WHITE PAPER

Evolving organisational culture:

Applying the lens of complexity to organisational culture change initiatives

Sonja Blignaut, April 2016.

Fixing culture is the most critical – and the most difficult – part of a corporate transformation… In the end, management doesn't change culture. Management invites the workforce itself to change the culture.

~Lou Gerstner, IBM

What if there was no such thing as an ideal culture, only an ever-evolving fit for purpose culture that is unique to your specific context? What if there was no "gap" that needed to be bridged between your current culture and a pre-defined utopian ideal. If we see culture as an ever evolving conversation, an ongoing narrative that is constantly emerging from thousands of interactions between people, systems, processes and environment across the organisation every day, how might our ideas and methods of culture change be different? What might be possible if every manager in your organisation, from CEO to supervisor were able to in real time tap into this conversation, the every day anecdotes that people all around the company are sharing around the water cooler, in the corridors after meetings, on the smoker's balcony. What if shifting culture were as simple as nudging this conversation to evolve in more beneficial ways through small actions in the present; by every manager or team asking, what do we need to do differently in order for people to tell more of these kinds of stories, and fewer of those? Thinking about culture from a complexity perspective and leveraging new tools available to us makes all of this possible.

A view of culture as something that can be designed or engineered has dominated our thinking for the last several decades. This view, along with the idea that an objectively defined ideal culture exists has led to a multitude of failed culture change interventions. Many leaders find themselves with a disenchanted and cynical workforce that resists or ignores culture change interventions having seen too many fail in the past. A comment made by an executive at a recent client workshop where the latest of three new sets of values in as many years were being rolled out to a divisional executive team sums this up perfectly: "*This is a utopia so far removed from our current reality that we cannot see how we can communicate this to our people now*".

Our attempts to craft or modify our organisation's culture have been influenced by an engineering paradigm that assumes predictability and privileges design. It has caused us to come to think of culture as a "thing" that can be designed or an ideal state we can engineer. Anthropologists however know that culture is not a "thing" that belongs to a company or society, it is not like our buildings that we can design and renovate. Rather culture continuously unfolds and evolves, as every member of the system is constantly part of co-creating, affirming and expressing it. Anthropologist Mary Douglas writes about, "… the admonitions, excuses, and moral judgments by which the people mutually coerce one another into conformity." (Douglas 1985:xxiii)

To illustrate, let's use a metaphor and contrast a typical business trip with a journey of discovery to unknown lands like those of Christopher Columbus. When we go on a business trip we typically have a pre-defined itinerary. We know our exact end destination down to the exact street address of our hotel and we create a detailed plan to get there. We can choose accommodation that perfectly suits our needs, book a window seat on a well timed flight and choose a rental car according to our preference. We might use a map to chart the optimal route to get to our destination, or pre-programme a GPS. Because we can determine exactly what the distance is between our current position and our destination,

we can usually predict with a reasonable degree of accuracy what our Estimated Time of Arrival (ETA) will be if all goes well. At the end of our travels we are definitely able to tell if we were on time and whether or not we've arrived at the correct destination.

Columbus on the other hand had no map to follow.   He was heading off into uncharted territory to discover new lands. What he had was knowledge of his current position (Spain), which direction he was setting off into, and a compass to help him navigate. He might have had the stories of adventurers who had gone before him to warn him of areas to stay away from, or which directions led to dead-ends, but he knew at some stage he would cross into territory where no-one had gone before. He had a vision and a purpose (to discover new worlds) and an initial direction, but he had no pre-determined end destination. He couldn't possibly determine the gap between where he was and where he'd end up, nor predict when he'd arrive. In fact, it would be pretty hard for him to know whether or not he had arrived at the right place, because that place hadn't yet been defined. Columbus had to set out into the unknown, head into a direction most likely to lead to beneficial discoveries, avoid known risks and dead-ends and learn as he went along. As his journey unfolded he probably discovered things along the way that he could never have predicted in advance.

Bringing about a change in organisational culture (or even in societal culture) is more like Columbus's journey than a business trip.

The problem is that most of the tools and methods that companies have been employing in their attempts to bring about a cultural shift are based on the assumption that one can plan for this shift like one plans for a business trip.   That the ideal destination can be pre-determined and the ideal journey designed to get there in the shortest time.   Our processes are linear, assuming that culture is a thing that is "engineer-able" and can be objectively analysed and diagnosed. In reality most programmes that assume that culture is static enough that a planned linear approach such as Lewin's three step change model of "Freeze, Change and Unfreeze" can be applied to shift it is likely to miss the mark.

"Bringing about a change in organisational culture (or even in societal culture) is more like Columbus's journey into the unknown than a well-planned business trip."

How then do we shift organisational culture?   Complexity theory offers us another way to make sense of culture, and how to change it.   From this perspective, we view organisations

as complex adaptive systems that are more like ecosystems than machines. Culture then is seen as continually emerging from the thousands of daily interactions that occur between the people, the environment, processes, systems and stories in the system. It is, in the words of Dialogic OD, an ever-evolving conversation that is constantly being co-authored and re-authored (Bushe & Marshak, 2014). In order to change it, we need to tap into this ongoing conversation, discover its current disposition or "tendencies" and nudge it into a preferred direction, in line with our vision, through small actions in the present.

In the following sections, we will briefly explore some of the key characteristics of complex adaptive systems (CAS for short), and the implications thereof for how we see and influence culture.

1. CAS are dispositional not causal and therefore largely unpredictable

Complex systems are open systems with rich interactions between the system and its environment. There are multiple interdependencies and feedback loops, some obvious, others hidden. In such interconnected open systems cultural patterns emerge from these relationships and interactions. To better understand the idea of emergence, think of the difference between an orchestra performing a piece of music from a written score and a jazz band "jamming" or improvising together. The orchestra's specific style and sound may be unique, but the melody of the song they are playing remains recognisable and predictable. Contrast that to the improvising jazz band. The song emerges as the musicians play off of each other's strengths and improvise together. No-one can claim to have written the song, no one musician can be identified as having "caused" a particular melody. The song emerged from the interactions between the musicians, their various instruments and the audience; the sound created is bigger than the sum of the parts, or the sound of each musician and his instrument. And while certain jazz bands may have a tendency or be pre-disposed to go in a given musical direction, no-one can accurately predict exactly what will emerge from their interaction. Over time we might observe repeating patterns, where given the same set of starting conditions, the same pattern forms. For example our Jazz band might always play a certain melody when in a certain town, when a certain musician is present, or they play to a familiar audience. These repeating tendencies do provide a measure of predictability, and therefore design, but always within boundaries.

Our friends and family are also pre-disposed in certain ways, we all have friends whom we know are more likely to be out partying on a Friday night, and others more likely to be home in front of the television, however we still cannot predict with a 100% certainty where they will be any given Friday night.

Our teams and organisations are exactly the same. We can map the current disposition or tendencies of our organisational culture and the current trajectory of the evolving conversation, but we cannot exactly predict a future outcome or behaviour.

This means that in order to become more effectively in our culture change efforts, we need to move away from thinking about designing an ideal future, to understanding the current state and making small changes in the present to create an environment from which beneficial patterns are more likely to emerge. We need to deal with people, and systems as they are, not try and force them to into an idealised mould.

2. CAS are non-linear

Complex systems are interconnected with multiple feedback loops, some re-enforcing, others not. Like the famed butterfly effect, where the flap of a butterfly's wings in one part of the world might contribute to the emergence of a hurricane on the other side of the world, a seemingly insignificant event or change could have disproportionately massive consequences. Think for example of the impact one image of a drowned toddler had on how the world responded to the Syrian refugee crisis. The converse is also true, big expensive interventions can have a negligible effect. We know very well that one event or rumour can virtually destroy people's trust in the leadership of an organisation, or from a consumer perspective in the brand of the company; but massively expensive change or marketing initiatives can have virtually zero impact.

Because of this non-linearity and the complex feedback loops, one can virtually guarantee that there will be unintended consequences when intervening in a CAS. We may not be able to predict exactly where they might occur or what form they will take; but we need to be prepared to deal with them as they emerge (Snowden, 2015). It is therefore prudent to start small and learn as we go, to run safe-to-fail experiments, rather than big-bang system-wide interventions. Then we will be able to amplify the beneficial patterns that emerge from our interventions and dampen or disrupt what is not beneficial early on. This ensures that potential unintended consequences are localised and manageable, and that we can dampen or disrupt them before they come a real issue.

3. CAS are adaptive, open and interconnected systems: reductive or diagnostic approaches are not appropriate.

Unlike complicated systems, such as a car or aircraft, a complex system cannot be taken apart, optimised and re-assembled. In a sense we are always dealing with the whole system and we also become part of it. We need to understand that even while we are examining the system, it is still adapting, evolving and responding to our presence. Think for example about a mechanic walking up to a Boeing 747 with his toolbox to take it apart and fix it, nothing changes in the aircraft. The plane and its problem are static; it can be diagnosed, parts can be replaced and optimised and ultimately it will still be the same machine. Contrast that to an organisation: when the consultants arrive with their briefcases and restructuring rumours start flying around; everything changes. Diagnosis and intervention are intertwined in a CAS, in fact thinking in terms of diagnosis is not helpful when engaging with a CAS. We also need to be aware that every action, in fact our mere presence is already creating changes in the system.

In their book The Practice of Adaptive Leadership, Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky describe what they call the "myth of the dysfunctional system".

"There is a myth that drives many change initiatives into the ground: that the organization needs to change because it is broken. The reality is that any social system (including an organization or a country or a family) is the way it is because the people in that system (at least those individuals and factions with the most leverage) want it that way...As our colleague Jeff Lawrence poignantly says, `There is no such thing as a dysfunctional organization, because every organization is perfectly aligned to achieve the results it gets.'" (Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009).

If we therefore seek to fix what we perceive as a dysfunction, we are working against the natural inclination of the system. Instead, we need to tap into, and become part of the ongoing conversation shaping the culture, seeking to understand its propensities and the direction of flow so that we can influence and co-create a more beneficial direction. We are not necessarily looking to create big, dramatic shifts, even a 2% change in direction can cause a ship bound for Greece to reach a completely different port.

The task of leaders and change agents therefore is to co-create or co-author new conversations and practices and create enabling environments from which beneficial cultural patterns and behaviours can emerge.

4. Human CAS are more unpredictable than others because human beings are meaning making beings and because of the three I's.

Complex systems involving human beings are very different to other natural systems like coral reefs or beehives. The reason for this is that human beings have intelligence, intentionality and we seamlessly navigate a multiplicity of context-based identities (Snowden, 2016). I am consultant, wife, daughter of elderly parents, entrepreneur, friend, consumer … and depending on my present context, you cannot be certain who you are dealing with. This is hard enough if you're only dealing with me, but in a large organisation you are dealing with hundreds or thousands of people just like me. According to Snowden "… *there is no difference between a terrorist, a citizen, an employee or a customer. They all represent the problem of asymmetry. Symmetric powers, be they governments or companies know how to deal with each other, but the uncertainty (and the opportunity) comes from the countless decisions of those they seek to influence, utilise or detect.*"

Human beings also have meaning making skills that we employ all the time, even when we're not aware that we are doing so. Within the context of bigger societal narratives, or unquestioned beliefs and ideas of the society we live in, we weave complicated webs of cause and effect. We link our experiences and the stories we hear from others into seemingly coherent narratives that make sense to us. Over time these come to shape and maintain our identity conclusions; they become "I am" or "We are" stories that determine how we see ourselves, other people and the organisations we work in. This meaning making also happens collectively; over time anything can come to mean something - often far removed from its intended meaning. For example, I heard a story from one of my clients about a secretary who had to rush out to buy a new shirt for her CEO before he could deliver a speech at the annual road show. The reason was that he chose to wear a blue shirt that morning, and that simply wouldn't do as everyone knew "when the CEO wears a blue shirt, bad news is coming …". No one thought about blue simply being practical or his favourite colour. A past event involving blue shirts caused blue shirts to come to mean something sinister. Similarly red shirts mean something very significant Star Trek fans. They all know that people wearing red shirts are "disposable". Any person wearing a red shirt while visiting an alien planet has a pretty dismal life expectancy. It might therefore be ill advised for a Health Insurer to use "We give you the red shirt treatment" as a marketing campaign.

So in order to know where we are and what we are dealing with, as well as the preferred direction we want to evolve towards, we need to gather the anecdotes of people's every day experiences and how they are making meaning of these experiences. We create a

"StoryScape" of sorts, helping us map the territory and understand where there might be potential to nudge the nudge the system into a new direction.

"You are never dealing with a green field, you don't get to start over. Everything you say and do is received and perceived through the lens of past disappointments and successes. Meet the system where it is, and evolve forwards from there."

5. CAS are highly sensitive to starting conditions – history matters

In a CAS you are never dealing with a green field or clean slate. Just like a parent with an unruly teenager can't decide on their sixteenth birthday to call a time out and "start over"; we need to deal with the present situation i.e. deal with the system where it is. We also need to take into account its history, because of the ongoing meaning making described earlier, we need to realise that people's response to every intervention or communication will be filtered through the meanings they've made of past experiences and failures.

If for example we want the culture to evolve in the direction of agility and devolved decision-making, but the organisation has a past of punishing people for making wrong decisions, we can't wish that history away. Those stories of the negative consequences of decision-making are part of the corporate memory; we need to acknowledge that they are there and move forwards from there. We also need to realise that simply telling people that those stories are no longer true is not enough, we need to make fundamental changes to the environment as well as our actions to make those stories impossible to tell now.

Another implication of a CAS's sensitivity to starting conditions, is that best practices tend not to "translate" well between different contexts, except when dealing with ordered and predictable contexts e.g fully codified manufacturing or accounting processes.

In each context there are ways of thinking and doing that have emerged and evolved over time from a very specific set of starting conditions. For example, something that successfully emerged in a US manufacturing company, or in the rural villages in Bangladesh will not simply work when applied in South African Financial Services companies. Think for example of Ricardo Semler and the unique organisational culture and structure that evolved over time in his organisation Semco. In his book Maverick he describes how a virtually leaderless

organisation where people choose their own roles and salaries came about and evolved over time. Starting conditions included Semler's own personality and leadership style, the South American culture and many other contextually unique factors. To try to replicate the end state of a long evolutionary process, by replicate what he did as a "recipe" is a recipe for disaster.

We need to fully understand the starting conditions we are working from in the now, as well as the history of the system that brought us to where we are today, and then work to emerge our own unique solutions, not try to replicate what emerged in other contexts.

6. CAS require a requisite diversity in order to be resilient

In many organisations the word diversity has become a loaded term. In South Africa it carries with it all the pain and complexities related to a legacy of apartheid, and legislated transformation targets that companies have to comply to in an attempt to redress the past. This has led to diversity becoming synonymous with often-painful compliance-driven processes.

When one looks at this through the lens of complexity however, diversity becomes an asset, a necessity not a problem. Every complex system has a requisite level of diversity that needs to be maintained: if there is too much diversity there is a lack of coherence in the system that prevents self-organisation and beneficial evolution. However, too little diversity leads to the loss of resilience and the system becomes vulnerable to disruption. Think for example about the difference between a nature reserve where bio-diversity is maintained, where there are many different kinds of plants and animals versus a commercial farm where only one type of crop is grown, or only one kind of animal is kept. Should there be a disruption, for example a big drought, the diversity in the nature reserve will ensure that the system maintains a degree of resilience, and that at least some species will survive. If there is no grass left, there will still be edible leaves on trees that can sustain some antelope, which in turn sustain the predators. On a cattle farm on the other hand, if there is no grass, the animals and ultimately the farming operation cannot survive; because there is no diversity, there is no resilience.

The same is true in our organisations, we need a level of coherence around the purpose and values of the organisation, however if we seek to create ONE culture, where everyone is expected to think and behave exactly the same we lose resilience. When the context shifts (and it will), if we all think the same, we'll all go down together. Although in many companies "sub-culture" has become a dirty word, seeking to eliminate unique cultural expressions is not a good idea. The reality is that there has always been, and will always be different cultural expressions in any organisation. Just like we cannot expect all the citizens in a country to have the exact same culture and behaviour, the same is true in an organisation. One cannot expect an IT department to have the exact same culture as the marketing department or Call Center. For example, the way that a value of "Teamwork" will find expression in a team of software developers collaborating to create something new, will look very different to the way it will be expressed by a Call Center team who have the same purpose and function, but don't need to collaborate as closely. The same goes for dress code, an IT geek or call center agent cannot be expected to dress the same as a CEO or sales person who deals with corporate clients. Complete homogeneity is not a realistic

expectation, and attempting to enforce a single culture onto a diverse organisation will simply bring resentment or force the sub-cultures underground.

This does not mean however that everyone can do what they want, pulling in different directions with no coherence. Rather than seeking total alignment e.g. to specific value-based behaviours, we focus on creating coherence on an organizational level around a visionary purpose or over-arching narrative within shared boundaries, typically set by values. Within this coherent enabling environment, we can allow for (and celebrate) the uniqueness of each of the various unique expressions and a level of autonomy that is required for people to feel empowered and engaged.

7. Culture in a CAS is about more than individuals and their behaviour … the environment matters

In modern organisations we have become overly focused on the behaviour and competencies of individuals. It is about the individual leader who has to have the right leadership competencies, or identifying the "best people" or top talent. And we are not saying that these things aren't important, but it is only part of the picture. You can have a team made up of the best individuals, but if you put them in a perpetually disabling environment, their performance will be mediocre.

Culture change efforts that focus on changing individual behaviours and mindsets but ignore relationships and environment are destined to fail. For example, in many organisations our tool of choice for modifying individual behaviour is performance assessments with key performance indicators (KPI's) linked to targets and incentives. So for example, if an organisation has a value of Productivity or Excellence, they might attempt to instill the right behaviours by crafting targets that ensure for example that call center agents handle as many calls as possible in the shortest amount of time. If at the same time the company has a new vision or strategy of Client Centricity, that same call center agent is inundated with messages of "Customer First!", they may even have other targets linked to how clients assess their service. Now imagine an excellent call center agent, who really cares about giving great service, who has all the right competencies: she knows the systems, she knows how to show empathy etc etc, but works in a constrained environment where the technical system she uses is outdated and she cannot see one view of her customer without having to switch from one screen to another with very a very slow internet connection AND she has a target (linked to her bonus or salary increase) that she cannot stay on the line with one client for longer than 2,5 minutes. The only culture we will be creating in this environment is one that resembles schizophrenia. Even if we hire the very best call center agents, give them the very best behavioural training and put posters of our values and associated behaviours in every cubicle, the environment we are creating for them to work in is disabling. It will not enable the culture we seek.

Culture change processes therefore have to focus not only on individuals and behaviours, but also on relationships (anyone with teenagers know the importance of having the right friends), systems and processes. If we need a culture of collaboration, instead of only asking why people don't want to collaborate we also need to critically look at the environment e.g. if office layouts enable or disable collaboration; our incentive and measurement systems (if people are measured for individual performance in functional silos, they will focus on that silo) and only then on behaviour. If we want different thinking, telling people they need to

9

think differently is meaningless. We need to put them in an environment where they have to think differently. Often simply changing the environment or the constraints placed on people leads to the natural emergence of the behaviour we need.

What does this mean practically?

"We need to know where we are now, and what direction we want to move in. In nautical terms, we need to get our bearings first, before we head out of the port."

"Grand visions of the future and massive engineering programs simply drive authentic behaviour underground and enable lip service to declared values. Nothing is without some effect, but the ineffectual is often too easily disguised to satisfy the stated needs of those in power. We need methods or tools that have greater authenticity to the reality of the evolutionary nature of cultural change, a process that is most effectively achieved by small actions in the present." – Dave Snowden

If we think back to the analogy of Columbus's journey, what we need to do becomes clearer:

1.   We need to know where we are, what resources we have and the obstacles we face.

We do this by tapping into the ongoing conversation, gathering large numbers of anecdotes or stories, retellings of everyday experiences. Depending on the tools we use, we may ask people to add additional layers of meaning to their stories by answering quantitative questions about their stories. This becomes a map of the current disposition of the system i.e. how it is culturally inclined.

It is important to think about the benefits and potential drawbacks of the tools we use to map the current culture.   In the past, there were basically two options available to us: quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews or focus groups.

A problem with quantitative cultural surveys in organisations is that they are mostly designed around a specific theoretical framework or hypothesis and they tend to be evaluative in nature.   With the best of intentions they want people to evaluate specific aspects of the organisation, to express a generalised opinion.   This process of evaluation is problematic as it focuses people on a single judgment with a single focus, often devoid of

context. This separates the evaluation from the diverse day to day experiences of people in the organisation. As Dave Snowden says:

"We don't live our lives in neat silos of hypothesis based surveys; we live the day to day experiences of social encounters, infused with multiple experiences, hopes and dreams that are not directly engaged with work, but which we cannot leave at the security card swipe in of the modern workplace."

General opinion or evaluation has some amount value, but they seldom offer immediately actionable insights. Typically such results require follow-up engagement to understand the patterns in enough detail to act. What is much more valuable and immediately actionable, is finding and understanding the stories or experiences that caused people to form a given opinion in the first place.

Another problem with traditional culture surveys and instruments is the separation of diagnosis and intervention. A CAS is continuously evolving. It also changes the moment it is observed or interacted with. Conducting a survey that only renders results 3 or 6 months later is often counter productive as the system may have already shifted significantly by the time the results are in. Often the survey itself shifts the sentiment within the system as they are associated with negative past experiences and most people in large organisations are survey fatigued. Because diagnosis and intervention are so closely intertwined in any complex system, we need to move away from once-off surveys and seek ways to continuously keep our finger on the pulse of the organisation.

Ideally we gather stories of experience continuously and incidentally (i.e. make it part of business as usual, vs broadcasting that this is part of a big culture initiative. Instead of asking employees to evaluate the organisation, we ask them to journal their everyday observations and experiences and interpret these into a quantitative framework. This provides us with quantitative data that always carry with it the explanatory narratives or context. Fortunately tools now exist that make this possible e.g. Cognitive Edge's ground breaking tool called Sensemaker®.

2. We need to know the direction we need to move towards (a bearing in nautical terms)

Our direction is usually determined by the purpose and vision of the organisation. For example in a financial services company, this might be to create financial f r e e d o m o r financial wellness for their clients; in a mining company it might be to become the first truly sustainable mining operation in its industry. Often this direction is linked more to the highest purpose of the organisation, than to the latest crafted vision and mission statement. In addition to our purpose, we also need a clear strategy to enable every part of the organisation to move in one coherent direction, while maintain a level of autonomy in execution.

3.   We need boundaries or constraints to keep us safe on the journey

Our values become the boundaries that keep us safe on our journey, almost like safety guardrails that provide a safe space for exploration and adaptation. Generic values such as Integrity and Respect don't offer competitive advantage, but they do enable an organisation to remain in business and therefore are boundaries that keep us safe while we move forward. Our values and strategy now become an enabling framework, not a prescriptive rulebook. We allow for autonomy and different expressions, as long as there is coherence around the purpose and strategy (we are all moving in the same direction) and values (we are all staying within the same boundaries).

4.   Small safe-to-fail interventions vs big interventions designed to be fail-safe

Based on what we now know about where we are, our bearing and our boundaries, we start evolving forward by implementing multiple interventions or small nudges.   These are anchored in the reality of the present, not in an idealised idea of the future. The focus is not only on individuals and behaviour but also on interventions that address the environment, systems and processes. A practical way forward is to ask: what do we need to change in the now, or do differently from today onwards, to get more stories like these that take us forward, and fewer like those that keep us stuck, or move us in the wrong direction.

Some of the changes we implement to address processes and systems might be the typical linear projects we are all familiar with.   These might have an immediate impact on the culture and may cause us to move forwards quickly.

However, many of our interventions will need to be emergent, we need to experiment and learn as we go along.   We start small and try many different, sometimes contradictory, things (safe-to-fail experiments), at the same time. All throughout the process, we need to make sure that there are feedback mechanisms in place to monitor for intended and unintended consequences.   One way to get the required feedback is by the continual gathering of every day observations and experiences as discussed earlier in the document. In that way we can keep our finger on the proverbial pulse of the organisation.

5.   We evolve forwards, amplifying what works, dampening what doesn't

As we start intervening and nudging, we would expect the nature of people's observations and experiences to change. Our interventions will lead people to have different experiences and different conversations.   If these conversations shift into a desirable direction, we amplify our efforts. If on the other hand our interventions had unintended consequences, which we will quickly see in the data, we are able to disrupt or dampen these negative patterns early before they become a bigger problem.

This thinking may seem like a radical departure from the usual approaches to culture and change that have become best practice. It might also sound complicated. However, the opposite is true, once we accept and understand complexity, it offers a simpler and more natural process that is based on how we all intuitively know cultures evolve outside the walls of our organisations.

Most of us already know how to understand and intervene in complex social systems, we do it all the time when dealing with our families and friends. However we've come to believe that when we step over the threshold of our work place, we have entered a different world where everything is neatly structured, ordered and predictable. Once we let go of our need for predictability and recipes, the rest comes naturally.

Sources:

Bush, Gervase R; Marshak, Robert J (2014) Dialogic Organization Development. Barrett-Koehler Publishers.

Douglas, Mary (1985) "Introduction" in Jonathan L. Gross & Steve Rayner, Measuring Culture: A Paradigm for the Analysis of Social Organization. New York: Columbia University Press.

Heifetz, R; Grashow, A; Linsky, M. (2009) The practice of adaptive leadership. Harvard Business Review Press.

Snowden, David J. (2015) The ethics of unintended consequences. http://cognitive-edge.com/blog/the-ethics-of-unintended-consequences/

Snowden, David J. (2016) Three or Five? http://cognitive-edge.com/blog/three-or-five/

Snowden, David J. Solving intractable problems. http://paulwallbank.com/2014/02/22/solving-intractable-problems/