut between success and failure In terms of business objectives and provide illustrations of both good and questionable practice.

We look at each case study through three basic questions: was the process appropriate for the type of change, were the leadership

behaviours effective in supporting the desired change and was the team well-balanced in terms of cognitive diversity?

For the sake of simplicity and clarity, we often use only two or three of the letters making up the full four-letter MBTI Type codes when referring to the cognitive style of the protagonists. The four Temperaments in particular (NT, NF, SJ, SP) have been shown by numerous researchers to be helpful descriptors⁵.

1. Retraining the global salesforce

In this example from a multi-national manufacturing company, we will see how a combination of adopting an expert-led process with an ill-adapted leadership style led to failure. The project was to introduce standardised sales training across the global salesforce, which was decentralised. Although they were theoretically coordinated centrally, in practice the sales teams reported locally. The implied objective was to increase sales, but this was never formally quantified. The project manager had six years of experience leading the largest international sales team in the company and was based at headquarters. A senior and well-respected leader in the company, he was expected to define and lead the project with minimum supervision. Crucially, the budget remained at the level of the individual countries, so he would have to create training that was accepted by each country sales manager.

The leader’s personality type was INTP. This means he had a preference for working alone, thinking through the issues in an ordered and rational manner, developing a model and building a vision for the future. He was less sensitive to the possible reactions of the people involved or to the details of implementation.

True to his type, the leader began by researching best practices in sales and creating a vision for the sales force behaviours and processes most likely to lead to success. He visited some (not all) of the country sales managers to gather their input. He then developed a detailed Request for Proposal and sent it to seven or eight external vendors with the ability to deliver global sales training. He analysed the submissions himself, and chose a reputable firm with a blue-chip reference list and the product that impressed him most. Proud of his work, he was convinced that the training would have a significant impact.

The difficulties began when he tried to roll the program out. Country sales managers who had been cooperative when he asked for their input were much less so when he asked them to implement the training. He had to deploy considerable efforts of persuasion to get some of them to adopt the training, while others never complied. Ultimately, about 70% of the population went through the training. There was little follow-up and no effort to embed the new practices in day-to-day sales management. As often happens in large companies, the leader was moved to a new role barely a year after being appointed. The project was thus never evaluated for its effectiveness, but there is little doubt that the overall impact was negligible.

It is not hard to see the basic errors. Indeed, one could question the very premise of the project itself: does it really make sense to introduce globally standardised sales training in a decentralised organisation? Furthermore, was training the right response to under-performance? To stand any chance of making a positive impact, the project leader should have stood back and recognised that he was faced with an adaptive challenge that was unlikely to respond well to an expert-led solution. In spite of his expertise in international sales, he was far from understanding the challenges faced by country sales managers in places as diverse as Hungary, Indonesia and the United States. Above all, he needed to listen to the stakeholders and establish himself as a trusted resource, able to help them address their local challenges.

Our role in this case was as an employee of the multi-national organisation concerned, at the centre of the action.

2. Culture change in a global organisation

A large global manufacturing company had undergone a multi-year period of divestment, acquisition and integration. When the cycle was nearing completion, they set a new strategy: focus on organic growth through improving customer satisfaction and increasing their share in high growth areas. The leadership team recognised that a cultural and behavioural shift was necessary to deliver the expected value, and believed they could achieve this faster than their competitors.

The change was initiated by an NTJ-dominated leadership team. People with the NTJ cognitive style tend to be visionary, analytical and structured. They played to their expertise and strengths by connecting the change to a clear goal, and set a few, (but not too many) milestones. In true NTJ style, they recognised the need to have a comprehensive architecture and new model so that operations, support functions and commercial activity would transform their culture in parallel. Much thought was put into their overall approach and they chose a mixture of business leaders and OD professionals to mastermind the transformation. For the leadership team, the change would be successful because of their clear strategic vision and competent execution, and they fondly imagined they might be reading future articles in business journals complementing them on their 'textbook' transformation.

Usefully, the team of business leaders and OD professionals appointed to the project had a strong NFP component. People with this cognitive style tend to be visionaries with strong people-oriented value systems, highly tolerant of ambiguity. Their natural preference to engage and inspire meant they launched a process to reach out to people across the globe to solicit opinions and perceptions. The process was successful in engaging people and helping them feel connected to the future business and energised by the possibilities. Unfortunately, the flip side of the NFP personality type is a lack of patience for structure and detail: the team fell into the trap of failing to create a clear roadmap of exactly what needed to be done, overlooking many details needed to cement the changes across a global organisation. For this team, the change would be successful because they engaged people and helped them feel ownership of the transformation.

The baton was now taken up by HR, who had been observing the action impatiently from the side-lines and were keen to assert their expertise. HR had a close relationship with external change consultants and stepped up with the confident message; *"leave it to us, we know how to do this"*. Somewhat unusually for HR, both the internal HR and the consultant teams had a dominant MBTI cognitive style of SJ. People with this style tend to be very much rooted in current reality and feel most comfortable when the structure is clear and all goals and plans to achieve them are well-defined. Their preference was thus to provide the necessary detail and process that would enable people to correctly implement the change. Working slowly and methodologically, they took the desired competencies as a starting point and ran a second comprehensive engagement process to turn them into specific, measurable behaviours. They took further time to re-engineer the company-wide reporting and appraisal processes to ensure consistency and compliance with the new frameworks and models. For this team, the change would be successful because *"culture eats strategy for breakfast, so cultural change needs to be done properly."* When challenged about slow progress, their defence was to provide academic case studies and compelling stories that confirmed their point of view.

By the time the complete package was branded, polished and ready for "The Launch", the moment had passed and there was little enthusiasm for its roll-out and implementation. The new processes were too little, too late to have any real impact.

Interestingly, cultural change was happening in many parts of the business, in spite of the absence of central direction. Both operations and commercial were discovering a huge amount through their trials and customer interactions and had already adapted their behaviours according to the reality they were facing, rather than waiting for an expert solution.

The project can thus be considered partially successful, but far from being a case study in excellence. In hindsight, the biggest mistake was to let slip the opportunity afforded by the initial stakeholder-engagement process conducted by the NFP project team. Had leadership launched a beta version of the cultural change at this point, using a series of experiments and pilots, they could have ridden the wave of goodwill from below that dovetailed with the strategic clarity from above. Allowing the SJ experts to take over at this point only compounded the error, adding very limited value while creating considerable delay and puncturing the initial wave of enthusiasm.

Why did the leadership team allow this to happen? We can see a plausible explanation through the lens of MBTI. The leadership team was dominated by NTJ and the project team was dominated by NFP personality types. Both these types are visionary (in different ways) but can lack the action-orientation needed to get things moving. What was lacking from both teams was the SP cognitive style and the associated thirst for action that stimulates an experimental approach. People with an SP cognitive style have a very practical

orientation and like nothing better than getting their hands dirty and trying things out.

The NTJ leadership team became convinced that their adaptive strategy would in fact be best achieved by applying expert competence to the challenge, thus allowing the HR expert team to take over and replace a promising adaptive change process by an expert-led process that proved to be a blind alley.

Ironically, two of the new key cultural competencies were supposed to be 'Agile in Practice' and 'Innovation Everywhere'...

Our role in this case was indirect and mostly observational. At the time we were providing a limited amount of leadership development and executive coaching. From past initiatives, we knew many of the people involved, but had no direct role in this culture transformation project.

3. Re-organising the regional salesforce

In our third example, the leader did everything right until he got bored and stopped paying attention. His Type was ENTP, meaning that his natural style was visionary, energetic, rational-analytical and demanding, while being ready to listen and tolerant of ambiguity. The organisation concerned was a sales team for the Nordic region of Europe, comprising the four countries Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. The sales team was composed of about 120 individuals spread across the area and responsible for all customer-facing operations, from pre-sales technical project evaluation through installation and configuration services to after-sales support. Market conditions forced a substantial reduction in force and the need to re-organise and share resources across the region. In spite of the close relationships between these four countries and the (relatively) common culture, there was a high level of resistance to the idea of sharing resources. The argument was: "my customers will never accept support from another country".

Clearly, this was a major organisational change that could not be imposed but must be co-developed and accepted by the entire team. Working closely with the ENTP Regional Manager, we suggested the use of Appreciative Inquiry⁶. This is a stakeholder-engagement process that begins by identifying and highlighting the past and current strengths of the organisation, before using them as the foundation for designing the changes required for the organisation to flourish in the future. It is a visionary and open, yet ultimately rigorous process that can appeal naturally to an ENTP leader.

We began by working with a core team of 16 persons including representatives from all sites and all departments to design the process with them, and then brought the entire organisation of 120 people together for a three-day offsite. In this particular case, developing the organisation – in terms of the ability of employees to work confidently together across borders and language barriers – was a vital performance objective. The process was effective, resulting in ten different employee-led performance improvement projects and a tangible sense of being a single, regional team. A manager was appointed to manage the implementation process, with an agreed supervisory structure and budget approval process.

All went well for the first three months. In particular, the cross-country teams began to function and there was a flurry of positive feedback concerning the competence and effectiveness of colleagues from other countries. The fear that customers would reject the new organisation proved baseless. The ice had been broken, and once the teams started to work together they continued to do so. It is thus fair to say that the major overall objective was achieved.

We only consider the example partially successful, however, because of the poor implementation of the stakeholder-initiated projects and the resulting failure to reap their benefits. During the first three months, the project review meetings were well attended,

decisions were taken and changes implemented. Supervising these meetings, however, required a different leadership style than that required at the beginning of the process. Where initially a broad vision and lots of enthusiasm were required, now the leader needed to move into a much more hands-on, detail-oriented management style, holding people to account and insisting on execution. Unfortunately, true to form as an ENTP, he found this boring, with the result that people lost their motivation and became disillusioned. Many of the projects went unfinished and the overall process failed to reach its full potential, whether in terms of operational productivity or organisational development.

Our role in this case was OD consultant, advising the leader on how to address the challenge and then taking an active role in facilitating the process.

4. Quality in a small manufacturing firm

Our final example is one of successful adaptive change, in which the leader adopted a stakeholder engagement process, reinforced throughout by effective leadership behaviours. The firm concerned was a manufacturer of high-precision instruments, who had gained an unfortunate reputation for late delivery, poor product quality and poor service quality. The company had about one hundred employees and was profitable. After an initial investigation, we determined that there were numerous problems throughout the system, and that the best way to tackle these would be through a collaborative re-design of the entire order-to-delivery process. Adopting the well-proven Rummier-Brache⁷ approach to Process Improvement, we facilitated the process re-design in such a way that the front-line people directly involved identified the problems and took all the decisions themselves. Needless to say, people who participate actively in redesigning the process are much less likely to resist its implementation.

As in the previous case, the CEO's type was ENTP. He fulfilled his role admirably throughout the process by clarifying his expectations in terms of measurable business metrics at the outset and then giving the team the space to work through the technicalities and the details. The process resulted in 37 significant dysfunctions being identified, together with their consequences and root causes. Dozens of process changes were worked through in order to eliminate the dysfunctions.

A few months later, the business results exceeded expectations. All metrics showed major improvements. There was also a clear improvement in morale: the team was proud of having solved their own problems and found solutions to issues that had plagued them for years.

We believe the project was successful because both the process chosen and the leader's behaviours were appropriate and effective. The situation was Complicated, so the temptation was to apply an expert-led process. Fortunately the leader recognised the adaptive nature of the challenge, and then allowed the project team to do its work with the bare minimum of constraints. He fulfilled his leadership role admirably by setting the direction, providing support throughout and ensuring all recommendations were implemented.

Interestingly, some problems started to reappear five years later; upon analysis this turned out to be due to lax supervision of the process and not the process itself. People were starting to take shortcuts and the review sessions, once weekly, had become fortnightly, then monthly and in some cases abandoned altogether. This is the Achilles heel of the CEO's visionary leadership style: a tendency to avoid managing the day-to-day details of execution.

Our role in this case was executive coach cum OD consultant, advising the leader on how to address the challenge and then taking an active role in facilitating the process.

Discussion and conclusions

We have looked at the reasons for the high rate of failure in change management initiatives through three different aspects: the type of process followed, the leadership behaviours displayed and the composition of the project teams. Successful change requires making good choices in all these areas, which means taking the time to step back and think, and if necessary, making the effort to overcome one's natural biases.

Many of the failures in change can be traced to the adoption of a top-down or expert-led process in situations where a stakeholder-engagement process would have had a better chance of succeeding. Expert-led processes are entirely appropriate in the right context but will not work when the problem is ill-defined and the solution will require people across the organisation to make changes in their values, beliefs, relationships or mindsets.

Whether the choice of process is appropriate or not, leadership behaviours are fundamental to success and the inability of the leaders to communicate effectively with the stakeholders often leads to mutual misunderstanding and failure. Many leaders find it difficult to put themselves in the shoes of their employees and imagine what their people need in terms of message clarity, message consistency and support.

Another facet of leadership behaviour is creating and sustaining high-performance teams. Insufficient psychological diversity – especially in terms of cognitive style – is one of the factors that most affects a team's performance. It is not necessary to use the MBTI for this (although we believe it helps). Through careful observation, you should be able to identify the people in your organisation who tend to come up with models and theories but may find it hard to take decisive action, and those who get stuck in, today, experimenting to see what works. You can also identify the idealists with grand visions compared to the more traditional types who try to conserve things as they are; and those who want structure, plans and process compared to those who believe in keeping options open and trying different things. All these cognitive preferences (and others) have their strengths and weaknesses: the best performing teams generally have a good balance of the different types and the ability to manage the resulting conflict positively.

What does this mean for you? We summarise our recommendations as follows:

1. Think carefully about the type of problem you are trying to solve. Is it technical or adaptive? Structure the project as a consequence: technical = team of experts; adaptive = team of stakeholders. Follow best practice for either process, adapted to your specific circumstances. There are no shortcuts.
2. Adapt your leadership behaviour and communication style to the audience. Above all, make sure you ask plenty of open questions and listen carefully to the answers, *especially if they contradict your point of view*.
3. Pay attention to the composition of your teams, particularly in terms of diversity in cognitive style. When teams are trained to welcome diverse opinions and disagreement, they will find better solutions than teams where everyone thinks alike.

THE MYERS BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

We have found the Myers Briggs Type Indicator⁸ to be a powerful lens in shedding light on inter-personal communication, even without formal testing. Here follows a very brief introduction to the MBTI, which is based on the theories of Carl Jung. It is the most widely-used and one of the most highly-validated psychometric tests available. Like all psychometric tests, it only provides a partial view and has its detractors.

The MBTI identifies people's preferences as being one end of each of four dichotomies, each consisting of two poles. The combination of these preferences leads to one of 16 specific Types. It is important to recognise that the assessment only identifies a natural preference and says nothing about competence or the ability to behave in different ways.

The four dichotomies are:

1. **Focus of attention:** External or Internal (E or I). People with an Extraverted preference focus more on the outer world of people and activity; people with an Introverted preference focus more on the inner world of thoughts and ideas.
2. **Ways to take in information:** Sensing or iNtuition (S or N). People who prefer Sensing rely on their senses and what is immediate and tangible, while people who prefer Intuition look for the bigger picture, patterns and future possibilities.
3. **Decision making:** Thinking or Feeling (T or F). People who prefer Thinking will apply a logical, analytical process to reach an objective decision, while people who prefer Feeling will reach their decisions based on their values and the impact on other people.
4. **Dealing with the outer world:** Judging or Perceiving (J or P). People who prefer Judging like their lives to be orderly, planned and predictable, while people who prefer Perceiving like to live in a flexible, spontaneous manner, keeping their options open as long as possible.

The combination of these four dichotomies provides a unique Type (e.g. ESTJ or INFP). These are not static definitions (people are not "put in boxes"), but descriptions of dynamic and interacting preferences. They provide insights into cognitive preferences, habitual patterns of behaviour and paths for personal growth and improved inter-personal communication.

AFTERWORD

Since it was reading their paper that initially inspired this article, we feel it important to note that we diverge from Bushe and Nagaishi in the second part of their paper, where they position OD practitioners in a rather idealistic frame. They argue that organisations cannot reach peak performance without being "developed", and therefore that the focus should be on "development" and the use of stakeholder engagement processes to achieve this. This might be appropriate in some not-for-profit organisations, but would be rejected by most of our corporate clients, who would most likely see it as fluffy nonsense emanating from an idealistic HR department.

In the corporate world, the time frame may vary, but the goals of change initiatives are invariably performance-related. This certainly doesn't mean that stakeholder engagement processes should not be proposed, but they must be put forward as the best approach to solving a business problem or to implementing a business strategy, not as a means to "develop the organisation", however desirable this objective may be. And if a side-effect of adopting the right process to solve the business problem is a better-developed organisation, so much the better!

ENDNOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Eaton, M. (2010) Why change programs fail. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 18:2, 37-42

Towers Watson (2014) *Change and Communication ROI Study Report*

² The *Cynefin* framework was first developed by David Snowden at IBM in the late 1990's and has gone through numerous iterations. Snowden introduced the concept in an IBM paper, co-authored with Cynthia Kurtz:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20060918205828/http://alumni.media.mit.edu/~brooks/storybiz/kurtz.pdf>

He presents the concept here in a video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N7oz366X0-8>

³ 'Clear' is the new name David Snowden is adopting for the bottom right domain of the Cynefin framework, previously called, variously, Simple, Obvious or Known. The latest iteration of the framework is here:

<https://www.cognitive-edge.com/blog/cynefin-st-davids-day-2020-1-of-n/>

⁴ Nagaishi, M. & Bushe, G.R. (2018) Imagining the Future through the Past: Organization Development isn't (just) about Change. *The Organization Development Journal*. 36. 23-36

⁵ Randall, K., Isaacson, M., & Ciro, C. (2017). Validity and Reliability of the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Journal of Best Practices in Health Professions Diversity*, 10(1), 1-27. doi:10.2307/26554264

⁶ Ludema, J.D., D. Whitney, B.J. Mohr, and T.J. Griffin (2003). *The Appreciative Inquiry Summit: A Practitioner's Guide for Leading Large-Group Change*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

⁷ Rummler, G.A. & Brache, A.P. (1995) *Improving Performance*. (2nd edition) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

⁸ Myers, P.B. & Myers, K.D. (1998) *Introduction to Type*. (6th edition) Mountain View: CPP, Inc.

SUPPORT FOR YOUR CHANGE INITIATIVES

Whether your challenge is technical or adaptive, the Enablers team is ready to support you through the changes, acting as step-by-step guides (process expertise) and foils/devil's advocates (asking hard questions) to keep you on track. You retain full ownership and responsibility; we make it easier for you.

Contact us at: marvin@enablersnetwork.com