Inquiring into Appreciative Inquiry: A Conversation With David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry

Peer-reviewed author version

Inquiring into Appreciative Inquiry

A conversation with David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry

Styn Grieten
KULeuven
Faculty of Economics and Business | Human Relations Research Group
24 Warmoesberg
Brussels, 1000, Belgium
Tel: 0032 2 609 82 86
E-mail: styn.grieten@kuleuven.be

Frank Lambrechts
Hasselt University
Faculty of Business Economics | RCEF Research Center for Entrepreneurship and Family Firms
1 Agoralaan
Diepenbeek, 3590, Belgium
Tel: 0032 11 268693
E-mail: frank.lambrechts@uhasselt.be
Corresponding author

René Bouwen
KULeuven
Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences | Work and Organizational Psychology
102 Tiensestraat
Leuven, 3000, Belgium
E-mail: rene.bouwen@psy.kuleuven.be

Jolien Huybrechts
Maastricht University
School of Business and Economics | Department of Organization & Strategy
Tongersestraat 53
6211 LM Maastricht, The Netherlands
E-mail: j.huybrechts@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Ronald Fry
Case Western Reserve University
Weatherhead School of Management | Organizational Behavior Department
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio, 44106-7235, USA
Tel: 001 216 368 2060
E-mail: ronald.fry@case.edu

David Cooperrider
Case Western Reserve University
Weatherhead School of Management | Organizational Behavior Department
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio, 44106-7235, USA
Tel: 001 216 368 2121
E-mail: david.cooperrider@case.edu

Inquiring into Appreciative Inquiry

A conversation with David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry

David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry are professors of Organizational Behavior at the Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University. CWRU's Department of Organizational Behavior is consistently acknowledged as one of the best in the world by the Financial Times. Together with their mentor, Suresh Srivastva, they created Appreciative Inquiry over 30 years ago. Since then, Appreciative Inquiry has been extensively applied world-wide, and many exciting results have been achieved and published. This paper is grounded in an in-depth conversation with David and Ron at the World Appreciative Inquiry Conference 2012, and subsequent discussions between 2012 and 2016. It focuses on how Appreciative Inquiry has been contributing to a generative scholarship and what new possibilities are on the horizon to strengthen these efforts. In the epilogue we highlight contributions to current debates around generative scholarship, and offer recommendations to heighten the generative potential of Appreciative Inquiry and our field.

Keywords: Appreciative Inquiry, Future forming learning, Generative scholarship, Organization development and change

Introduction

This Reflections on Experience paper is based on an in-depth conversation with David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry at the World Appreciative Inquiry Conference 2012 in Ghent, Belgium, and subsequent discussions between 2012 and 2016. The theory and vision for Appreciative Inquiry (AI) was first articulated and researched in David Cooperrider's PhD dissertation defended in 1985. It was called, *Appreciative Inquiry: Toward a methodology for understanding and enhancing organizational innovation* (Cooperrider, 1986). Together with their mentor Suresh Srivastva and colleagues in the Department of Organizational Behavior at Case Western Reserve University, David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry are co-creators of AI. Taking the first academic publication on AI in *Research in Organizational Change and Development* (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) as the starting point, the 25th anniversary of AI was an excellent opportunity to start inquiring into how AI has been contributing to a generative scholarship and what future trajectories lie ahead.

Originally, AI was conceived by Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) as a new grounded *inquiry method for action research* into "what gives life to organizations when they are most alive," capable of answering the social constructionist call for building *generative theories* (Gergen, 1978, 1982): social theories that function not to mirror yesterday's world for purposes of prediction and control, but instead to challenge the status quo, and open the world to new possibilities for collective action. These theories (e.g., new change and organization theories), argued Gergen (1978, p. 1346), "can provoke debate, transform social reality, and ultimately serve to reorder social conduct." AI's larger purpose was, and continues to be, to help contribute to a social science of possibilities instead of probabilities, "helping to make life all that it is capable of becoming" (Cooperrider, Zandee, Godwin, Avital, & Boland, 2013, p. xii).

Conventional action research's overemphasis on action at the expense of generative theory building, and its innovation-limiting focus on diagnosis and problem-solving from a deficit orientation, was the main impetus behind AI's original articulation (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987). AI's ambition, indeed, was to reawaken and expand Kurt Lewin's early vision of action research as a humanly significant and beneficial science where theory and action synergistically speak to each other (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987), which is encapsulated well in Lewin's two dictums: "There is nothing so practical as a good theory" and "You cannot understand a system until you try to change it" (cf. Schein's path to theory development: Schein, 1996).

In contrast with conventional action research, AI was proposed as an appreciative, applicable, provocative and collaborative form of organization study (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Cooperrider 1986), that, *when undertaken from a true co-operative inquiry stance*, was capable of creating generative ideas (i.e., compelling new ideas that trigger new actions) in the applied worlds of study participants (Bushe, 2010, 2013; Bushe & Paranjpey, 2015) and new generative theories in academia, both contributing to social transformational innovations (Ronald Fry, personal communication, 2015).

The applied power of AI as a life-centric or strength-based (vs. deficit-based) organization development (OD) process and approach to change management was very quickly adapted all over the world (Fry, 2014), and somewhat overshadowed generative theory building efforts (Cooperrider, 2013). In that applied capacity, and often expressed in terms of its "4-D" learning cycle (Cooperrider & Whitney, 1999), AI invites system stakeholders into a collaborative and rigorous inquiry/search into each other's stories about what is already giving life ("Discovery") to their organizing efforts when they are at their best. The joint discovery of

high commonality among strength-based stories then forms a new foundation from which stakeholders co-envision new possibilities to enact that future ("Dream"). Stakeholders then construct the, for them, most attractive possibilities through crafting provocative propositions, scenarios or concrete prototypes ("Design"), and launch self-directed initiatives to realize the design solutions ("Destiny") they themselves have co-created, continuing the dynamic learning cycle into the future (e.g., Barrett & Fry, 2005; Bushe, 2012a, 2012b; Cooperrider, 2012; Fry, 2014; Verleysen, Lambrechts, & Van Acker, 2015).

Currently, AI is practiced globally and its popularity is still growing (Cooperrider et al., 2013; Fry, 2014). The positive and transformational impact of AI on persons, groups, organizations, and multi-stakeholder collaboration is widely recognized and documented (e.g., Barrett & Fry, 2005; Bushe & Kassam, 2005; Cooperrider, 2012; Cooperrider et al., 2013; Fry, Barrett, Seiling, & Whitney, 2002; Verleysen et al., 2015). AI, argues Quinn (2000), is revolutionizing the field of organization development and change, and is an important precursor of the positive organizational scholarship domain (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003) and strengths-based movement in management (Buckingham, 2006) (see also Bushe, 2012b; Cooperrider et al., 2013; Verleysen et al., 2015). Moreover, Gergen (2015) conceives AI as a type of *future-altering research* that is capable of *cooperatively* building new and better collective local futures, and Carlsen and Dutton (2011, p. 16) state that AI can "unlock generativity in organizational development and in theorizing" (see also Zandee, 2013).

Of course, like all approaches, AI is also surrounded by some criticism and concern. A common concern is that a focus on "positivity" in organizational life might discourage participants to explore "negative" organizational experiences, while doing so might *also* be meaningful to support the change process (e.g., Barge & Oliver, 2003; Fitzgerald, Oliver, &

Hoxsey, 2010). Moreover, Barge and Oliver (2003) challenge a too narrow interpretation of appreciation as solely "being positive," arguing that appreciation requires connecting with what others find important in the here-and-now in a life-generating way.

More and more AI scholars, also triggered by these thoughtful critiques, are transcending the positive/negative duality by studying AI's capacity to enact generativity (e.g., opening the world to new possibilities) in its inquiry and learning process (e.g., Cooperrider, 1986; Bushe, 2007, 2010, 2012a; Zandee, 2013, 2014; Fry, 2014; see for an excellent overview: Cooperrider et al., 2013). Recently, Cooperrider et al. (2013, p. xiii, italics added) have reemphasized the original 1987 call to advance "a *generative scholarship* of human organizations [that] re-weaves into the very fabric of our field a *deep appreciation* for the miracle of life, a felt sense of a reverence for life, and a *burning need to wonder* about 'what gives life?' to living systems."

The next sections of the article display the in-depth conversation with David Cooperrider and Ronald Fry. The main purpose of the conversation was to learn about how AI has been contributing to a generative scholarship and what new possibilities are on the horizon to strengthen these efforts. In the epilogue we deepen the conversation's contributions to current debates around generative scholarship, and offer recommendations to heighten the generative potential of AI and our field.

The Discovery of Appreciative Inquiry

We would like to invite you to go back in time and share your personal learning history that led up to the "discovery" of Appreciative Inquiry.

David: I was in the doctoral program at Case Western Reserve University and Ron was on my dissertation committee together with Suresh Srivastva, who acted as my chairman. In 1980, I was getting started with a study at the Cleveland Clinic, which is probably the number-one heart

center and one of the top tertiary-care medical centers in the world. They had been through a revolution where 500 of the top physicians in the world came to their board and said: "Listen, we need a whole new kind of organization; we are not a part of the decisions that are taken." They wanted to transform the existing dual medical/administrative hierarchy into a single organization where they would be part of the leadership in a significant way, meaning that beyond their surgery they would also be co-leaders in finance or marketing or any other administrative arena. They created an amazing group concept of leadership where they would make decisions in groups of 500 people.

I went in together with Alan Jensen (fellow doctoral student) and was asked by the chairman of the Board of Governors of the Clinic, Dr. William Kiser, to do a conventional organizational diagnosis looking at "deficits" and "gaps" in human performance. Dr. William Kiser said: "It's like Ezekiel's wheels: one wheel turns and the other one doesn't. Everything has become so complex with hundreds of committees – communication is problematic and has to be improved significantly." But as we got in there for the study, it was very exciting for me to see this precious, nascent social invention of egalitarian governance happening. Yes, it wasn't perfect and it wasn't fully born and, yes, it was very complex. But when I came back and talked to Suresh, Ron and others about my excitement with this embryonic social invention, I said: "Suresh this, as you have declared, is perhaps the most important organizational innovation in the world and therefore I'm not sure we should be adding an organizational diagnosis into it as the chairman of the board requested; we might miss the precious and delicate details of the innovation." Suresh could see my sense of awe about the social invention, and said: "Go with your excitement and study everything that gives life to that nascent social innovation," thus allowing my excitement to lead the focus of the inquiry. And so that's what I started doing. We

got permission from Kiser to inquire into and emphasize the factors that contributed to the highly effective functioning of the Clinic when it was at its best. We had already some questions (because it was part of another person's dissertation earlier) that were both diagnostic and kind of appreciative, but we didn't call it appreciative until we presented the first report to the Board in 1981. But when I looked at the database of stories collected through our interviews, all I did was analyze "What is it that is giving life to this nascent, tremendously precious social invention?" So it was a kind of cognitive dissociation from everything that wasn't giving life to it and just a focus on everything that gives life to the system when it's most alive. I literally set aside all the deficiencies and looked only at the things that were giving life to the system when it was most alive. Then I took the best of the best to then speculate and leap to ideal type possibilities for the future—to build a theory of possibility: not a theory of yesterday's world but of tomorrow's possibilities. The first document, presented in 1981 to the Board of Governors, was called the Emergent Themes report. It presented data illustrations of the life-giving best, first, and then a long jump leap to articulate an ideal-type future—what the whole organization could be like, all the time.

It was very exciting to see what happened when we presented the results of this early on to the Board of Governors of the clinic. They went through those 30 pages of emergent life-giving themes and said: "Well, where are all of our problems?" And we replied, "That was not our methodology." In that feedback report to the Board there was a footnote where we said our methodology was an "Appreciative Inquiry." At that time, I didn't have a sense of the importance of that as a word combination, but what happened was an eruption of interest in that inquiry, the findings, and the vision that came forward. It then unfolded in tremendously exciting ways. Dr. Kiser said: "It's like you were able to peer into our soul; now can you do this kind of

Appreciative Inquiry with all 8,000 people?" That was in 1981. So we expanded the study and immediately noticed, and traced, with time one and time two data, how inquiry itself, with no other intervention than appreciative knowing, moved the system closer and closer to its own consensually validated ideals.

So while I was interested in the egalitarian organizational innovation, for me the striking discovery was the inquiry-and-change nexus, and so the real adventure was the intellectual journey of building a logic for a more appreciative approach to inquiry. I had several sources of inspiration. One was Ken Gergen's call for generative theory (Gergen, 1978): Not theory that just maps yesterday's world but theory that anticipates the future; theory that challenges the guiding assumptions and opens up possibilities or new forms of action. Ron, Suresh and I talked about it and decided: Let's merge some of the ideas around grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which is very discovery-oriented and not yet locked into the verification. Grounded theory was saying that one of the great contributions of science is discovering, labeling and building new concepts and constructions. We connected this with the call for a generative kind of theory coupled with a radical appreciation of everything that gives life. That was the focus. So the next part of my dissertation started to track that intervention effect of the inquiry, how this *doing the inquiry* had an impact on people's aspirations and visions. To the point where you begin to say that intervention is a redundant term. Inquiry and intervention are two sides of the same medal. We don't need this second term anymore. It was very exciting. At one moment we were asked: "Can this be done with 8,000 people?" And then it started to dawn on us that AI could be done consciously and we deliberately started to think about it as a way to really work with people, groups and organizations.

Ron: For me, the discovery of AI was much more specific, in the early phase of Dave's story.

Dave mentioned just prior that he was working with another doctoral student. This was a separately defined study at the clinic where they were doing interviews with the physicians to help shape some ideas about a performance management system for their group practice. Suresh, in particular, because he had a history in the clinic working with their leadership, had made it very clear to Dave and some of his peers that they were walking into a *very* special place. He used words like "the best of the best", "there's no place like this place", "these people are fantastic and excellent", and "one of the most advanced places in the world: world-class." So I remember sitting in Suresh's office, with David, Alan Jensen and Frank Barrett. They had come back from a day of interviews and they were really upset. They weren't hearing anything close to what Suresh had painted. They were hearing things like "this place is just political" and lots of other complaints.

David: One of our core questions at that time was, "tell us your biggest failure."

Ron: Right! So they were kind of demoralized and stressed. And then, as they talked about it in the room, they started turning on us, you know, the three students with whom we had great relationships, they were angry at us for "setting them up." And at some point, because it was getting finger-pointing and accusatory, Suresh sat back in his leather chair, and he said: "I wonder if what is happening right now is a consequence of the questions we are asking." And for me that was the moment I always remember as a real "aha!"

We had been talking, in different ways, about the power of the question and even this idea that intervention and inquiry cannot be separated. Suresh spoke to those ideas often, but it became very concrete for me right there at that moment that *these questions in the interview were having an impact on the dynamics of the relationships right here and now* in the room. So that's what I always go back to as the point of beginning for me personally. And then follows, as Dave

said, the evolution of his thesis and the first articles like the one in *Human Relations* (Srivastva & Cooperrider, 1986). So it centers on what we now refer to as the constructionist principle, the idea of not just words but *questions* being fateful. There is no neutral question: All questions are going to set direction. And you find what you ask for. For me, this all became very vivid, understandable and experienced in that moment at Suresh's office.

Emerging Contributions of Appreciative Inquiry

What do you consider as the most important emerging contributions of Appreciative Inquiry?

David: I think there are three sources of excitement right now. First, there is the need to shift from our language of the mere measurement effect to recognition that in human systems what we should be talking about is the exponential inquiry effect—a Heisenberg "observer effect" on steroids as you will. In the marketing literature, there has been a lot of research that shows that just simply asking a question about an individual's purchase intentions begins to shift his/her subsequent behavior. This has been labeled the "mere measurement effect." But our experience is showing that we ought to be talking about the "Gergen-Heisenberg Principle." The Heisenberg observer effect in physics says that observing the physical world always has an impact on that world. Inserting a thermometer in a glass of water to determine its temperature, for example, will change the actual temperature of the water. *In the human sciences, we are in our infancy in understanding the snowball effect of the very first questions we ask. The questions we ask determine what we find, and what we find escalates in our language, in our dialogue, in our conceptualizations and very much takes part in the social construction of reality.* Our questions are fateful: Once posed, questions do their work, they cannot be stopped. We become what we inquire into. When people co-inquire into the life giving, the good and the possible, they simultaneously change their system in that direction. Likewise, studying low morale will produce

its own ripple effects. So in the social sciences we need a distinction: It is not just the Heisenberg observer effect. It's more like a "Gergen-Heisenberg Principle" that needs to be explored with a focus on understanding exponential dynamics and sensitive dependence on initial conditions. I do not see this area being explored in the management and organization field, or it is just emerging very slowly. In leadership education, for example, there is no course on the art of asking the question; we don't treat it as anywhere near important compared to understanding a balance sheet, or calculating the opportunity cost of capital.

The second source of excitement is that the question of all the senior leaders Ron and I are working with, is not anymore about changing one group at the time, be it top-down ("rolling it out") or bottom-up, but their question is about change at the scale of the whole. How do we move our whole 67,000-person telephone company? How do we move our whole Northeast Ohio region in terms of economic development? How do we move a whole global United Nations system? How do we do that together, with high engagement, and rapidly? The isolated changes, the segmented changes, the silo changes – even if they are great ideas and great innovations – are not going to make the difference in our increasingly interconnected, systemic world in terms of our contributions and competitiveness. Especially in the sustainability domain, the call for change at the scale of the whole is compelling. Look at all the grand challenges for establishing systemic climate action, sustainable water usage, green cities and economic conditions for world peace.

The third source of excitement is that we are in a stage now where we need to develop a new language for what we have been discovering while doing AI. We are talking about how strength touching strength creates change, how hope touching hope creates change, how the union of strengths does more than just help us to perform, but actually cause us to *transform*. We

are in great need of a theory of non-deficit positive change. We have a theory of problem-analytic change that says that change is moving from a negative to a zero, "back to normal." But what we don't have in our management literature yet is a language around a non-deficit kind of change that moves from a "+2" to a "+20" or even a "+200." To really build a full theory of that dynamic we need a new language. How should we call it? "AI ignites a process of positive change?" I think that language is academically weak because it is more than positive change. Likewise, you cannot call it "AI ignites a process of transformation" because there are all kinds of transformations such as negative transformation so it does not talk about the positive part of it. Developing this new language matters greatly to the future of management education, academia, and practice because *the limits of language are the limits of our worlds. We won't be calling for it if we don't have the language.* Very rarely do you get a call that says "we want to invite you to our company to help us to ignite the process of strength-based or 'life-touches-life' change." We are in a stage where we need to give some intellectual depth and language to that. Do we call it "AI and strength-based dynamics lead to a process of co-elevation?" Or a "pro-fusion", a positive coming together of strengths? Is that the new language? Right now I am playing with the idea of humanity's shift from blind evolutionary change, to conscious evolutionary change, and now towards conscious co-elevationary change. The positive dynamic in AI is conscious co-elevationary. *Evolutionary* change and *elevationary* change are different—and that's wide open territory for lots of exploration.

Is developing a new language developing a new management and organization reality?

Ron: Theory development is linguistic. A new theory is a new language. Theory and language are not separate. I think this new language will increasingly enable both academics and practitioners to call for, and inquire into, strength-based life-giving change that co-authors a new

social reality of organizing. The new language will enable management and organization scholars to build new theories of non-deficit change and publish them in academic journals and will also allow us to teach better the stages of positive change.

David: Our executives, our business, non-profit and government leaders are trying to manage organizations in a multi-stakeholder world of unprecedented change. And the only change theories that they can fall back on are the change theories that happen under times of great stress or duress. So our change theories fit well with times of trauma and hurt, but we need to learn how to change *before* the trauma because we don't change well when hurt, defensiveness, anger and fear reign in our corporations. We have developed a great capacity to deal with crises, but trauma-based change will not create the kind of resilient organizations that we need for the future. We need the dynamic of change when things are excellent.

Rapid Trust, Future Forming Learning, and The Power of the Whole

Ron: Related to that is another area where I think our language has stalled or kind of stagnated; learning. Learning is very historically based. It is the acquisition of knowledge defined as "past discovery." However, what we observe in whole-system, AI summits when they are most exciting and most powerful is a different kind of learning or discovery that is happening. Dave, you used the term "anticipatory learning" a long time ago (see Cooperrider, 1990), indicating a kind of learning in the direction of positive anticipatory images of the future. What is that really about? During three-day AI summits, 200 to 900 or more stakeholders of a common system collaboratively devise a powerful and positive systemic purpose in a dynamic 4-D learning cycle: Discovery, Dream, Design and Destiny (e.g., Cooperrider, 2012). In introducing yourselves [the interviewers], you said that your interest is in how quality relationships affect change. Maybe that should be upside down: How does change affect relationships? How does

going through the learning stages of AI and the experience of wholeness affect relationships? Otherwise we are kind of stuck. Everything starts with an explanation of the dyad or the relationship. Don't get me wrong, I totally agree that all of this is relational practice but what about the relation-as-a-whole or the relation *with* the whole? *It is our socialized view to always start with the relationship or the person and go up or out. Maybe there is something that can be understood if we look at it the other way around and start with the whole.* The executive questions about changing at the level of the whole are like: "I need the change and then I can do the training. I can't wait for trust to develop gradually. I can't wait for all these interpersonal things that we believe are good and great; I will think about that later." I am not refuting the importance of sustainable, high-quality relationships, but what about *rapid trust*?

David: Right!

Ron: People are starting to write about rapid trust (e.g., Meyerson, Weick, & Kramer, 1996; Milhauser, 2011), and that is more what I think I see and experience during AI, especially in summits. It's not the same high-quality connection that Jane Dutton and her colleagues (e.g., Dutton & Heaphy, 2003) talk about, which is more of an enduring, resilient "friendship." What I am talking about is a connection that allows and creates space for people to act and innovate and learn as they go. In summits, people are stakeholders in a common system so they have impressions of each other, but they don't have any real relatedness based on closely working together. Still they come together and stay together, not just for that meeting, and they *risk* working together: They risk cooperating, they risk playing, they risk designing. In the way we've been brought to think about this in our discipline, you wouldn't predict that because they haven't been with each other long enough to establish the psychological safety to build trust or mutual respect. So something happens in a much more rapid way that crosses a threshold that allows for

the opportunity to coordinate and collaborate. Of course, it is always possible that I cannot meet your expectations or I can anger you, but something got us to the point of even *trying* it. And it wasn't being told to do it because this is all coming from a self-organizing voluntaristic affect that is in the room.

So, in a way, it confounds expectations that we would form in human resources management and group development where we learn that relationships in groups can only grow slowly and that a group has to go through several stages before becoming a high-performing team?

Ron: Exactly! In large-group summits, *generative connections* quickly emerge through which people surface new ideas and demonstrate the energy and desire to collaborate to make those ideas reality in the future. And that gets us back to this point of anticipatory learning. I'm just trying to put those words together and not think about learning the way we normally think about it. At some point, some shared image crystallizes and that attracts people; it *pulls* or attracts something. It's not quite experiential in the group-dynamics sense of the word. It is experience but it's something contagious. It's a kind of process of a self-fulfilling prophecy of future forming (e.g., Gergen, 2015). Necessary conditions for this generative connection seem to be the shared experience of positive affect and the impression of a connection to the whole while intensively working together on a design task that calls for the combining of the strengths of every stakeholder in the room. I think it's very important, at least in AI processes, that people have begun connecting through sharing strength-based stories and finding commonality. I do think those are important ingredients. But it just happens so quickly! We need much more understanding of what it is exactly that happens in those relationships and makes them so generative.

We were in a discussion yesterday and the proposition was emerging that setting the goal

or even agreeing on a higher goal doesn't seem to be enough to deal with complex targets like sustainable growth and development. So the proposition was: "Maybe it's the willingness to engage in a learning and valuing process that is crucial." Rather than have another summit to try to get people agree on a higher target for a complex problem domain, reduced CO_2- emissions for example, let us get people to actually commit to a learning process, an appreciative *inquiry* process. Because we keep coming up short when it's about something like these targets; we either don't agree or we agree but we don't *implement* anything. Our meta-proposition was that, when you use the AI summit process to engage, design and launch initiatives, you will actually meet and exceed whatever goal you happen to set, as opposed to focusing on "Do we agree on the goals and are the goals big enough?"

Most Important Shifts in Thinking

You both described the birth of Appreciative Inquiry and its emerging contributions. What have been the most important shifts or innovations in your thinking?

Ron: There was a very interesting shift for me when a major critique came out in the Academy of Management Review by Barge and Oliver (2003). The basic argument of that critique was that the bias towards positivity blinds you to a part of reality, that is, the deficits, gaps, and problems, so how can it be an accurate portrayal of reality? I'm not apologizing for positivity *at all* but I do think that, for a lot of practitioners if they are not careful, positivity becomes an end in itself. If that is the case, we sort of end up with *appreciation* trumping *inquiry* as opposed to *appreciation being a kind of inquiry*. So, I think that was a growth, an evolution in my thinking. Usually you get into, let's debate positivity versus negativity and I think we were stuck there for a little while. At least I was.

The language that I am currently using is a shift a little bit away from positivity as being so central toward generativity. Since 1978, Ken Gergen has used the term "generative theory" in the context of inquiry and research (Gergen, 1978). As Dave said before in our conversation, generative theorizing is about developing knowledge that can help transform our social realities by challenging guiding assumptions and that what is taken for granted thereby providing new ideas or alternatives. But for us, it's also an action. It's not just a generation of new ideas of working, but it's also a "doing" of collective future forming through generative connections. So I like the generativity concept as another way to go further. I think this is about generative connections which show up as energized, collaborative, voluntaristic and self-organizing. And, as said earlier in our conversation, positivity is a necessary condition. We don't see any logic or theory that says that we are going to get that with people experiencing negative emotions. So it's a necessary condition but it also is an insufficient condition just to have positive affect. We think that the experience of the power of the whole is also an important condition but we need to inquire into that much more.

David: For me, the important issue is the call to create a generative human science and theory that opens the world to new possibilities. While deconstructing the dominant language of deficits and problems, the conclusion I came to was that *the field's deficit-based assumptions were holding back its generative capacity.* And what we were finding at the Cleveland Clinic was the more we study what gives life, the more we surface moments of courage and inspiration and hope. Instead of a search for positivity, I would call it: "What is it that gives life when human systems are most alive and we are at our best?" That *search itself* feeds the imagination in the mind that opens the conceptual floodgates.

Joseph Campbell looked at all civilizations and cultures and he said there's one thing that

moves civilization forward more than anything else, "awe is what moves us forward." Awe is what opens the mind, awe is what broadens and builds our capacities (Campbell, 1971). Like when Ron and I do these studies using AI interviews searching for tremendous innovations in business and society relationships for sustainability, we come up with a Dutch company, OAT Shoes, that has created complete cradle-to-cradle operations and shows us a 100% biodegradable sneaker, that after you're done with it, you can plant in the back yard and a tree grows out of it. Well, that creates a sense of surprise. It's that positive surprise of resources that we have that sparks the imagination. So, part of the strategy to develop more generative theory led to the conclusion that "it's not until we reawaken our sense of the special that we're going to open our minds to new possibilities." In positive psychology there is a tendency to talk about the positive as *if it is a thing*. But what we are talking about is that it is the *search* for the positive and the *discovery* into the positive that holds the greatest potential to open up the generative mind.

In his keynote address at the 2012 World Appreciative Inquiry Conference, Ken Gergen said that expressing negative emotions can have a positive impact on relationships, on the flow between people, because it can actually bring people together. What is the generativity in expressing negative emotions?

Ron: I do not disagree with Ken's statement. It is what Dave said, "positivity is not a thing."

David: Right! It's *the search* into the positive or maybe better a search into the life giving that is important and so the appreciative inquiry there would be on the times when negative emotions have had life-giving impact. For example, at the Cleveland Clinic there were many stories of explosive conflict. If I was just judging, "Oh, all I am doing is collecting positive or negative data," then I wouldn't have looked at that. But it was a different question. It wasn't positive or negative; it was "What gives life to this living system when it's most alive?" And all of a sudden

you discover the way they did their conflict was very life-giving. These physicians didn't do the conflict in the hallways, but butted heads face to face, which was what they had learned at medical school.

Ron: Which means that, when they walked away from that clashing of heads, they walked away with a constructive interpretation of the incident.

Negative emotions can be generative under certain conditions?

David: Yes, and exploring what might that be, what it looks like and what we learn from it is very interesting.

Ron: I think you can argue the opposite too. There are certain conditions under which one person's expression of positive emotion is actually not generative to another. For example, when there is suspicion in the sense of "I have heard that before." The first time I say, "Good job!", it can be a motivating and generative gesture. But if I do that constantly the generative potential will disappear because it becomes a sort of routine. It doesn't work because the surprise and the exploring are gone. So, the question is "How to sustain the exploring?" It is the exploration into what makes this so-called negative interchange generative that is life-giving or energy-giving. People who facilitate AI summits know very well that, particularly after the dream phase in the AI learning cycle, when self-steering groups are designing, there is a lot of tough talk going on. It's not just all "this is wonderful." There is a crescendo of an overall positive affect but in the groups some very hard things are getting said and differences are being confronted. And there should be, I mean, if it is working, there should be some very candid opinions and differences getting on the table, particularly when you get down to "how are we actually going to get from where we are toward these aspirations?" It's not just, "oh, it's obvious what we agree on, isn't that wonderful, let's just do it." It does not work at all like that.

Edgar Schein would argue that people should have the opportunity to struggle through discomfort and ambiguity—tough moments—to really learn or to become a mature high performing group. Are you saying that also is a part of the AI process?

Ron: That's a provocative question. We adapted a lot of Marvin Weisbord's way of creating instructions for conversations which he used as part of his Future Search methodology (Weisbord, 1992). If you look at the early participant workbooks for AI summits you will see a lot of similarity. There is one particular difference. Weisbord uses a little diagram indicating that you must go into the "valley of despair" before you can climb to the mountain tops; a somewhat similar concept there to what you're quoting from Schein. I think that's a point of debate or contention. For me, it does not appear that that is a necessary step in all instances. I think it gets back to the building of rapid trust which probably wouldn't be possible if we always have to struggle through moments of despair and discomfort first. I don't know if you agree on that or not, Dave.

David: I agree but it's more than that. I think it's an assumption that's been smuggled in from every corner; that we first have to go into the depths of despair. It's a basic assumption in a lot of psychoanalytical work and in T-groups and sensitivity training. It is an assumption in the heart of most change models. According to John Kotter's famous books *Leading Change* (Kotter, 1996) and *The Heart of Change* (Kotter & Cohen, 2002), you have to whip up the dissatisfaction and sometimes, he says, managers even need to *invent* the dissatisfaction and sense of urgency and even get surveys that make up the data to show how bad our customers feel. And again, quite frankly, it's a theory of change, but I think we have gotten to the point that we see that it leads only to incremental change because it's not based on *inquiry and learning*. The assumption base behind the idea of pointing to this big problem to pump up the energy assumes that we know the

ideal. You can't say there is a problem unless you have an underlying assumption that there is some ideal. So what happens is we stay locked in the universe of knowledge. No wonder every organization development diagnosis comes up with the same things: People aren't getting the right communications, they don't feel heard, etcetera. Because in that problem- and dissatisfaction-based model we are assuming we know the ideal. Otherwise you couldn't say there is a problem. And so what's happening is: We are not doing inquiry if by inquiry we mean the experience of the unknown, the experience of mystery and "not knowing" that changes our lives (see also Lambrechts, Bouwen, Grieten, Huybrechts, & Schein, 2011). AI really is an inquiry-based kind of change. Just like we overestimated the role of the negative and dissatisfaction as a factor in change, we've underestimated the role of the life-giving and the positive in change. One piece of evidence of that is we have no theory of positive change. Not one. And yet positive change is happening all the time. Look at all the stories and cases all over the world.

Ron: I don't know how Ed's thinking has evolved, but his elaboration on Lewin's unfreezing-change-refreezing model (e.g., Schein, 1996), which has been the genetic code of organization development, said there are two main ways to unfreeze: One is disconfirmation and the other is guilt induction. Those are the two leverage points you have for unfreezing. And you must unfreeze before the actual change (through positive or negative identification) can take place. Now, Ed Schein's study base for that article was American prisoners of war who had gone through a communist Chinese indoctrination program (Schein, 1961). He studied brainwashing to learn about change and used the brainwashing mechanism as the metaphor and basis for his change theory.

David: And those theories of change are part of our common culture. If a child comes home from school and has an A-A-A-C and an F, where does 80% of our change agent theory, as parents, go? It's to the F because we think that's where the greatest amount of change is going to happen. And our media is set up that way, too. In our newspapers there are 80 articles about violence and corruption for every 20 on excellence. It's an imbalance that takes our strengths for granted. One aim of positive-change theory and strength-based management is to reverse that 80/20 rule and to remind us that excellence is not created by fixing problems but by amplifying strengths. Strengths do not take care of themselves. We should nurture them.

Envisioning The Future of Management Inquiry

Let's imagine the field of management inquiry 15 to 20 years from now and it embodies all that you strive for with AI. How would that field look like? What do you envision as important shifts?

David: I can think of one big shift. If I ask managers today what is the opposite of micro-management, they don't have a response; we don't have a term. I think we are moving towards a macro-management discipline. Peter Drucker talked about it as one of the sole differentiating factors of a CEO: Bringing in the meaningful outside differentiates the CEO's work from everybody else's work. I think that's going to be an important task for everybody now, in other words, to develop the capacity to scan the world for that best new idea.

Unfolding from the metaphor that we live in a universe of strengths as managers, we've developed a "three-circle" framework that describes three phases of creating the positive strengths revolution in management and organization development (Cooperrider, 2012; Cooperrider & Godwin, 2011): elevation, alignment and magnification, and refraction of strengths. My ideal image of the future would be a management and organization field that is all about elevating, aligning, magnifying and refracting strengths to design and create sustainable

value.

The first circle points to all the concepts, tools, resources, and applications that support the *elevation* of inquiry into strengths and the *extension* of relationships. The focus is mainly on the individual and small group level. The theory base includes the great burst of research in positive psychology, positive organizational scholarship and MIT brain research. The tools include, for example, the Best-Self Analysis, the Values-in-Action Inventory of Strengths, the StrengthsFinder Survey, or the Resonant Leadership exercises. Business applications are talent management, training, career coaching and so on.

The second circle goes beyond elevating individual or isolated strengths and refers to all the concepts, tools and applications that foster combinations, magnifications and chemistries of strengths, enabling us to do large group summits as easily as we did a team-building session years ago. I mean some day it is going to be common experience to be able to assemble a 500-person multi-stakeholder group. We had a big trucking company, Roadway Express, that showed us that. The managers did 65 500-person AI summits in a year and a half to quickly redesign dock layouts and so on. Grievances went down from 300 to zero, stock prices rose in 2 years from $14 to $41 per share, a new high-engagement leadership culture emerged, product innovations went up and powerful partnerships were established with companies like Boeing and others. The theory base of this second phase includes social constructionism and AI literature that addresses, for example, the reality-creating power of narratives, stories, symbols, and rituals. A second inspiration has been Peter Drucker's work on *The Effective Executive* (Drucker, 1966). In a conversation I had with Peter Drucker in 2003 on AI, he stated that "the task of great leadership is to create an alignment of strengths in ways that make a system's weaknesses irrelevant" (Cooperrider, 2012, p. 108). In other words, it is the alignment and magnification of

strengths, the working in configurations of the whole, that makes strengths matter. The management tools include, for example, the large-group method of the AI Summit and business applications are among others change management, mergers, new business model or strategy development, and collaborative design (see also Cooperrider & Godwin, 2011).

Finally, we have the third circle, the refraction of strengths, and that involves more than elevating and aligning strengths into new powerful constellations. I think this represents the new North Star for management. If management is going to be a profession as Peter Drucker called for, it needs not only a knowledge base. It should also have some overarching ideal, like in law where it is justice. But what is this overarching ideal in management? I think it's emerging as *sustainable value*. It's all of the tremendous innovation that is happening about bringing in environmental and social impact concerns to drive business innovation and management innovation. So I think this third circle is all about the discovery, design and leadership of *positive institutions*: Institutions that magnify and bring our highest human strengths to society, to the world. For example, a factory that's being designed to give back more energy to the world than it uses, like the SC Johnson factory in Wisconsin, is a step towards becoming a more positive institution. It's magnifying our human strengths of creativity. That might become a framework for a curriculum: Leadership all about offering these kinds of spin-offs that could happen. But at the heart of that a kind of appreciative intelligence is required, a capacity to see these strengths and connect and bring them together.

Our universities and business schools have an important role to play here. They can create strong learning environments in which students can develop an appreciative eye through experiential exercises and AI theory and applications. *But our universities and business schools themselves need to become much more positive institutions.* Why? Over a million students a year

are coming out of our business schools, undergraduate and graduate, and they are making the billions of decisions every day that add up to where our world is heading. I think organization development is going to reshape itself where it becomes a go-to discipline for innovation. Right now that's not the case: It is a go-to place for intervention, not for innovation. Where do companies go for innovation, not only technological innovation but breakthrough organizational innovation? They go to the design firms, like IDEO. So I think that an important part of management education will center on our third "D" in the AI cycle, the designing of ideal future images, where we think and act more like designers, architects, or other creators, and not just like reactive solvers.

Ron: The third circle Dave was describing would mean that the dominant unit of analysis in research and in literature would be *the organization or system*. And I don't mean to objectify that but it wouldn't be the individual and it would no longer be just the group. It would be the multiplicity of groups or the community.

You've been talking about your ideal image of the future. But what is necessary to make the transition from where we are now to that future image?

David: When Ron and I do these large-group AI summits, like when we did it with Kofi Anan and the 500 business leaders developing the UN Global Compact or when, more recently, we worked with 700 business and civil-society leaders with Cleveland's Mayor Jackson to start working to build a Green City on a Blue Lake, what we developed is that, by the second day, people move into design studios where we have, like in a group of 700 people, 21 design studios. Think of a design studio almost like what you would see in a design firm, like IDEO, where people are doing some powerful brainstorming and rapid prototyping and building the artifacts of the future, building the designs, taking concepts out of words and building them in creative

terms. With this loud call for creativity and innovation, I see business schools of the future as a powerful mix of managing as a liberal art and creating and innovating so that management schools look like *design studios*. That is, where you go into a building and see hot design studios everywhere. They are working on real-life things. You see hot teams, you see the artifacts and you see visual representation, you see the use of models and architectural computation where you can see things in three dimensions and expand our way of thinking. So I see a combination of management inquiry as a liberal art and a design studio in the future.

I think we would increase our relevance exponentially. I mean that is what happens when we set up our new generation summits as design studios: "This group is going to start designing the prototype for our offshore wind energy system, this group is going to design the prototype of the plug-in vehicle electric charging stations for the city, this group is going to start prototyping…" What happens is that people are *really* building something, almost like potters who have clay in their hands. They think differently, there is an embodied kind of thinking. Maybe it's a little bit of getting back to experiential learning theory. When we send teams of students into the field to do AI with clients and they start designing, that's when the learning comes alive.

Your attention has been shifting from the classic constructionist AI principal "words create worlds" to jointly designing creates worlds?

David: Indeed, it is in the constructing, the building of something together, that learning comes to life. I think this is a real important observation that we have had. If part of our underlying question all throughout our careers is "when is it that the best of human systems comes out?" I think we learned that *appreciation* is powerful in that regard. We learned that organizations are centers of relationships and relationships come alive where people see the true, the good, and the

better in each other when they have an appreciative eye. We started learning how *inquiry* is powerful. If we do a low morale survey, it's going to have one impact and, if we do a study into moments of high engagement and commitment, that will have a different impact. We started learning that *wholeness* brings out the best in human systems: just having one customer in the room brings out the higher capabilities. And what is most exciting right now is that we're learning that going beyond dialogue into designing the actual rapid prototypes and artifacts makes the learning process come alive. We typically think that designers are designing products but *we design everything*. We design human interactions, we design lobbies and healthcare organizations to appeal to a patient's sense of healing. And so, with that design attitude and experience, what we are finding is that the best in human systems comes not just in talk. We have so many meetings of talk and people aren't satisfied anymore. But it's when they take part and they see the new assembly line that we've designed, then 50 years of labor-management conflicts start going away because we can *see* what we have created together. So I am intrigued with our observation that it's in the design phase of AI that the very best in human beings comes out because somehow "we trust it now, it's real." It's not just checking off "you brought us together to get our *input*" on a bureaucratic checklist.

So instead of just having conversations with the multiple stakeholders, you have them in the room co-designing or co-constructing the possibilities?

David: Exactly, inquiring and learning together. Fairmount Minerals, one of the largest producers of industrial sand in the US, is an example. In 2005 over 350 people, including multiple stakeholders, gathered for a three-day AI strategic planning summit focused on game-changing innovations for sustainability. This led, among other things, to the discovery of new markets, prototyping of new products, and the design of renewable energy facilities. A couple of

years after they started using AI and sustainability work together, they became the number one corporate citizen in America. But from the start they invited in the protest groups to the table; not just for input, not just for involvement but to *co-design the strategies* of the firm. It was in that co-creation that adversarial relations became co-creative relations that are now simply invaluable.

Biggest Challenge: Grounded and Generative Theory Building from Immersion in The Field

What do you see as the biggest challenge for future organization development and change research in the management research community?

Ron: I think there is a real challenge in terms of the *loss of action research*. There are fewer and fewer outlets to publish for young academics. I just finished a five-year cycle on the executive board of the Organization Development and Change Division at the Academy of Management. Dave has lead on that board, as well. We went three straight years without giving a paper award for action research because there were just no papers that really were action research. We had Hilary Bradbury and Peter Reason in support to assess the papers and they also said the papers nominated didn't fit any of the definitions of action research. So I think we are facing a critical point that the idea of *knowledge building from a true cooperative inquiry stance* in the field is eroding in academia.

David: There is a danger of this trajectory towards more ivory-tower scholarship meaning that it's distant, specialized and removed from the world. That obviously hurts the teaching because then you have professors who can't talk from any kind of story base in terms of their engagement in the world. But look at the best scholars in our field that have made the biggest impact. They were grounded, generative and positive theorists. Let me give you a few examples. C.K.

Prahalad's work was all based on a grounded approach to new strategy theory. Peter Drucker's work – he was the most influential management thinker of all time – was all clinical and engaged. His first book, *The Concept of the Corporation*, was an anthropological emersion into General Motors and being a consultant with GM throughout that process. Clayton Christensen's work is all about the storytelling around innovation. It's about immersion and then building theory from that grounded data. I would say the greatest thinkers in the field have three characteristics: they are grounded and engaged scholars; they are very much generative theoretical contributors to new language and new concepts; and they are very much in the organizational scholarship domain of lifting up new positive possibilities.

Epilogue

On the basis of their learning experiences as practicing scholars, Cooperrider and Fry illustrate above how AI has been contributing to a generative scholarship and what routes may lie ahead. The main purpose of this epilogue is to deepen the conversation's contributions to current debates around generative scholarship, and offer ideas to elevate the generative potential of AI and our management and organization field.

We would like to start with the "discovery moment of AI" that points to the transformational power of reframing the question away from problem/deficit seeking toward what may be "life giving" and generative in social-organizational contexts. This moment is particularly insightful because it illustrates, in a powerful way, what Cooperrider in the conversation calls "the exponential inquiry effect" or the "Gergen-Heisenberg principle" (see also Cooperrider, 2013): "the questions we ask determine what we find, and what we find escalates in our language, in our dialogue, in our conceptualizations and very much takes part in the social construction of reality." The experience also shows that this "snowball", reality-

producing effect of the (very first) questions we ask is not only limited to the original inquiry context but "spreads" to other social contexts as well: Questions and words *continue to do their work* and help to create the world we later "discover." If we take the exponential inquiry effect seriously in our scholarly efforts, it matters greatly which topics we study, which questions we ask, which concepts we develop, which theories we build, and which overarching ideal we pursue in our management and organization field.

The concept of the exponential inquiry effect, which is at the *epistemological core* of AI thinking and doing, also sheds light on both Cooperrider's and Fry's resolve and call to develop a new language/theory of non-deficit based, life-centric or strength-based change. Their search for more *prospective* concepts (Shotter, 2011, p. 254) that not only grasp the essence of AI but also point towards "future possibilities rather than past facts … bring[ing] previously unnoticed aspects of our activities imaginatively to light," signals a clear return to the original ambition of AI (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) to develop generative theories (Gergen, 1978).

Indeed, the "exponential inquiry effect" itself can be conceived as such a prospective concept. Although on different levels, "co-elevation", "pro-fusion", "generativity", and "future forming learning" can also be considered as examples of prospective concepts from the conversation. As such, they might contribute to a new kind of theory. Cooperrider is now writing about what he is calling *proleptic* theory building where the word proleptic literally means "speaking the future into existence" (proleptic; from the Greek prólēpsis: anticipation, preconception, flash forward) (David Cooperrider, personal communication, 2015).

In the conversation, Fry describes how an important shift in his thinking was provoked by a critique developed by Barge and Oliver (2003). Indeed, several thoughtful critiques on AI have been formulated over the years (e.g., Barge & Oliver, 2003; Grant & Humphries, 2006;

Fitzgerald et al., 2010) that center on variants of what (to do) with the so called "negative" (e.g., Bushe, 2010, 2012a), calling for a *broader scope of appreciation* and *greater reflexivity* in AI practice. Instead of adopting a defensive stance trying to disprove and counter these critiques (see for an excellent review: Bushe, 2012a), AI scholars have largely been embracing them as possibilities to further develop their own thinking and acting, hereby demonstrating an important facet of generative scholarship.

A common critique (e.g., Barge & Oliver, 2003; Fitzgerald et al., 2010) is that AI's focus on "positive", high-point stories of organizational life might "invalidate the negative organizational experiences of participants and repress potentially important and meaningful conversations that need to take place" (Bushe, 2012a, p. 15). As is theorized by Fitzgerald et al. (2010), AI is able to remove "shadow" (defined as censored emotional and/or cognitive content) from the life-giving forces, but may simultaneously cast its own "shadow" on other, potentially important aspects of organizational life. Moreover, Barge and Oliver (2003, p. 130) argue that the meaning of appreciation should not be limited to praising moments of excellence, but "requires connecting with what others value in the moment," in a context-sensitive and reflective way, recognizing that "differing forms of talk and emotion can be life generating." This might mean exploring, in a life-enhancing way, vulnerabilities, fragilities, distresses, fears, criticisms, and what, from a critical theory point of view, might be labeled as "power systems" (e.g., Grant & Humphries, 2006). In appreciating these critiques, AI scholars have initiated an ongoing *search* into "how to inquire into the *full spectrum* of organizational life generatively so that the transformational potential of AI is advanced" (see for an excellent overview: Cooperrider et al., 2013). For example, an important shift in practice is particularly exemplified in the discovery phase where the inquiry into "best of past" stories starts to focus more on the strengths and

generative practices actors have been engaging in, also while dealing with the biggest challenges or hurdles along the way. However, as is also evident from the conversation, *finding a non-polarizing language to talk about AI remains a challenge* (Bushe, 2012a).

There is no doubt about AI's enormous impact on persons, groups, organizations, and multi-stakeholder collaboration in a variety of interactive contexts worldwide. However, "in the rush to take the power of AI into the applied world of practice," generative theory building efforts have been overshadowed (Cooperrider, 2013, p. 5; Bushe, 2012b; Zandee, 2013, 2014). What possibilities are on the horizon to strengthen these efforts? Given the fading away of action research as knowledge building from a *true cooperative inquiry stance* in academia (see also Lambrechts et al., 2011; Schein, 2015), we invite more scholars to build generative theories *from within* the practices they participate (e.g., Shotter, 2011). Applied to AI scholarship, we join authors such as Fitzgerald et al. (2010, p. 225) who invite us to "engage in our collective AI conversations and practices [more] reflectively." The AI scholar is typically a practicing scholar (a "seriously endangered species" according to Bushe, 2010, p. 236) who has the great opportunity to develop generative theory from his/her immersion into AI-driven change processes as an active and reflective participant (e.g., in a facilitator role). How to do this?

In the conversation, Cooperrider re-emphasizes a core point from the 1987 article (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987): In order to develop more generative theories, we need to reawaken our sense of awe, surprise and wonder about what gives life ("the appreciative eye") because this sparks the imagination and opens our minds to new possibilities that might transform the status quo (see also Zandee, 2013, 2014; Shotter, 2008). This also implies that we allow ourselves to be struck by the inherent polyphony or multi-voicedness of organizational life

(e.g., Shotter, 2008) and the multiple interpretations that can be made depending on "who's doing the talking."

To infuse this sensitivity still more in AI scholarship and in scholarship in general, scholars might find it useful to set up "reflective relational practices" (Hibbert, Sillince, Diefenbach, & Cunliffe, 2014). Researchers then appreciatively engage with *other* voices, perspectives, assumptions, theories, critiques … and, at the same time, build new *connections*, allowing them to generate richer theoretical accounts that are tied to particular contexts (Hibbert et al., 2014). AI scholars could, for example, explore and deepen meaningful process events, topics, questions, and personal assumptions within representative groups of the "whole system-in-change" (multiple voices and perspectives), or within multi-disciplinary/-voiced teams of researchers (Zandee, 2013, 2014). These (or other variants of) reflective relational practices might be part of in-depth, context-sensitive, and longitudinal studies on AI, given the need thereof (Bushe, 2012b). In the conversation, Cooperrider and Fry raised several interesting topics that can guide future research endeavors, for example, the formation of generative connections and rapid trust on a system-level. While AI summits are fruitful research contexts, it would be worthwhile to broaden the research scope to other but related multi-stakeholder approaches and contexts for purposes of cross-pollination. Particularly interesting examples of such dynamic, inclusive learning spaces are "collaboratories" (Muff, 2014) and "multi-party collaboration" projects (Bouwen & Taillieu, 2004) where multiple stakeholders are thrown back on each other in order to define and co-create new solutions for pressing complex societal and sustainability issues. Initiating a *search* for what gives life to a variety of multi-stakeholder collaboration contexts would allow for a richer understanding of their enabling practices and conditions (e.g., Carlsen & Dutton, 2011).

We agree with Zandee (2014) that scholars who want to have a generative impact, write differently, i.e., more evocatively, relationally, and prospectively. It is their task to "turn passing events, unique events which exist only in the moment of their own occurrence, into 'moving' accounts of events, into dramatic or poetic scenes, or scenic events, which can exist in their inscriptions, and which, on being read, or in being experienced in some other manner, can 'move' readers in a way similar to how people were moved by the original events" (Shotter, 2011, p. 258).

References

Barge, J. K., & Oliver, C. (2003). Working with appreciation in managerial practice. *Academy of Management Review, 28,* 124 - 142.

Barrett, F. J., & Fry, R. E. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive approach to building cooperative capacity*. Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute Publications.

Bouwen, R., & Taillieu, T. (2004). Multi-party collaboration as social learning for interdependence: Developing relational knowing for sustainable natural resource management. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 14*, 137 - 153.

Buckingham, M. (2006). *Go put your strengths to work.* New York: Free Press.

Bushe, G. R. (2007). Appreciative Inquiry is not (just) about the positive. *Organization Development Practitioner, 39,* 30 - 35.

Bushe, G. R. (2010). Commentary on "Appreciative inquiry as a shadow process." *Journal of Management Inquiry, 9,* 234 - 237.

Bushe, G. R. (2012a). Foundations of appreciative inquiry: History, criticism and potential. *AI Practitioner, 14(1),* 8 - 20.

Bushe, G. R. (2012b). Appreciative inquiry: Theory and critique. In D. Boje, B. Burnes, & J. Hassard (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to organizational change* (pp. 87-103). Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Bushe, G. R. (2013). Generative process, generative outcome: The transformational potential of appreciative inquiry. In D. L. Cooperrider, D. P. Zandee, L. N. Godwin, M. Avital, & B. Boland (Eds.), *Organizational generativity: The appreciative inquiry summit and a scholarship of transformation* (pp. 89-113). Bingley, England: Emerald.

Bushe, G. R., & Kassam, A. F. (2005). When is appreciative inquiry transformational? A metacase analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41,* 161 - 181.

Bushe, G. R., & Paranjpey, N. (2015). Comparing the generativity of problem solving and appreciative inquiry: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 51,* 309-335.

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). Foundations of positive organizational scholarship. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 3-13). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Campbell, J. (1971). *The portable Jung.* New York: Viking Press, Inc.

Carlsen, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2011). *Research alive: Exploring generative moments in doing qualitative research.* Copenhagen, Denmark: Copenhagen Business School Press.

Cooperrider, D. L. (1986). *Appreciative Inquiry: Toward a methodology for understanding and enhancing organizational innovation*. Ph.D. dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH. For a copy go to: http://www.davidcooperrider.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Dissertation-Cooperriders-1985.pdf

Cooperrider, D. L. (1990). Positive image, positive action: The affirmative basis of organizing. In S. Srivastva, D. L. Cooperrider, & Associates (Eds.), *Appreciative management and leadership: The power of positive thought and action in organizations* (pp. 91-125). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cooperrider, D. L. (2012). The concentration effect of strengths. *Organizational Dynamics, 41(2),* 106 - 117.

Cooperrider, D. L. (2013). A contemporary commentary on appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In D. L. Cooperrider, D. P. Zandee, L. N. Godwin, M. Avital, & B.

Boland (Eds.), *Organizational generativity: The appreciative inquiry summit and a scholarship of* transformation (pp. 3-67). Bingley, England: Emerald.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Godwin, L. (2011). Positive organization development: Innovation-inspired change in an economy and ecology of strengths. In K. Cameron, & G. Spreitzer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 737-750). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. Pasmore, & R. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (pp. 129-169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (1999). *Appreciative inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cooperrider, D. L., Zandee, D. P., Godwin, L. N., Avital, M., & Boland, B. (2013). *Organizational generativity: The appreciative inquiry summit and a scholarship of transformation.* Bingley, England: Emerald.

Drucker, P. F. (1966). *The effective executive*. New York: Harper Business.

Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. (2003). The power of high quality connections at work. In K. Cameron, J. Dutton, & R. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 263-278). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Fitzgerald, S. P., Oliver, C., & Hoxsey, J. C. (2010). Appreciative inquiry as a shadow process. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 19,* 220-233.

Fry, R. (2014). Appreciative Inquiry. In D. Coghlan, & Brydon-Miller, M. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 44-48). London: Sage.

Fry, R., Barrett, F., Seiling, J., & Whitney, D. (2002). *Appreciative inquiry and organizational*

transformation: Reports from the field. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Gergen, K. J. (1978). Toward generative theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36,* 1344 - 1360.

Gergen, K. J. (1982). *Toward transformation in social knowledge*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gergen, K. J. (2015). From mirroring to world-making: Research as future forming. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 45,* 287 - 310.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine Publishing Company.

Grant, S., & Humphries, M. (2006). Critical evaluation of appreciative inquiry: Bridging an apparent paradox. *Action Research, 4,* 401 - 418.

Hibbert, P., Sillince, J., Diefenbach, T., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2014). Relationally reflexive practice. A generative approach to theory development in qualitative research. *Organizational Research Methods, 17,* 278 - 298.

Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Kotter, J., & Cohen, D. (2002). *The heart of change.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Lambrechts, F., Bouwen, R., Grieten, S., Huybrechts, J., & Schein, E.H. (2011). Learning to help through humble inquiry and implications for management research, practice, and education: An interview with Edgar H. Schein. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10,* 131 - 147.

Meyerson, D., Weick, K. E., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Swift trust and temporary groups. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 166-195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milhauser, K. L. (2011). *Distributed team collaboration in organizations: Emerging tools and practices*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Muff, K. (2014). *The collaboratory. A co-creative stakeholder engagement process for solving complex problems*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.

Quinn, R. E. (2000). *Change the world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1961). The mechanisms of change. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), *The planning of change* (pp. 98-107). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systemic Practice and Action Research, 9(1),* 27 - 47.

Schein, E. H. (2015). Organizational psychology then and now: Some observations. *Annual Review of Organizational and Organizational Behavior, 2,* 1 - 19.

Shotter, J. (2008). Dialogism and polyphony in organizing theorizing in organization studies: Action guiding anticipations and the continuous creation of novelty. *Organization Studies, 29,* 501 - 524.

Shotter, J. (2011). Knowledge in transition: The role of prospective, descriptive concepts in a practice-situated, hermeneutical-phronetic social science. *Management Learning, 43,* 245 - 260.

Srivastva, S., & Cooperrider, D. L. (1986). The emergence of the egalitarian organization. *Human Relations, 39,* 683 - 724.

Verleysen, B., Lambrechts, F., & Van Acker, F. (2015). Building psychological capital with appreciative inquiry: Investigating the mediating role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 51,* 10 - 35.

Weisbord, M. (1992). *Discovering common ground*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Zandee, D. P. (2013). The process of generative inquiry. In D. L. Cooperrider, D. P. Zandee, L. N. Godwin, M. Avital, & B. Boland (Eds.), *Organizational generativity: The appreciative inquiry summit and a scholarship of* transformation (pp. 69-88). Bingley, England: Emerald.

Zandee, D. P. (2014). Appreciative inquiry and research methodology. In D. Coghlan, & Brydon-Miller, M. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 48-51). London: Sage.