**University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons**

Master of Applied Positive Psychology (MAPP)
Service Learning Projects

Positive Psychology Center

2009

Reaching for Cultural Change

Shannon Polly
University of Pennsylvania, spolly@aya.yale.edu

Michelle McQuaid
University of Pennsylvania, michelle.mcquaid@au.pwc.com

Louisa Jewell
University of Pennsylvania, louisa@crystallizers.com

Bobby Dauman
University of Pennsylvania, bobby@spiritualsalesblog.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.upenn.edu/mapp_slp

Part of the Other Psychology Commons

Reaching for Cultural Change

Keywords
positive psychology, Appreciative Inquiry, Reach, Australia, service learning

Disciplines
Other Psychology

Reaching For Cultural Change

When positive psychology emerged in the late 1990s it defined itself as the study of positive emotion, positive character, and positive institutions (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005). While the study of positive emotions and character have found footing in research the study of positive, flourishing institutions has lagged behind (Peterson, personal communication, March 28, 2009). We believe, however, that by giving positive psychology away through service learning projects to institutions that normally may not have access to positive psychology we can gain valuable insights into what constitutes, improves, and perpetuates flourishing institutions along with valuable insights in the application of positive interventions. With these objectives in mind we chose *Reach*, an Australian non-profit, non-denominational organization whose vision is that "Every young Australian should have the support and self-belief to fulfill their potential and dare to dream." (Kaufman, personal communication, January 5, 2009).

Understanding Reach

In overall terms Australian youth fare pretty well (Kaufman, 2009). 70% live in intact families (AIHW, 2005); 80% complete Year 12 and 50% these go on to higher education (AIHW, 2005); 93% report being satisfied with their health (ARACY, 2008) and 48% believe in 'a god' (Mason, Weber, Singleton & Hughes, 2007). On the flip side there are some areas of concern: mental disorders account for 50% of the disease burden in young people (Kaufman, 2009); the rate of deaths by intentional self-injury is 10 per 100,000 (ARACY, 2008); 25% are overweight and less than half meet the recommended physical activity (AIHW, 2006); 31% drink alcohol in amounts that put them at risk (AIHW, 2006); and jobs for young adults have declined since 1995 (Dusseldorp, 2007). The top concerns for young Australians are body image, alcohol abuse and family conflicts (Australian Democratic Party, 2008).

Reach focuses on normal (non-clinical) populations, as well as on early identification and prevention of psychopathology and tries to fills a gap between organizations that provide purely recreational activities and those that provide clinical and crisis care for young Australians. *Reach's* specially trained "Crew" of inspirational young leaders runs workshops, weekends away and large-scale events to bring to life *Reach's* mission to "encourage all young people, no matter what their circumstances, to believe they can achieve." (Kaufman, 2009). *Reach* uses group interaction, creative expression and sensory based technology to create experiences of raw and courageous human expression for young people from all walks of life that inspire a search for greatness. About 60,000 young Australians experience *Reach* each year. Independent research shows that *Reach* helps teenagers improve overall levels of self-esteem, optimism and feelings of control over themselves and their lives (Kaufman, 2009).

Reach's people include: a small administrative staff (aged late 20's to mid 40's); the *Reach* 'Crew' (aged 15-25); a team of adult volunteers (aged early 30's to mid 50's); and a board of seven directors (aged late 30's to late 50's). Although workloads can be emotionally and physically intense with considerable after hours and weekend activities for all involved, generally *Reach* and its people have been able to manage these conditions well. Psychologists are available for the Crew and the staff to call on as they need and in between peak periods of activity the school calendar year also ensures there are regular periods of low activity for recovery. Generally turnover of people has been low and a high proportion of them feel called to work for *Reach*.

Over the past five years however, *Reach's* brand credibility and solid financial base have enabled the organization to grow rapidly in recent years to meet the escalating demand for its programs. Although the number of staff and Crew has increased to help make all of this happen

there is a widely held view within *Reach* that the team is stretched too thin and that relatively few people carry the burden for delivering a significant amount of its work. An immaturity of people strategies and processes and an undercurrent of 'us' versus 'them' between older staff and younger crew have resulted in a culture that is heading away from everything *Reach* stands for.

To address these issues, *Reach's* 2008 business plan introduced a strategy for *Reach* people to "create and facilitate an engaging organization that ensures the *Reach* spirit is strengthened and kept alive in everything we do, through development of the potential and passion of our people." (Kaufman, 2009). As a result *Reach* has: completed a cultural analysis to discover strengths and weaknesses; designed a strengths based performance approach for personal and professional development; and introduced the vocabulary of "*Reach* people" in favor of role specific division of crew, staff, board, or volunteer. When shared at the annual *Reach People Camp* this strategy engendered hopes for improvement but also surfaced murmurings of coercion rather than consultation and disbelief that anything ever really changes at *Reach.* It appeared that the organization's tendency for negative narration of their cultural past would sink their dreams for the future before they had even been given a chance. Buy-in for the people plan has been further complicated by recent decisions to lay off one staff member and implement a 10% pay cut across the organization as funding slows to a trickle due to the economic downturn.

Discovering the True & the Good

To determine how we could best serve *Reach* we began by undertaking a literature review (see Appendix A) to find what empirically based positive psychology theory and interventions could help to create and facilitate an engaging organization. We discovered: the importance of highlighting the strengths and virtues of individuals and *Reach* as a whole; the

3

value of cultivating positive leadership; how engagement is impacted by intrinsic motivations; and the power of high quality connections.

The strengths philosophy is founded on the principle that individuals are more likely to succeed in pursuits that build on their greatest talents than focusing on improving weaknesses (Clifton & Harter, 2003). Gallup reports evidence that strengths-based development relates to various positive outcomes, including increases in employee engagement and productivity (Hodges & Clifton, 2004). In Gallup's extensive research on employee engagement, participants who responded to "At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day" was positively correlated with lower turnover, improved customer service, increased productivity and profitability (Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2002).

Dahlsgaard, Peterson & Seligman (2005) identified 24 strengths organized under six core virtues: wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence. Although all 24 strengths have been consistently found to be associated with life satisfaction, Park, Peterson and Seligman (2004, 2005, 2006) have concluded that zest, hope, gratitude and love most substantially improve life satisfaction. In another study Peterson, Park, Hall & Seligman (in press) found that across all tested occupations zest predicted which people believed their work was a calling, as well as predicting work and life satisfaction (Peterson et al, in press). Zest's link with well-being makes it important in organizations (Park, Peterson & Seligman, 2004) as well-being predicts improved job performance and reduced turnover (Wright & Bonnett, 2007). Further, whole organizations can be zestful (Park & Peterson, 2003). Ensuring that the strengths of *Reach* people are highlighted and engaged will be key to developing their potential and passion.

4

A recent literature review performed by Kuoppala, Lamminpää, Liira, and Vaino (2008) looked at hundreds of studies and focused on 27 linking leadership to the well-being of the followers. In their review they considered positive leadership philosophies such as Considerative leadership, Supportive leadership and Transformational leadership. Their meta-analysis revealed that the relationship between leadership and job performance was unclear, but they did find a moderate relationship between leadership and job well-being. This data supports the claim that positive leadership leads to higher well-being. Kim Cameron in his book *Positive Leadership* (2008) explains that positive leaders: do not strive to achieve ordinary success, but rather to aspire to levels of achievement that are spectacular or also referred to as 'positively deviant performance'; have an affirmative bias with a focus on strengths and human flourishing as opposed to a focus on deficits; and endeavor to be virtuous in their approach and create virtuous organizations, in other words, to also 'do good' in the communities they live in (Cameron, 2008). Opportunities to demonstrate positive leadership that strengthens the spirit of *Reach* and keeps it alive in everything they do would help to improve overall job well-being among the team.

It has been well documented that employees value intrinsic rewards such as the nature of the work itself more than pay (Jurgensen, 1978 as cited in Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001). How, then, does one go about fostering intrinsic motivation? Brown & Ryan (2004) use a self determination theory (SDT) perspective to discuss fostering internalization and integration of a specific value and adaptation to extrinsically motivated behavior. . However, where Brown and Ryan claim that it is solely intrinsic motivation that is most effective at motivating people, Isen and Reeve enhance the results that affective disposition affects performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001). Further, Wright and Shaw claim that employees with positive

affect may be more motivated according to several theories of motivation including goal setting theory (as cited in Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001). In order to engage the heads, hearts and hands of *Reach* people to bring the people strategy to life allowing them to align their intrinsic motivations is vital.

Dutton and Heaphy (2003) argue that the quality of connections – whether the connective tissue between individuals is life-giving or life-depleting – fundamentally impacts how organizations function. Further, Losada and Heaphy (2004) found that positivity and connectivity within teams has a direct impact on business performance leading them to conclude that an abundance of positivity can generate the state of realistic enthusiasm and propel organizations to *Reach* and uphold heights of excellence (Losada & Heaphy, 2004). Fredrickson's (2003) "broaden-and-build" theory - that positive emotions broaden people's momentary thought-action repertories and builds enduring personal resources - confirms Losada and Heaphy's finding that positive emotions create expansive emotional spaces that open possibilities for effective action and durable psychological and social resources in terms of the strength and quality of connections among team members. The evidence suggests an empirical basis to support that the building of high quality connections between employees generates positive emotions and in turn is a sound basis to generate extraordinary business performance. While there are excellent high quality connections within specifics groups of *Reach* people (i.e. Crew to Crew, staff to staff) neither their people strategy nor their vision for the organization will truly be achieved without high quality connections across the organization to really unite them as *Reach* people.

Dreaming of the Possible

When we asked how all this data could best serve *Reach* we found ourselves agreeing with Bushe (1998) who recommends Appreciative Inquiry (AI) as a useful intervention when a team finds itself stuck in a pattern of dysfunctional interaction and needs creative ways out. AI is a philosophy that is grounded in the assumption that every organization has a hidden and underutilized core of strengths – its positive core – which, when revealed and tapped, provides a sustainable source of positive energy for both personal and organizational transformation (Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2008).

Bushe's work found that AI's "4-D" cycle – discover, dream, design and destiny – generates positive emotions between participants and creates an opportunity to begin building high quality connections based on an important shared experience (Bushe, 1998). We believed that the AI process and 4-D cycle would enable *Reach* to: *Discover* the stories about the best of *Reach's* strengths, individually and collectively, changing their narrative to something more positive; *Dream* together so each person's intrinsic motivations are given an opportunity to align with what could be; *Design Reach's* organizational social architecture – norms, values, structures, strategies, systems, patterns of relationship and operation – to bring their build positive emotion and high quality connections; and create their *Destiny* by allowing people to volunteer ownership to innovation and action.

One of the most effective means of using AI in organizations to accelerate positive change is the AI Summit – typically a single event or series of events that bring a large number of people together to complete the 4-D process so that participants are excited about where they are going, have a clear plan to move forward, and feel confident about their ability to '*Reach*' their destination (Ludema, Whitney, Mohr & Griffin, 2003). This was an ideal intervention for *Reach* as it provided an opportunity to demonstrate positive leadership and engaged the

organization's strengths of curiosity and creativity evidenced in their own programs. Thus we felt confident that this approach used the best of what positive psychology knows to help put *Reach* on the pathway of positive change.

In the spirit of AI we began by forming a planning team that comprised ourselves and representatives from *Reach* - the CEO, staff members, and Crew. Our role within this team was to: share our knowledge of positive psychology and appreciative inquiry; facilitate an AI experience for the planning team; and provide appreciative guidance. It was essential that the *Reach* team felt ownership of the Summit – it was their intervention not ours - and actively: shaped the summit task; selected participants; created the mini-summit design; and determined what would happen after the intervention (see Appendix B for example of planning team agenda).

An effective summit task excites, energizes, and invigorates participants to contribute at the highest level. It asks the questions: What do we really want from this summit? What are our ultimate hopes and aspirations? What will success look like? In addition, there are some rules for choosing an effective summit task. Is it stated in the affirmative? Do you really want it? Is it driven by true curiosity? Does it require collaborative action? (Ludema, Whitney, Mohr & Griffin, 2003). We facilitated discussions with the planning team and helped them to agree upon the summit task.

Once the summit task was determined, we invited *Reach* to consider three to five affirmative topics to uncover what they really wanted to learn about. Topic choice is a fateful act as organizations move in the direction of inquiry and words create worlds. These topics could have been anything related to organizational effectiveness but must be stated in the positive, identify the objectives people want and spark genuine curiosity (Cooperrider, Whitney &

Stavros, 2008). We facilitated an interview experience with the planning team using foundational AI questions from which they were able to identify the key patterns and themes that emerged to shape their topic selection (Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2008).

Now that the summit task and affirmative topics were clear, the participants could be selected. AI experience teaches us that getting the whole system in the room brings out the best in people. This is important because wholeness: eliminates false assumptions and evokes trust; allows people to gain a sense of interdependence; lets people see, experience and connect with purposes greater than their own or that of their team; and establishes credibility in the outcomes because everyone is part of the decision. Instead of forming judgments compassion for different perspectives is formed. People realize they really need each other to accomplish their goals. Thus, participation at an AI summit is holistic with the entire organization and members of its entire value chain present. (Ludema, Whitney, Mohr & Griffin, 2008). We helped *Reach* to create a stakeholder map to identify the best mix of voices from inside and outside of *Reach* to answer the summit task and affirmative topics. *Reach* decided to limit the scope of participants to the staff, Crew, board, and volunteers, despite our concerns that the voices of teachers, parents, young people, corporate sponsors, and government supporters would add important voices to the room.

The next step required us to help *Reach* determine the summit format. Typically an AI-Summit occurs over three to five days and is designed to flow through the 4-D process of discovery, dream, design, and destiny to build a lasting platform for innovation and commitment to change. If faced with a situation where it is impossible to pull the whole system aside for four days, as is the case for *Reach,* alternative formats include mini-summits, pre-work and post-work sequences or a rolling process of shorter AI meetings, each focusing on one of the 4-Ds

(Ludema, Whitney, Mohr & Griffin, 2008). As we knew *Reach* would face difficulties securing the whole system for several days due to the school schedules of many of the youngest voices we suggested they consider a one day mini AI-Summit that focused on the discovering *Reach*'s positive core and co-creating a shared future dream as these appeared to be the most pressing needs. A follow up workshop could then be held for *Reach* people to design the pathways to make the dream a reality and then teams of volunteers would be invited to shape the destiny of innovation and action. We helped *Reach* to explore the format that best met their requirements and they decided on a three hour format for the *discovery* and *dream* phases followed up by mini-summits. We cautioned *Reach* these constraints were likely to impact the ability of the intervention to create alignment of people's intrinsic motivations to the organization's strategy and to improve the quality of connections across *Reach's* people as the reality is that these outcomes require time. *Reach* requested we still proceed. We agreed, as a small positive beginning seemed a better solution than no beginning at all within the cultural and environmental context *Reach* faced. As much of *Reach's* work leverages metaphors to tell stories, we also encouraged them to build the mini AI-Summit around the generative metaphor which they agreed to do.

Finally, we helped *Reach* consider what would happen after the summit in terms of communication of outcomes, support for innovation and action teams and other uses for AI within the organization. As part of this process we shard other principles or applications of positive psychology that may assist *Reach* with the future they have chosen. For example, how to foster high quality connections between *Reach* people, coaching and development with the help of the VIA Classification of character strengths, techniques to build positive emotion such as active-constructive response and opportunities to cultivate positive leadership.

Appreciating the Results

The *Reach* team did an amazing job quickly organizing all of the logistics for the first event. More than 120 people attended the night, a generative metaphor of "The family album" was brought to life within the venue and across all of the materials and two of the *Reach* Crew members joined a member of our cohort to facilitate the mini AI summit. Generally people were very engaged in the *Discovery* tasks and as we uncovered *Reach's* positive core together the discussion from the group was that this was true of their experiences at *Reach.* As people began to *Dream* of the future of *Reach* it became clear that their belief in *Reach's* potential aligned well with the business strategy outlined but also stretched these basic building blocks to outcomes well beyond management's own dreams.

At the end of the workshop there was a general feeling of excitement, energy and hope for *Reach* and its people in the room. One of the *Reach* board members expressed his personal amazement and appreciation for what he had just seen unfold and felt that this would only help the organization grow. The CEO commented on what an incredible experience the night had been and how he felt we had helped to strengthen and live the *Reach* spirit. Many of the participants lingered after the event not wanting to leave the energy created within the room.

In the background, however, of these very positive outcomes, some important nuances were unfolding. Of most concern was that a handful of older crew members left the room at different stages of the event without explanation and never returned and that in the group sessions many of the staff present were reluctant to add their voices to the room. These are the influential *Reach* people who feel most disenfranchised with the organization at present because they are struggling to connect their own feelings with *Reach's* dreams. The pace of the event was simply too fast to give them a real chance to rediscover what they loved about being at

Reach before asking them to dream of a shared future. We also believe that the addition of more of the voices served by *Reach* – such as young people, parents, teachers, sponsors – may have offered a different point of view of what they do to those who were disillusioned.

As a result, *Reach* has decided that before proceeding to the *Design* and *Destiny* workshops they need to take the time to "scoop the group" of those who struggled so that they are given an opportunity to fully connect and have a clear voice about what they want for *Reach* and themselves. These discussions are taking place at present and we look forward to working with *Reach* in the near future to determine how the dreams from the mini AI summit and other stakeholders can be brought to life.

Measuring Success

The ideal results of our application plan would be an increase in employee engagement and a reduction in employee turnover. As AI Summits are only the beginning of the change process the actual implementation of the action items in the design and destiny phase are key to experiencing the benefits of the summit process. This is an important distinction discussed with the *Reach* team so that the proper expectations are set. As such, any evaluation of the program would have to be contingent on these items being put into practice. Assuming *Reach* implemented all of the action items resulting from the summit, one of the best statistically valid surveys for measuring employee engagement is the Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA).

The Gallup Organization studied over 8,000 business units and over 200,000 employee responses to validate the GWA. This simple twelve question survey was determined from a number of qualitative and quantitative studies. As part of a meta-analysis study, they estimated the correlation of employee engagement at the item and composite level, with business outcomes correcting for measurement error in the dependent variables (Harter, Schmidt & Keyes, 2002).

The meta-analytic correlation of business-unit employee engagement to composite performance is .26 within companies and .33 for business units across companies. Within a given company, business units above the median on employee engagement realize .5 standard deviation units higher performance than those below the median. For business units across companies, this difference is .6 standard deviation units of performance (Harter, Schmidt & Keyes, 2002). The performance indicators were turnover, customer service ratings, productivity and profitability. These findings are impressive, giving us the confidence to use this measure with the *Reach* team.

As the cost of delivering this to the entire *Reach* team may not be affordable, we are happy to design a similar employee engagement survey free of charge using survey tools that would be completed online. The organization could complete the survey now and then we could track the progress of the initiatives being implemented and have the entire organization complete the survey once again after 6 months and then 12 months. We have chosen not to do this immediately following the summit because this could just reflect the positive high being felt after an uplifting AI experience. Six months would give enough time for some of the initiatives to have been implemented. If all initiatives had been put into place, we would hope to see an improvement of the overall accumulative average score for *Reach* on the survey after 6 months. If only some of the initiatives had begun, we would hopefully see some upward shifts in the scores but expectations would have to be reviewed to ensure *Reach* is aware that the scores are dependent on the implementation of the action items.

Turnover is also an important factor in determining employee satisfaction. To determine the pre-summit turnover rate, *Reach* would take the number of people who voluntarily exited the organization in 2008 and divide that by the annual average number of employees in 2008. This is the turnover rate. This turnover rate could be calculated after 12 months to see if the AI

Summit intervention had any effects on turnover rates. Turnover, however, is a lag indicator so we would also recommend they calculate turnover rates at 24 months as well. If we see a reduction in turnover we would know that the intervention was a success.

Signing Off

Through our experience with *Reach* we believe that we have come one step closer to realizing some of positive psychology's goals. Gable and Haidt (2005) restated positive psychology's goals as: to understand the factors that build strengths; outline the contexts of resilience; ascertain the role of positive experiences; and delineate the function of positive relationships with others. Positive psychology needs to understand how all of these factors contribute to physical health, subjective well-being, functional groups, and flourishing institutions. We feel that the experience of giving positive psychology away through service learning projects along with the application of appropriate positive interventions such AI and perhaps in the future strength based focus and coaching and active constructive response techniques has and will go a long way in discovering and augmenting what constitutes, improves and perpetuates flourishing institutions.

<div align="center">**References**</div>

Australian Democratic Party (2008). *Australian Democrats Youth Poll*. Stott Despoja, N: Author.

    Retrieved 15 January, 2009 from

    http://www.natashastottdespoja.com/cms_resources/Youth%20Poll%202008%20final.pd

    f.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2007). *Young Australians: their health and*

    wellbeing. (AIHW cat. no. PHE 87). AIHW: Author. Retrieved 15 January, 2009 from

    http://www.aihw.gov.au/publications/aus/yathaw07/yathaw07.pdf.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2005). *Australia's Welfare 2005* (AIHW cat.

    no. AUS 65). AIHW: Author. Retrieved 15 January, 2009

    http://www.aihw.gov.au/mediacentre/2005/mr20051130-highlights.cfm

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2006). *Australia's Health 2006* (AIHW cat.

    no. AUS 73). AIHW: Author. Retrieved 15 January, 2009 from

    http://www.aihw.gov.au/publications/index.cfm/title/10321

Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth. (2008). *Report card on the wellbeing of*

    young Australians. ARACY: Author. Retrieved 15 January, 2009 from

    http://www.aracy.org.au/reportcard

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking

  the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders' impact follower attitudes and

  behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(6), 801-823. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.003

Barrett, F. J. & Cooperrider, D.L. (1990).Generative Metaphor Intervention: A New Approach

    for Working with Systems Divided by Conflict and Caught in Defensive Perception. *The*

    Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol 26. 219-239.

Baumeister, R. F., Gailliot, M., DeWall, C. N., & Oaten, M. (2006) Self-regulation and

    personality: How interventions increase regulatory success, and how depletion moderates

    the effects of traits on behavior. *Journal of Personality, 74(6),* 1773-1801.

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Fostering healthy self-regulation from within and

    without: A self-determination theory perspective. In Linley, P. A. & Joseph, S. (Eds.),

    In *Positive Psychology in Practice* (pp. 105-124). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Bushe, G. R., Coetzer, G. (1995). "Appreciative inquiry as a team development intervention: A

    controlled experiment," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 31: 13-30

Cameron, K., (2008). *Positive Leadership: Strategies for extraordinary performance*. San

    Francisco: Berrett-Koehler

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (Eds.), (2003). *Positive organizational*

    scholarship. San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between

    organizational virtuousness and performance. *American Behavioral Scientist. Special Issue:*

    Contributions to Positive Organizational Scholarship, 47(6), 766-790.

    doi:10.1177/0002764203260209

Clifton, D. O., & Harter, J. K. (2003). Investing in strengths. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, &

    R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*

    (pp. 111-121). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cooperrider D.L., Whitney D. & Stavros J.M. (2008). *Appreciative Inquiry Handbook: For*

    Leaders of Change 2nd Edition. Brunswick, Ohio: Crown Custom Publishing, Inc.

Dahlsgaard, K., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005).Shared virtue: The convergence of

valued human strengths across culture and history. *Review of General Psychology,* 9,209

213.

Deci, E.L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R.M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments

examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological*

Bulletin, 125, 627 – 668.

Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. (2003). The power of high quality connections. In Cameron, K.

S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship.* San

Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Dusseldorp Skills Forum (2007). *How young people are faring 2007: At a glance*. DSF: Author.

Retrieved 15 January, 2009 from http://www.dsf.org.au/papers/197.html

Fredrickson, B. L. (2003). Positive emotions and upward spirals in organizational settings. In

Cameron, K., Dutton, J. & Quinn, R. (Eds.) *Positive Organizational Scholarship* Ch 11

Emotions and upward spirals.

Gable, S.L. & Haidt J. (2005). What (and Why) is Positive Psychology? *Review of General*

Psychology, 9(2), 103-110

Gable, S. L., H. Reis, E.A. Impett, and Asher, E. R. (2004). What do you do when things go

right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 87 (2) 228-45.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see

the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development.

Leadership Quarterly, 16(3), 343-372. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.003

Goleman, D., McKee, A., Boyatzis, R. E. (2002). *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of*

Emotional Intelligence. Boston MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. (2004).Should we trust Web-based

studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about Internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, 59, 93–104.

Grant, A. (2008). The Significance of Task Significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms and boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 93(1), 108-124.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Keyes, C.L. (2002). Well-Being in the Workplace and its Relationship to Business Outcomes: A Review of the Gallup Studies. In C.L. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: The Positive Person and the Good Life* (pp.205-224). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Hodges, T. D., & Clifton, D. O. (2004). Strengths-based development in practice. In A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds.), *Positive psychology in practice*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Isen, A., & Reeve, J. (2005). The influence of positive affect on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Facilitating enjoyment of play, responsible work behavior, and self-control. *Motivation and Emotion*, 29, 297-325.

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.

Kuoppala, J., Lamminpää, A., Liira, J., & Vaino, H. (2008). Leadership, job well-being, and health effects-A systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 50, 904-915.

Locke, E. A. (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting, *Applied & Preventive Psychology 5,* 117-124.

Losada, M., & Heaphy, E. (2004). The Role of Positivity and Connectivity in the Performance of

      Business Teams: A Nonlinear Dynamics Model. *American Psychologist* 60: 678-86

Ludema J.D., Whitney D., Mohr B.J. & Griffin T.J. (2003). *The Appreciative Inquiry Summit: A*

      Practitioner's Guide for Leading Large-Group Change. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-

      Koehler Publishers Inc.

Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organization behavior. *Journal of*

      Organizational Behavior, 23(6), 695-706. doi:10.1002/job.165

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B.J. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In K.S. Cameron, J.E.

      Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.). *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241-261). San

      Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Avey, J. B. (2008). The mediating role of

      psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate-employee performance

      relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior. Special Issue: Contexts of Positive*

      Organizational Behavior, 29(2), 219-238. doi:10.1002/job.507

Luthans, F., Youssef, C.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human*

      competitive edge. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press Mason M., Webber, R.,

      Singleton A. & Hughes P. (2007). *The Spirit of Generation Y: Young People's*

      Spirituality in a Changing Australia. Victoria: John Garrett.

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2003). Virtues and organizations. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R.

      E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp.

      33-47). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2006a). Character strengths and happiness among young children:

      Content analysis of parental descriptions. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7, 323–341.

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2006c). Moral competence and character strengths among adolescents: The development and validation of the Values in Action Inventory of Strengths for youth. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29, 891–905.

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23,* 603-619.

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Character strengths in fifty-four nations and the fifty US states. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 1,* 118-129.

Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist*, 55, 44–55.

Peterson, C., Park, N., Hall, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (in press). Zest and work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.*

Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman (2004). *Character strength sand virtues: A classification handbook.* New York: Oxford University Press/ Washington, DC/American Psychological Association.

Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Assessment of character strengths. In G. P. Koocher, J. C. Norcross, & S. S. Hill, III (Eds), *Psychologists' desk reference* (2nd ed., pp. 93–98). New York: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Greater strengths of character and recovery from illness. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1, 17–26.

Peterson, C., Ruch, W., Beermann, U., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2007). Strengths of character, orientations to happiness, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 2,* 149-156.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2003). Character strengths before and after September 11. *Psychological Science*, 14,381–384.

Rath, T. & Conchie, B. (2009). *Strengths-Based Leadership*. New York: Gallup Press.

Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress:

Empiracle validation of interventions. Positive psychology progress: *American*

Psychologist, 60, 410-421.

Wright, T.A., & Bonett, D.G. (2007). Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as

nonadditive predictors of workplace turnover. *Journal of Management, 33,* 141-160.

Positive Psychology Principles & Applications for Reach

Team building

      Connections between people are the life blood of every organization as individual interactions and the collective efforts of teams are the basis for any work being accomplished. As a result the quality of connections between people impacts the potential of every organization to survive and thrive. The field of positive organizational scholarship encourages organizations to invest in building high quality connections between employees that generate positive emotions as the basis for generating extraordinary business performance (Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003). Is this good advice for an organization seeking to improve team performance?

      Dutton and Heaphy (2003) argue that the quality of connections – whether the connective tissue between individuals is life-giving or life-depleting – fundamentally impacts how organizations function. During a high quality connection (HQC) the individual feels safe and confident to express their emotions, explore new ideas and influences and able to function in a variety of circumstances. They feel engaged, vital and a heightened sense of positive regard for others (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003).

      Research to fully establish the impact and mechanisms of HQC is still in its infancy, however this thesis is echoed in the findings of Losada and Heaphy (2004) that positivity and connectivity within teams has a direct impact on business performance. Observations of more than 60 different business teams led this duo to discover that high performance teams (based on independent business indicators of profitability, customer satisfaction, and evaluations by superiors, peers, and subordinates) had unusually high positivity ratios, at about six to one,

higher levels of connectivity and asked questions as often as they defended their points of view. Consequently, Losada and Heaphy conclude that an abundance of positivity, grounded in constructive negative feedback, can generate the state of realistic enthusiasm and can propel organizations to *Reach* and uphold heights of excellence (Losada & Heaphy, 2004).

Addition evidential weight to these findings is a growing body of compelling evidence demonstrating the value of positive emotions has been led by Fredrickson (2003). Fredrickson authored the "broaden-and-build" theory which finds that positive emotions broaden people's momentary thought-action repertories and build their enduring personal resources (Fredrickson, 2003). This explains Losada and Heaphy's (2004) finding that positive emotions are not just an end state in themselves, but also a means of creating expansive emotional spaces that open possibilities for effective action and create durable psychological and social resources in terms of the strength and quality of connections among team members (Losada & Heaphy, 2004).

The evidence suggests that there is an empirical basis to support the advice that building high quality connections between employees to generate positive emotions is a sound basis from which extraordinary business performances can be generated. Assuming that this is not already the natural state of a specific organization, how can they intervene to create a context that facilitates this transformation?

Bushe (1998) recommends Appreciative Inquiry (AI) as a useful intervention when a team finds itself stuck in a social process rut - some pattern of dysfunctional interaction - and needs creative ways out. Grounded in a theory of how to develop social systems, AI is a form of action research that attempts to help groups create new, generative images for themselves based on an affirmative understanding of their past. Bushe's work has found that AI's "4-D" cycle – discover, dream, design and destiny – helps create an expansive emotional space to share and

shape identities, generate affirming positive images that allow for discourse and collaboration, agree effective actions to make the images real and accept personal responsibility to interact accordingly. The process generates positive emotions between participants and creates an opportunity to begin building high quality connections based on an important shared experience (Bushe, 1998). To date AI has proven to be a popular approach among some of the world's leading organizations.

Gable, Reis, Impett and Asher's (2004) Active-Constructive Response (ACR) is another useful intervention which has been proven that communicating personal positive events with others, particularly when the other is perceived to respond actively and constructively (and not passively or destructively), is associated with increased daily positive affect and well-being, above and beyond the impact of the positive event itself and other daily events. Their research shows that this process of "capitalization" is central to "coping" with positive events, cultivating positive emotions and enhancing social bonds (Gable, Reis, Impett & Asher's, 2004).

Organizations such as PricewaterhouseCoopers are already combining the interventions of AI and ACR as the basis of their cultural transformation to ensure that high quality connections that generate positive emotions compose the fabric of daily life within the organization. While it is clear that the organization can intervene to try and build high quality connections, it is also clear that much could be gained by individuals understanding and developing their personal character strengths to help nurture more positive connections at work.

Character Strengths

Good character is essential for individuals and societies to survive (Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2006). But are there actual character building strengths and virtues? And can they be identified, measured, accessed, and enhanced to improve and increase life and work satisfaction

and performance? A major objective of positive psychology is to create a consensual

classification of widely valued positive strengths and virtues (Peterson, Park & Seligman, 2004,

2005, 2006). Dahlsberg, Peterson & Seligman (2005) identified 24 strengths organized under six

core virtues: wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance and transcendence. These

ubiquitous virtues and strengths emerged from exhaustive surveys of influential religious and

philosophical traditions. Measurement and evaluation of the Values in Action Inventory of

Strengths (VIA-IS) has been deliberately broad including focus groups, questionnaires,

structured interviews, informant reports, and case studies of paragons confirming the test's

reliability and validity.

Park, Peterson and Seligman (2004, 2005, 2006) have consistently found that although all

24 VIA strengths are associated with life satisfaction while zest, hope, gratitude and love are

substantially related to improved life satisfaction. The most common character strengths across

the US and 53 nations were kindness, fairness, honesty, gratitude and judgment. The US profile

converged with 53 nations and across all fifty states (Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2006).

Moreover, studies with youth also report the strengths of zest, hope, gratitude and love to be

most associated with happiness (Park, Peterson & Seligman, 2004).

In addition to the study of all 24 VIA strengths, many studies have explored the value of

individual strengths to life and work satisfaction. For example, Baumeister, Galliot, DeWall, &

Oaten (2006) reported on many experiments that found that self-regulation energy gets easily

depleted after any number of stressful life, work and personal circumstances. But the self-

regulation mechanism is like a muscle. That is, with regular consistent exercise of self-

regulation your self-regulation capacity not only grows stronger it also generalizes to many other

unrelated aspects of your life. Baumeister and colleagues suggest that self-regulation is the king

of strengths. As it is enhanced, through positive interventions for example the increased energy and capacity it creates allows many other strengths to be enhanced as well thereby increasing life and work satisfaction (Baumeister, Galliot, DeWall & Oaten, 2006).

The strength zest has been found to predict general life satisfaction among children, youth and adults (Park, Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Park & Peterson, 2006a, 2006c). Further, zestful people are more likely to pursue flow in their everyday activities and to regard their lives as meaningful (Peterson et al., 2007). In another study Peterson, Park, Hall & Seligman (in press) found that across all tested occupations zest predicted which people believed their work was a calling, as well as predicting work and life satisfaction (Peterson et al, in press). Zest's link with well-being makes it important in organizations (Park, Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Well-being predicts improved job performance and reduced turnover (Wright & Bonnett, 2007). Further, whole organizations can be zestful (Park & Peterson, 2003).

Hope and optimism have also been extensively studied. Optimistic, hopeful individuals have better social relationships, higher levels of physical health, academic and athletic performance, recovery from illness and trauma, pain tolerance, self-efficacy, and flexibility in thinking. Optimistic, hopeful people are also associated with better performance, more perseverance and better moods at work (Peterson, 2000; Peterson & Seligman, 2003).

Clearly the benefits of the VIA strengths and virtues are extraordinary and universal in terms of domain and life/work satisfaction and performance. But there are some evaluative questions about many of the studies mentioned. Most of these studies have used the Internet to collect their data. Consequently, the subject pool has tended towards middle-aged, educated women. However, now that 70 % of the adults in the US have Internet access samples using self-report questionnaires typically yield results of equivalent reliability and validity as

conventional paper and pencil measures (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastave & John, 2004). And the results have been retested and replicated with many other testing mechanisms and populations. Another concern is that most of these studies demonstrate cross sectional correlates with relatively short term consequences. Long term, longitudinal studies to learn the origin of strengths and virtues along with their long term consequences are highly recommended. In addition, many strengths like bravery are phasic. That is, they do not display themselves until the situation calls for them. Finding ways to explore the characteristics and outcomes of tonic and phasic strengths will greatly add to our knowledge and application. Moreover, it is also of high interest to study how strengths cluster and synergize in terms of their natural utilization and application.

Considering the above, designing and implementing positive interventions to enhance the VIA strengths in general and zest, hope, gratitude and love in particular should be highly beneficial to life and work satisfaction and performance. We believe starting with an Appreciative Inquiry Summit will evoke *Reach*'s individual, team and organizational strengths, virtues, positive core, values and best practices. Time permitting, we will continue with several customized positive interventions and coaching to create a truly strength-based, fully integrated culture that will greatly facilitate and enhance the life and work satisfaction and performance of its individuals, team and entire organization.

Positive Leadership

One has only to visit the 'leadership and management' section of the local bookstore to see the burgeoning shelves filled with prescriptions for exceptional leadership. The vast majority are written by great leaders who share their stories and advice garnered by their leadership successes (and failures). Very few strategies in these books are supported by empirical research

27

and even fewer have been written with a positive psychology focus. In this economic downturn, positive leaders are more important than ever to boost morale but do positive leaders produce better business results?

In their ground-breaking book *Positive Organizational Scholarship,* Cameron, Dutton and Quinn (2003) put together a collection of chapters dedicated to the application of positive psychology in an organizational context. Surprisingly, there is only one chapter devoted to the topic of leadership by Lufthansa and Avolio (2003). Drawing from positive psychology and a focus on building strengths in individuals, Avolio and colleagues put forth a model for Authentic Leadership (Avolio et al., 2004). An authentic leader is one who acts according to his/her authentic self and leads in such a way that subordinates can gain self-awareness and psychological strength (Luthans and Avolio, 2003). The empirical link between authentic leadership practices and follower performance have not been fully developed, but the authors claim it contributes to positive organizational behavior (Avolio et al., 2004). Luthans, built the theory of positive organizational behavior (POB) (Luthans, 2002) and later, Luthans, Yourself and Avolio, used this as a foundation for their latest book *Psychological Capital* (2007). Positive psychological capital is made up of positive psychological resources of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and psychological resilience. Research shows that "employees' psychological capital is positively related to their performance, satisfaction, and commitment and a supportive climate is related to employees' satisfaction and commitment." (Luthans et al., 2008, p.219). The evidence provided in these sources for the link between authentic leadership and business performance is *Reach*ing and leaves me unconvinced.

Kim Cameron in his book *Positive Leadership* (2008) describes positive leadership a little differently. First, positive leaders do not strive to achieve ordinary success, but rather to

aspire to levels of achievement that are spectacular or also referred to as 'positively deviant performance'. Second, positive leaders have an affirmative bias with a focus on strengths and human flourishing as opposed to a focus on deficits. Third, positive leaders endeavor to be virtuous in their approach and create virtuous organizations, in other words, to also 'do good' in the communities they live in (Cameron, 2008). Studies indicate significant relationships between virtuousness and both perceived and objective measures of organizational performance (Cameron, 2008). According to Cameron (2008) two mediators are: An amplifying function that creates positive spirals in the organization, and a buffering function that strengthens and protects organizations from adversity. Working with the *Reach* leadership team to build character strengths using the VIA would improve organizational performance.

Gallup scientists, based on decades of research, have yet another description of what constitutes great leaders. In *Strengths Based Leadership,* Rath and Conchie identify three components of effective leadership: knowing your strengths and investing in others' strengths, getting people with the right strengths on your team, and understanding and meeting the four basic needs of those who look to your for leadership: trust, compassion, stability and hope (Rath & Conchie, 2008). The strengths philosophy is founded on the principle that individuals are more likely to succeed in pursuits that build on their greatest talents than focusing on improving weaknesses (Clifton & Harter, 2003). Gallup actually reports the most compelling evidence of all the positive leadership literature reviewed here that strengths-based development relates to various positive outcomes, including increases in employee engagement and productivity (Hodges & Clifton, 2004). In Gallup's extensive research on employee engagement, participants who responded to "At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day" was positively correlated with lower turnover, improved customer service, increased productivity and

profitability (Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2002). We can assist *Reach* in applying positive psychology to improve management's ability to fully engage employees which should have a good likelihood for success.

To inform our approach with *Reach*, we could turn to the work of Goleman, McKee and Boyatzis who delineate six leadership styles (2002). Using emotional intelligence as a foundation, four positive leadership styles; Authoritative, Affiliative, Coaching and Democratic have been identified as being positively correlated to having positive effects on employee work environments while the other two, Pace Setting and Coercive correlate with negative effects on organizational climate (Goleman, McKee & Boyatzis, 2002). The authors claim that different circumstances call for different leadership approaches and leaders using a mix of 4 different styles do better than those who use less. This work is based on research conducted with thousands of leaders around the world and thus has greater credibility.

Finally, a recent literature review performed by Kuoppala, Lamminpää, Liira, and Vaino (2008) looked at hundreds of studies and focused on 27 linking leadership to the well-being of the followers. In their review they considered positive leadership philosophies such as Considerative leadership (treating employees with consideration), Supportive leadership (concern for subordinates or coaching) and Transformational leadership (inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration). Their meta-analysis revealed that the relationship between leadership and job performance was unclear, but they did find a moderate relationship between leadership and job well-being. This data supports the claim that positive leadership leads to higher well-being. But does further research support Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes' (2002) claim that well-being is empirically linked to increased profitability? We will turn to more specific data in our next section.

Employee Engagement and Performance Improvement

In 2001, a new meta-analysis of 312 samples with a combined N of 54,417 has delineated a moderate correlation of .30 between job satisfaction and job performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001). This contradicts a previous meta-analysis that only found a .17 correlation (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001, p. 382). The authors propose a model to replace previous unidirectional models of correlation between the two variables. Among other things, they claim that there may be moderating factors of job complexity, self-esteem, intrinsic motivation, positive affect and goals. As *Reach* is not looking to redesign jobs or alter self-esteem among its employees, we will look at the latter three factors.

Brown & Ryan use a self determination theory (SDT) perspective to discuss fostering healthy self-regulation via intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Brown & Ryan, 2004). SDT focuses on fostering internalization and integration of a specific value and adaptation to extrinsically motivated behavior. It has been well documented that employees value intrinsic rewards such as the nature of the work itself more than pay (Jurgensen, 1978 as cited in Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001). How, then, does one go about fostering intrinsic motivation?

Isen and Reeve conducted two experiments that demonstrated that positive affect not only fostered intrinsic motivation "as reflected by choice of activity in a free-choice situation and by rated amount of enjoyment of a novel and challenging task" but also promoted responsible work behavior in a situation where work needed to be done (Isen & Reeve, 2005, p. 297). In the study, participants were primed with a gift of candy (which they did not eat) then they engaged in an inherently interesting task and they were rewarded with money for an uninteresting task. As a result, Isen and Reeve found that those who received candy spent more time on the interesting task, but they also returned to the uninteresting task to complete it (2005). This draws a

connection between positive affect and aspects of self-regulation such as forward-looking thinking and self-control. Where Brown and Ryan claim that it is solely intrinsic motivation that is most effective at motivating people, Isen and Reeve enhance the results that affective disposition affects performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001).

But why does generating positive affect work? Wright and Shaw claim that employees with positive affect may be more motivated according to several theories of motivation including goal setting theory (as cited in Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001). Locke and Latham argue that high commitment to goals is attained when the individual is convinced that the goal is important and attainable. We will return shortly to the importance of the goal when we look at Grant's work on task significance. In regards to a goal being attainable, self-efficacy directly affects performance, influences the difficulty level of the goal chosen and the commitment to that goal (Locke, 1996, pp. 118-122). Perhaps cultivating positive affect encourages higher levels of self-efficacy which in turn affects performance. In addition, recent researchers have empirically shown the connection to task significance to job performance.

Grant (2008) conducted two experiments with fundraising callers who received a task significance intervention (the mediators being perceived social impact and their perceived social worth) which in turn increased their level of job performance both in number of calls made and amount of money raised. After reading a paragraph about the effect a scholarship would have on students, participants had an increase in conscientiousness and prosocial values. The rewards demonstrated here were intrinsic in nature and we will see in the next article what effect can have.

Deci, Koestner & Ryan (1999) discover in their meta-analysis of the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation that positive feedback enhanced both free-choice behavior and

self-reported interest. In addition, unexpected tangible rewards and verbal rewards that were

non-controlling tended to encourage college students more than children. Perhaps there is a

correlation between authentic positive feedback and the positive affect (in Grant's work)

generated by such feedback.

Actual AI Summit Planning Team Meeting

Reach AI Committee Summit Call Sheet – (2 hours – 24th February 2009)

Reach team – Gordon Lefever (CEO); Romi Kaufman (*Reach* psychologist); Brionhy Sullivan (*Reach* programs); Emily Johnson (*Reach* facilitator); Katie Inglis (*Reach* facilitator).

UPenn team – Shannon Polly (meeting host); Louisa Jewel (timekeeper); Michelle McQuaid (scribe); Bobby Dauman.

Call Overview

1.00pm – 1.10pm	Shannon - Welcome and introductions
1:10pm - 1:25pm	Bobby - Theory and overview
1:25pm – 1.45pm	Shannon - Final confirmation of AI task
1:45pm - 2:35pm	Louisa - Affirmative Topics and introduction of interview guide
	(they will take this away to create)
2:35pm - 2:50pm	Michelle - AI formats and stakeholders
2:50pm - 3:00pm	Shannon – Next steps & Final Wrap Up

Bobby – Theory and overview (15 mins)

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is the cooperative co-evolutionary search for the best in people, their organizations and the world around them. AI is about what gives life to any living system when it's most effective and alive. AI depends upon the art of 'appreciation,' and the practice of asking 'unconditional' positive questions of that engages your and your organizations infinite positive potential. Instead of focusing on the usual negative, critical, deficit management used in most organizations that asks what are the key problems that have to be solves AI helps to focus on what's positive, using powerful imagination to innovate new solutions that you can embrace. AI's discovery, dream, design and destiny model links the energy of your positive core strength, virtues and values to changes never previously thought possible.

So, AI is a deliberate life centered search for your best past, present and future. It's based on the simple assumption that every organization has things that work well. And those strengths are the starting points for creating positive change. AI invites people to participate in dialogues, to share individual and team stories about their present and past achievements, strengths, highpoint moments, traditions, values, opportunities, insights, wisdom and visions of valued and possible futures all to create *Reach*'s 'positive core.' Then AI links your exciting, energized positive core to your change agenda moving you towards your shared dreams.

The AI process involves interviewing and storytelling to draw what's best in the past, to find out what you want more of and to set the stage for imagining and visualizing your future. Now, before we talk about the actual AI process I'd like to give you a little more depth of understanding by briefly describing underlying AI. The first is the Constructionist principle which simply states that your overall social knowledge and *Reach*'s destiny are interwoven. The seeds of change are implicit in your first questions. Your questions determine your answers out of which *Reach*'s future is conceived and constructed. AI utilizes your reasoning mind via your questions and stories to reclaim and unleash the power of your individual and group imagination.

AI's second principle is that of Simultaneity. This simply recognizes that the questions and the change are not truly separate moments. They actually happen simultaneously. The seeds of change are in the questions that you are asking yourselves all day long that continually generate thoughts, discussion and images of the future. The AI inquiry structures the process so your questions find and discover the stories and solutions already in your individual and group mind.

AI's third principle is the Poetic Principle. Just as great work of poetry or literature has endless sources of learning, inspiration and interpretation *Reach*'s story is constantly being coauthored and reinterpreted allowing for new inspiration and learning. And the beauty is you can choose what part of *Reach* you want to study and focus on. You can study alienation or joy, what doesn't work or inspiring innovation. But remember what *Reach* studies and focuses on will expand and move in that direction. So, choose wisely.

Next is the Anticipatory Principle. Much research has shown that an organizations image of the future guides its current behavior. Like a movie projected on a screen we care forever projecting ahead of ourselves. This expectation brings the future powerfully into the present and becomes a mobilizing agent. In short your endless questions create your thoughts. Your 60,000+ thoughts per day are condensed in to images. And your dominant images determine your future.

The last is the Positive Principle. Years of study and application have shown that momentum for change requires large amounts of positive energy, emotion, social bonding, hope, inspiration and the joy of mutual creation. Again, *Reach* will move in the direction of its questions. So, the more positive the beginning questions the longer lasting is the positive affect and the change.

Now, as just mentioned Positive Imagery is a key element for AI. Our beliefs and convictions are determined by our questions, thoughts and especially images. You have all heard of the placebo effect. Positive images result in a positive belief that ignite healing responses that often times are as good or better than conventional therapies. Placebo is so powerful that is effective with everyone 35 to 70% of the time.

Another image, belief effect is the famous Pygmalion effect. Many replicated studies have shown that when teachers are unknowingly led to believe that their students are highly

gifted no matter how much they complain about the workload soon they become highly gifted students. But these students were not gifted; they were randomly selected average students. Unfortunately the opposite holds true as well. If the teacher holds a negative expectation the students end up performing far below their potential. It's the projected image that creates the expectation that creates the results. So, first you believe it, see it in your mind and then see it physically.

1. Positive Effect and Learned Helplessness.
2. Inner Dialogue.
3. Positive Imagery as a Dynamic Force.
4. Met cognition and the Conscious evolution of Positive Images.
5. AI 4-D Cycle.
6. Close & Turn Over.

Shannon – Confirmation of AI task (20 mins)

Sample Summit Tasks:

- Balancing Customer Service Through an Appreciative Eye
- Excellence in City Leadership
- Becoming the World's Best HR Business Partner
- Just-in-Time Learning
- Ultimate Teamwork
- Excellence in Action: Celebrating Our Past and Creating Our Future
- Called to the Future Together: Planning for Mission in the New Millenium

Possible Reach Tasks:

- Creating a positive revolution as *Reach* people
- Growing *Reach* and *Reach*'s people
- Extraordinary action by *Reach* people
- Revolutionizing *Reach*
- We are all *Reach* people
- Revolution, Rebellion, *Reach*
- Revolutionary teamwork moving upward

What are your gut reactions to the tasks below? What feels right? What is missing from it?

Suggested Task
Creating a Positive Revolution as *Reach* People

Louisa – Affirmative Topics and introduction of interview guide (50 mins)

Organizations are stories-in-the-telling. Stories define organizational potential. Organizations follow certain 'storylines' that shape their identities, priorities, values and directions. Let me explain by using a story myself. Tom White, president of telephone operations at GTE, characterized GTE's storyline as "the best problem solvers on the planet". They had over 2,000 measurable indicators to pinpoint deficiencies in their processes and systems. They prided themselves on finding problems and fixing them. But said Tom, the consequence of this storyline was that people began to follow it in their relationships with one another. Before long, GTE Telephone operations had created a 'negative culture, a descent into a sense of hopelessness'. Tom's conclusion was that organizational culture is in essence 'the stories we tell ourselves about ourselves and then forget they are stories."

This is important because in an AI summit, organizations and communities 're-story' themselves from the perspective of their strengths. We know there are issues and hurdles to overcome – but the stories are not about those. The AI summit allows us to learn from stories of when *Reach* was at its best, to share stories about hopes for the future, to design your organization to support the priorities embedded in your 'new' stories and together, you launch action to make them happen. The organization will begin to live a new strength-based story about who you are and what you aim to accomplish.

Powerful Questions

The next part of our planning meeting today is to design powerful questions that reveal these organizational stories. Together, we are going to create an interview guide that will be used during the AI summit that will connect these powerful questions to the Summit agenda.

You have all agreed that the summit topic will be _____

Facilitator's note: There are three steps in crafting an appreciative interview guide:

1. Selecting affirmative topics
2. Writing appreciative questions
3. Creating the interview guide

Now we want to design three to five meaningful and strategically powerful affirmative topics that will lead to learning and action related to _____ (summit task).

Opening Interviews Exercise

Purpose: To determine the positive core and dreaming about the future of *Reach*

Timing: 30 minutes

Description:

Divide the group into pairs. Share the following questions with them:

1. Think about a time when you were really engaged in and excited about your work at *Reach*. Tell me a story about that time. What was happening? What were you feeling? What made it a great moment? What were others doing that contributed to this moment? What did you contribute to creating this moment?

2. What are your three wishes for the future to heighten the vitality and strength of the *Reach* organization?

Allow 15 minutes per person.

Return to the group and discuss how it went. Share descriptive adjectives.

Decide on Reach's Affirmative Choice Topics

Purpose: Determine the affirmative topics

Timing: 15 minutes

Review traditional problem-solving topics clients provide and rework these topics into affirmative topic choices

Review the newly revised topics (based on the group discussion above) that all contribute to attaining the AI summit task

Decide on three to five topics they would like to explore further

Create Interview Guide

Purpose: Create the Interview guide

Timing: 10 minutes

Give everyone a sample interview guide

Review it briefly so they get an idea of how the questions can be crafted around each choice topic. Assign this as homework. Get some dates set to follow up with this work before the summit.

Michelle – Stakeholders and format (15 mins)

Stakeholders

The theory of AI is grounded in the belief that is essential to have the whole system in the room. Why? When people see interconnections among teams, processes, people and ideas they know better how to participate and therefore are able to make commitments that were previously impossible or unlikely. If anyone is missing, there is much less potential for new discoveries and innovative action. Mapping the stakeholders – those people who or groups, internal and external to *Reach* – that have a stake in the decisions and actions that will take place around the topic. For example, a university invited faculty members, administration, board members, full and part-time students, parents of students and high school guidance counselors to their strategic planning summit.

The best way to identify your stakeholders for *Reach*'s topic is to consider the five I's of involvement:

1. Interest in the summit task and potential outcomes
2. Influence, formal and informal, to provide resources to achieve the summit task
3. Information or access to information needed for summit success
4. Impact or a high probability of being impacted by what happens during the summit
5. Investment, financial or emotional, related to the summit task and outcomes

We have talked about using *Reach*'s tribal bond in March to run the AI process. Do you believe that the people invited will meet the five I's? Do you feel like there is anyone not on the list of attendees who may bring a different but valued perspective to the chosen topic – for example teachers who invite *Reach* to schools, parents who send their children, corporate sponsors who donate money, government bodies who certify *Reach*'s work, kids that participate in the programs, the advisory board being established? Are there are any other groups that would fulfill the five I's and should be present at tribal bond to help you discover and dream new points of view? *Allow for discussion and agreement of who should attend.*

Format

The AI experiences show that if you really want the kind of deep long-lasting change that a summit can produce, a minim of three days is required. Clearly we don't have the option with *Reach* so rather than a complete summit all in one hit we are recommending an AI experience from which we can flex and select the best of what AI has to offer for *Reach*'s timeframe. Please be aware though that you are experiencing hybrid AI solution rather than the recommended ideal.

When people have to try a hybrid some of the formats that have been found to be successful is a series of mini-summits each including subsets of the whole system, breaking the four D's into several stages over a series of meetings, allocating prework (for example discovery interviews) and postwork (destiny to implement) or a rolling process of shorter AI meetings where each meeting tackles one of the four D's.

With this in mind of the four D's – discover, dream, design and destiny – that Bobby outlined earlier how would you ideally like to spend the time at tribal bond? *Allow for discussion and try to Reach agreement on how.*

What would you like to design for a follow up to tribal bond to try and complete the full 4D's at *Reach*?　　*Allow for discussion and try to Reach agreement on how.*

Shannon – Next steps and final wrap up (10 mins)

Appendix C

Tribal Bond Run Sheet

Suggested theme: "Our family album: Ordinary people doing extraordinary things to inspire their individual and collective greatness"

Suggested objectives: to capture the stories of our favourite family moments and dream together of what's still to come.

Staging: A table plan is provided outside the room so participants can easily find their place card once inside. At 5.50pm participants enter room which is set up like a family dining room and take their seats. Pictures of Reach people frame the walls reflecting favourite moments of our family history.

6.00pm　　　　**Welcome**

- Invite participants to be seated at their tables.
- Set up format and purpose of the evening
- Invite participants to walk down memory lane and recall the family history

Purpose: a) create safe space where people understand their role and what's in it for them b) build positive emotion to broaden their minds for the activities ahead.

Logistics: Consider music as people enter to set the mood. Facilitator (s) need microphones to welcome people and set up evening. The walk down memory lane of photos could be virtual or three dimensional.

6.10pm　　　　**Discovering our relatives**

- Participants are asked to introduce themselves to the person on their right and use the question on their placemat to discover an extraordinary *Reach* story for this person and capture it down to add to the family album. They are encouraged to add a picture of the person to the story if they can.
- When they are done. The person they have interviewed will return the favour to capture your extraordinary *Reach* story and portrait also.
- We'll spend the next 15 minutes – a little over 7 minutes for each interview - getting to know a long lost relative.

Purpose: to discover the stories of Reach people's: unleashed, uninhibited creativity and dreaming; times when they have seen the spark in people's eyes; and reflect on what we achieve we are connected and aligned with ourselves, each other and Reach's vision.

Logistics: The four questions (see question guide) will be spread along the table with only one question appearing on the placemat of each person. For example, 16 people will have question one on their placemat, 16 people will have question 2, 16 people will have question 3 and 16 people will have question 4. The placemat should have room for the question and recording the story and picture of the interviewee. Pencils should be provided on the tables.

6.25pm   **Discovering our family strengths**

- On the back of your placemat you'll find a number. Find the people sitting next to you and across from you that share the same number. Welcome to your new family!
- Please agree who among you will facilitate the discussion you are about to have; keep time; scribe ideas; and report back to the group.
- Now please spend about three minutes introducing the relative you just discovered. Be sure to share their name, a short version of their story of greatness and what enabled them (the root causes of success) to do something so extraordinary.
- As the stories are shared be sure your scribe captures down on your table cloth the root causes of success that enable ordinary people to do extraordinary things.
- When all the family have been introduced, please select the top 3 – 5 root causes of success that were common across your stories and you think particularly capture what enables *Reach* people to inspire their individual and collective greatness. Write these on the large flip chart sheets.
- Make sure your reporter is ready to share these root causes of success with the entire *Reach* family. Have one of your stories of greatness ready to demonstrate why these root causes were so important to your group.
- You have just over 30 minutes to discover your family strengths.
- At the end of this time ask the scribe to collect all the interview sheets and have these collected for safe keeping.

Purpose: To build a shared narrative of Reach people working together to do extraordinary things and identify the root causes of success that make this possible.

Logistics: Participants will be in groups of eight – be mindful of noise in the room as they need to be able to hear from one end of their seats to the other and across the table. Consider placing the instructions on the back of the placemats or in an envelope on the table for each group – this gives them the instructions to refer back to. Be sure we have tablecloths they can write on. Agree what they will put the root causes onto and where in the dining room they will stick these up to

create a powerful visual of the strengths Reach has to draw on for the stages of dream and design.

7.00pm   **Discovering our family's individual and collective greatness**

- Reporters are asked to all come up and add their root causes of success to the family album. *Facilitators help them put them up to speed the process. As they are added facilitators call out what words they are seeing go up for other participants.*
- One group per question is then asked to spend about three minutes share the root causes they identified and a story of greatness that demonstrates why these strengths are so important to *Reach*.
- Ask participants to gather around the visual as one large family group. Ask what patterns, highlights or surprises they see in the family album.
- Acknowledge everyone's efforts and apologise for not having the chance to hear all the stories. Let them know all their work is being collected and will be reviewed for the final family album to share. Ask everyone to return to their seats and collect the tablecloths at the end of the exercise.

Purpose: To demonstrate that this shared narrative exists not only in small groups but across the whole Reach family. Demonstrate why unleashed, uninhibited creativity and dreaming, the spark in people's eyes and connection and alignment with ourselves, each other and Reach's vision matter.

Logistics: Need quick, easy way to faster the root causes of success to the visual image. Ideally the final visual this creates should be a positive image that is inspiring and satisfying.

7.30pm   **Dreaming of our family's potential**

- When people are re-seated take them on a five - seven minute sensory of what the future of this family would look like. Imagine you've just woken from a deep sleep, it is 2012 and you've just walked back into *Reach*. How has *Reach* helped these family members come together to do extraordinary things that inspire individual and collective greatness? *etc…*
- At the conclusion of the sensory ask the groups to spend the next ten minutes sharing the future they saw for *Reach*. Remind them to have a facilitator, time keeper and scribe to capture their dream.
- Now ask them to spend the next 15 minutes finding a way to capture the essence of the dreams they have been discussing and share them with the wider family in a way that excites and energises family members. They can create a phrase that captures the dream, draw a picture or act out part of the dream together. Whatever format is selected, it should take no more than three minutes to share this dream with the wider group.

Purpose: To create a shared dream of how Reach people could work together to do extraordinary things that inspire individual and collective greatness

Logistics: Sensory and music to be run by Tamika. Art supplies to create pictures etc ready at hand for tables if they wish to use.

8.00pm   A shared dream

- Begin by asking the groups not picked during discovery to come forward one at a time and share their dream with the group. *Depending on time try to include all groups – if not possible then assure these groups their dreams will be collected to add to the family album.*
- Invite the whole family to provide feedback about which parts of the dreams made them feel most inspired – the images or ideas they feel are most compelling for the future of *Reach* people.

Purpose: To find the shared energy for a collective dream about how Reach people could work together to do extraordinary things that inspire individual and collective greatness

Logistics: Need to keep pace moving through this so that energy builds for the end – remember they have been sitting a while at this point!

8.45pm   Conclusion

- Thank everyone for their participation and explain that work on the family album doesn't end tonight.
- Detail that over the coming weeks we will begin together to design pathways to use the strengths we've uncovered to move us from our reality today to the dream we've identified. More will be shared on how people can participate in this over the coming days – but we hope everyone that believes this dream is worth creating will be involved.
- IMPORTANT TO HAVE GREAT END: To close out would be great if we could take any of the pictures from the discover section of workshop and have dropped to music to give them the sense of how the family album has already changed just in the one night and encourage them to keep sharing the stories they discovered with family members over the coming weeks and months so that we don't forget the extraordinary things that *Reach* people do together.

Purpose: To give them clear direction that the work doesn't end here and we want them to be involved as much as they choose to throughout next stages. To finish with a peak ending so people's memory of the event is great and to have really shifted the narrative forward about the ability of Reach people to work together.

Logistics: Want to end on time so people not deserting before done. Not sure if possible to quickly drop photos from first hour to some preselected music for a slide show to finish?

POST TRIBAL BOND

The organising committee will regroup on Thursday 19 March to review the dream and select approximately four design paths for exploration. The *Reach* team will nominate a leader for each of the design paths and this person will help drive the next stage forward.

Suggest that:

- a small version of the family table or the family album is set up in high traffic area in the Jam Factory so that the ideas live on for the next month.
- each week one design pathway is the focus of work at this table/area (i.e. week one may be *Reach* people development, week two may be *Reach* people recognition, etc). These topics, their design leaders and their timing for design is published to all *Reach* people as the next step from Tribal Bond.
- a regular time is nominated (i.e. Tuesday at 10am) when *Reach* people are invited to gather to meet that week's design leader and explore how to design a pathway from our reality to our dream. The output of this team is left on the dining table/in the album for others to provide appreciative feedback (this is done with post it notes that can highlight the strengths of the ideas, offer hopes or provide integration to other design streams).
- at the end of the week the workstream leader writes up the design pathway and shares with the committee for input and fine tuning.

One month after tribal bond find an opportunity to reconnect *Reach* people – particularly staff and crew – to share the design work streams and invite people to indicate if they would like to be involved in making this a reality. Closer to the time we can design this workshop together.