

CHAPTER ONE

AN INVITATION TO CHANGE

IN THIS CHAPTER

- Change attempts often fail because of the assumptions we make.
- We often find ourselves in situations that require us to adapt but choose to distort reality and deny what the world is telling us.
- To be excellent, we have to be at the edge, a place of uncertainty and learning.
- When we are committed to a higher purpose, we move forward through the fear of conflict, and as we do, we learn and we see in new ways.

I recently received a phone call from an information technology executive whose team had spent months designing a technical change that was about to be launched across the corporation. Other senior people had consistently advised him to talk to someone who “understands change in terms of people and culture” before rolling out the change. So he asked me to come in and speak to his team about how to implement the change process. He also mentioned that his people were not very interested in hearing about the role of culture in their change effort and could see little value in such a visit.

This executive was a very educated and experienced man. Yet he was about to launch a companywide change without having considered the role of culture in the change process. Such ignorance is unimaginable—it’s the equivalent of learning that your brain surgeon is ignorant of the organ known as the heart. Yet such ignorance is also very widespread; it often seems as though ignorance about the

importance of organizational culture is an epidemic. I hold the radical belief that many people do not know how to lead change, including people who think they already have.

Think About It

- Why did this executive spend months planning a change without considering his company's culture? Where was he focusing his attention?

- Have you ever been involved in leading an organizational change effort? What was the primary focus—on the mechanical processes or the needs for human learning involved in the change? What was the result? Looking back, what do you think you should have done differently?

- How might you plan a change effort to take culture into account? What would you do to be credible when you asked others to change their behavior?

THE WESTERN WAY

Jeff Liker is perhaps the world's leading outside expert on how work is done at Toyota. When I spoke with him not long ago, he explained that, despite the glitches that came to light in 2010, Toyota had been so successful that thousands of companies have attempted to implement the Toyota concept of lean manufacturing. *Lean* is a philosophy of excellence that puts a heavy emphasis on

the customer and the value chain. Implementing this concept, managers work to eliminate waste through a process of continuous improvement.

But Jeff pointed out that only 2 percent of companies that have implemented lean have achieved the anticipated results, and many of those ultimately experienced disappointment. These failures represent billions of dollars in lost value.

Why have the results been so miserable? At Toyota they understand something about change that few Western companies understand. Western companies operate with a checklist mentality. An expert comes up with the “correct” way to do something, builds a plan, trains the people, and audits the change progress. The great thing about this approach is that it is fast and efficient. The bad thing is that it seldom works. Worse, we often fail to see that it does not work.

THE CHECKLIST MENTALITY

As Jeff was talking, I recalled a quality evaluation program called Q1 that Ford introduced in the 1980s to stimulate deep change. To obtain the Q1 award, a plant had to pass an examination given by a group of hard-nosed outside evaluators. Leaders from successful plants were often invited to share their strategies with other groups.

At the time, my colleagues and I at the University of Michigan were running a professional development program for three thousand middle managers at Ford. Sometimes, we invited Q1 award winners to give presentations.

These presenters would usually recount the plant’s general history, describe their results from the Q1 effort, and explain what had been done to obtain the results. The discussion would then turn to the issue of greatest interest for the audience: How could another plant achieve similar results?

At this point, the presenter would usually talk about things like the need for “everyone” to learn. He or she might talk of equality, participation, risk-taking, continual experiments, authentic communication, mutual learning, the transformation of assumptions, and the joint implementation of new ideas. (The presenter was actually talking about the subject of this book: leading deep change.) These discussions made the managers uneasy. After a few minutes, someone would invariably say, “Give me specifics. What do I need to do and when?”

I asked one presenter about this pattern. He explained, “They just don’t understand. They want a checklist, but this is not about checklists. This is about figuring out where you are and where you need to go and then launching an effort to get there. It’s about learning together. The key to becoming a Q1 plant is finding the unique strategy for your plant. Once you find it, you have to start looking for the next one, the one that will be right for tomorrow. There are no recipes.” Few people want to hear that last sentence. It suggests that we need to do a kind of work that no one wants to do: the work of deep change.

Thirty years later, we are having the same conversations. The reason why today’s executives look at Toyota’s success, invest heavily in change, and then fail miserably is because successful implementation of a successful model is not about copying some existing technology. Rather, it is about changing culture, which means changing the way people have thought and acted for years. It is about learning how to learn together and create excellence in real time.

Leading deep change is never easy. But *why* is it so hard to understand and lead deep change?

Think About It

- Have you ever been part of a change effort in which your organization tried to import processes that others had used successfully? What were the results? What were some of the reasons for those results? Why might something that worked in one organization not work in another?

- When you look to examples of success to guide your own actions, do you prefer examples that provide concrete steps, tell you what to do and when to do it? What if an example did not provide concrete how-to steps? Could you use it? How?

CHALLENGE YOUR NORMAL ASSUMPTIONS

The process of leading deep change violates the assumptions that normally guide our interactions with others. Thus, simply telling people about that process will not show them why it works—the explanation just bounces off of their strongly held normal assumptions. Deep change begins with a state of mind. When I teach deep change, I no longer try to explain. Instead, I put people through experiences that cause them to challenge their own assumptions.

For example, I sometimes use a simple role-play to show that resistance to the ideas of deep change is not limited to corporate managers. Two volunteers play spouses who have just returned from their honeymoon. After breakfast, the “wife” leans back and lights up a cigarette. The “husband” is concerned about her smoking but has never raised the issue. He decides that he can no longer suppress his concern. I ask him to begin a conversation with his beloved. The objective is to get her to quit smoking.

The dynamics are predictable. The husband tells the wife that her smoking is a problem. She grows defensive and angry. He points out the scientific link between smoking and cancer. She rebuffs this argument. Then he suggests that their marriage may not survive if she continues to smoke. She usually agrees that the marriage might not survive. The intervention fails. This pattern is repeated nearly every time the simulation is run.

Think About It

- What happened during that role-play? Why does this kind of intervention nearly always fail?

- When was the last time you tried to get someone else to change, at work or in your personal life? Was the intervention successful? Why or why not?

- Think about a time when someone wanted you to make a change. How did the person talk to you about it? If he or she used rational arguments, how did that make you feel? Did those arguments convince you to change? Why or why not?

- If someone wanted you to make a change, how would you suggest they go about it? What kinds of things could they do or say to convince you to change?

That role-play is an example of a very common kind of interaction. One person defines the other as having a problem, thus taking on a higher role in an assumed hierarchical system. Person 1 communicates the problem and Person 2 resists. Person 1 now defines the other person (or people) *as* the problem, transforming him or her (or them) into an object that needs fixing. Person 1 takes the expert role and provides a rational argument for why Person 2 must change. He or she continues to resist. The first person shifts to intimidation. Person 2 becomes more defensive and, sometimes, more assertive. Person 1 might then turn to coercion. Like a criminal with a gun, he or she may get the desired behavior change, but change made this way is unlikely to last, and coercion fatally wounds relationships over the long term.

The attempt to “engineer” other people’s behavior is one of the primary reasons why so many organizational change efforts fail. Most failed CEOs lose their jobs because they cannot get their employees to change in such a way as to deliver increased performance. Despite their enormous authority, their careful plans and strategies, they are unable to lead people through the process of change. They are trapped in our normal assumptions of hierarchy, control, linearity, expertise, achievement, and recognition.

COLLECTIVE LEARNING

When Jeff Liker talks about Toyota, he explains something he calls a *collective learning process* in which two or more people learn in real time as they move forward together. In this process, everyone learns from everyone else. The notion of authority fades into the background.

One of his favorite examples is the story of a manufacturing firm that hired a Toyota expert as a consultant to improve its processes.

After touring the manufacturing site, the consultant said, “You have three shifts with a total of 140 employees. I suggest that we reduce to two shifts with a total of ten people while maintaining the current level of productivity.”

Naturally, the managers’ first question was, “How?”

Please carefully note the consultant’s answer: “I do not know.”

A normal consultant would have given an answer even if he had to make it up. Consultants have a profound need to look like experts, a trait they share with the rest of us. We are afraid of what will happen if others find out we do not know all the answers.

The consultant added, “We will have to learn our way to our goal. I would like you to concentrate your efforts on eliminating the inventory backlog. In a few weeks, I will come back and see what you have learned.”

The people in the manufacturing firm worked hard to eliminate the backlog. They met often, tried experiments, and listened to each other. In the process they learned to interact as equals. They generated a number of innovations and were excited to share them when the consultant returned. The consultant reinforced their efforts and then turned their attention to another part of the process. This pattern continued for two years. At the end of two years, the firm was down to two shifts and had reduced the workforce from 140 to 15.

This is a rather dramatic outcome. As they looked back on what happened, it was clear that they had a vision and they pursued it as a team in the process of collective learning. It had to be more than a linear process articulated ahead of time by an expert who then measured and controlled what happened. It had to include a change process based on adaptation. They tried things, worked together to evaluate the results, and then made adjustments and tried again. As they communicated with one another, their assumptions changed. Together, they learned

the way to their goal: they built the bridge as they walked on it. It was a process of deep change.

Think About It

- Why are people often uncomfortable with a change process that involves setting a goal and deciding over time how to accomplish it, instead of following a checklist?

- Control over the collective learning process comes from trust. Have you ever been a part of an organization that was full of trust? How did that high level of trust change the way people interacted with each other?

- What are some things that people in organizations can do to increase trust so they can engage in a collective learning process?

TWO KINDS OF CHANGE: INCREMENTAL CHANGE AND DEEP CHANGE

Most of the changes we experience and lead can be classified as incremental changes. *Incremental change* is change based on past experiences. Our experiences become a series of assumptions that we make about cause and effect. We see change as a mechanical process, one that we can control. We think we know what adjustments must be made for the desired result to occur. Because we assume we

are in control, we act upon others, directing them with a clear expectation of what the outcome will look like.

Deep change is a fundamentally different process because it requires people to develop new expectations. As people experience deep change, they move from their old assumptions to a new set of assumptions. They start to see, feel, and think differently. Soon, they behave differently. To get a child to put her bike away, for example, we can drag her outside and demand that she do it. This does not guarantee that the bike will be in the right place tomorrow night. We need her to see, feel, and think differently. When she does, we will no longer have to direct her. She will put her bike away because putting her bike away is a part of who she is.

In the deep change process, we surrender control as it is normally understood. It is tempting to say that we give up control. That is not quite so. It is more accurate to say that we shift to another kind of control. We join with others in relationships of trust. As we do so, we extend that trust to create collective intelligence and capacity. We must move forward, experimenting and paying attention to feedback in real time. We share with others everything we are learning, and they do the same.

As this collective learning process unfolds, we begin to accomplish things that we could never have accomplished alone. We discover that excellence is a form of deviance, that we can only be excellent if we are not doing what is normal. We must be at the edge of where we feel comfortable, because the place of uncertainty is a place of learning. Learning is the engine of deep change; as we put ourselves into uncertain places, our assumptions change and we grow. We increase our capacity best by being fully challenged. But challenge is not enough. For us to turn uncertainty into personal transformation, we must be supported and encouraged in the process of engagement and learning. This kind of growth makes us into more effective versions of ourselves, allowing us to become empowered individuals and empowering members of our community.

Deep change requires us to recognize that we are not experts with superior logic. Leaders of deep change are visionaries with a driving desire to enact their given vision. They are not acting upon people—they are acting with them. Assumptions of hierarchy become latent or dormant as people learn together in networks of equality.

Think About It

- Why is it possible to be excellent only when we are not doing what is normal?

- What kinds of things can we learn when we leave our comfort zones?

- Have you ever changed because of something you learned when you were dealing with uncertainty? What was the experience like?

BECOMING A TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADER: AN ANALOGY

In his book *The Man Who Listens to Horses* (1997), Monty Roberts tells how he discovered his potential. Monty grew up with a father who trained horses. Actually, his father “broke horses,” using violent physical force.

Monty’s father based his approach to horse training on assumptions of control. The objective was to subjugate the horse, break its spirit, and make it a slave to the rider’s will. Seeing how the broken horses suffered, the young Monty vowed to find a better way.

On visits to Nevada as a youngster, Monty became fascinated with wild mustangs. He spent long hours observing these horses in the wilderness. He watched how they used their bodies to establish relationships, communicate, and shape behavior in the herd. He formulated hypotheses about what he was seeing. He began to recognize the hidden or deep organization of the herd.

Based on his reflection, Monty began experimenting with ways to use his eyes, hands, and body to communicate with the animals. Through trial and error, he was eventually able to communicate in the language of the herd. His goal was to build trust. Monty would adapt to the horse and the horse to Monty as each learned about the other. This would continue until the horse was willing to allow Monty to climb on and ride.

Monty eventually learned to train horses in a fraction of the time that it took his father and his father's colleagues. His process was not only faster, his horses were more dependable and more responsive. Monty began transforming animals that other trainers had given up on. He even trained wild mustangs to be gentle mounts, a feat that many trainers had considered impossible.

Monty became a master of change because of a disciplined self-change effort. He paid deep attention to how horses organize themselves, coming to know things that most people in his profession never learn. Through this process, he developed *adaptive confidence*, a belief that he could move forward into uncertain situations and learn what he needed to know as he needed it. Masters of deep change often have a universal theory of change; they tend to believe in their capacity to bring about transformation in nearly any situation.

A SECOND ANALOGY

What does becoming a master of horse training have to do with becoming a leader of deep change? There are vast differences between training horses and changing human systems. In examining any phenomenon it is natural to see differences. With more work, it is often possible to see deeper commonalities. When we learn to see commonality, we cross normal conceptual boundaries and we gain insights that open the door to new possibilities. If we are willing to learn from many different examples, we gain unusual new insights. We can see that Monty Roberts's careful reflection and willingness to try new methods is an example of the care and openness to learning that characterize transformational leaders in every human system.

Here is another example. Describing a master craftsman repairing a motorcycle, Robert Pirsig, author of *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* (1974), writes:

Look at a novice workman or a bad workman and compare his expression with that of a craftsman whose work you know is excellent and you'll see the difference. The craftsman isn't ever following a single line of instruction. He's making decisions as he goes along. For that reason he'll be absorbed and attentive to what he is doing even though he doesn't deliberately contrive this. His motions and the machine are in a kind of harmony. He isn't following any set of written instructions because the nature of the material at hand determines his thoughts and motions, which simultaneously change the nature of the material at hand. The material and his thoughts are changing together in a progression of changes until his mind is at rest at the same time the material is right. [p. 148]

Here I take the liberty of adapting Pirsig's description of how a master repairs a machine to Monty Roberts's horse-training method.

Monty isn't ever following a single line of instruction. He's making decisions as he goes along. For that reason, he'll be absorbed and attentive to what he is doing. His motions are in a kind of harmony with the horse. He isn't following any set of written instructions because the horse's state determines what Monty thinks and does. What Monty thinks and does then further shapes the state of the horse, which, in turn, further shapes Monty's actions. In all of this there is ever-increasing trust. The quality of the relationship between Monty and the horse is changing. The two are in a dynamic relationship that is giving rise to a capacity that neither has individually. Each relationship with each horse is not exactly like any previous relationship. But there is a desired outcome and general principles that Monty follows until the outcome is co-created.

What is common to the mastery of machines, or horses, and the changing of human systems? Let's adapt the description to a skilled executive trying to change a group of people.

The executive isn't ever following a single line of instruction. She is making decisions as she goes along. For that reason she'll be absorbed and attentive to what she is doing. She and the people are in a kind of harmony. The state of the group determines what she thinks and does. What she thinks and does then further shapes the state of the people, which in turn further shapes the executive. In all of this there is ever-increasing trust. The quality of the relationship between the executive and her group is changing. The two are in a dynamic relationship that is

giving rise to a capacity that cannot otherwise exist. This relationship is not exactly like any previous relationship. But there is a desired outcome and general principles that she follows until the outcome is co-created.

Think About It

- Have you ever known someone who seemed to have a deeper understanding than others of how to improve the people around him or her? What sorts of things did this person do?

TRAPPED IN NORMAL CHANGE ASSUMPTIONS

Monty Roberts was excited to share the many benefits that came from his new way of “gentling” horses with his father and other trainers. But they ignored the evidence and denied the validity of his claims, even after his methods won acclaim. How could these men reject a method that was so efficient and effective?

The answer is that they were men of another paradigm. They made normal assumptions. Horses were the enemy, and they were dangerous, so a trainer had to control the training process. The trainer achieved success by breaking the horse’s will—by forcing the horse to comply. Their assumptions led to violence that only confirmed those assumptions. The idea of establishing a gentle, trusting relationship with a horse was so foreign to them that they could not make sense of Monty’s method, much less attempt it themselves.

Most of us have similar internalized assumptions. When we need to influence others, we assume that we should tell them why they should change. We assume that we have greater expertise; we place ourselves in a position of superiority and attempt to exert control. We assume that we have the right to act upon others. If the people we hope to change do not comply, we look for points of leverage.

Leverage is the method we use to “break” the will of the other. Leverage produces resistance, and that resistance confirms our assumption that we need to be in control and crush the opposition. Having confirmed our assumptions, we reject any alternatives. To the horse breakers, Monty was a fool, and no hard evidence was going to change their conclusion. Their position had little to do with Monty; rather, it was the result of how their own identities had evolved. They sensed that Monty’s method was better than theirs, and they felt threatened. Instead of embracing change, they held more tightly to their own assumptions. That is our normal way of reacting. We are those horse breakers. When we see evidence that suggests our core assumptions are wrong, we often ignore it or attempt to discredit it, because the suggestion that we need to learn stimulates feelings of fear.

When you develop the kind of adaptive confidence that Monty developed, you will be willing to accept evidence that contradicts your core assumptions. People with adaptive confidence are confident precisely because they know that they will incorporate new information into their plans, even when that new information requires them to change. Over time they begin to trust the fact that they can learn, that they can figure it out. They become confident that they can adapt.

Think About It

- Have you ever worked with anyone who refused to consider alternatives to their assumptions, despite the evidence? Why do you think the person did that? What was the result?

- What assumptions do you have about how to influence change in others? How successful have those assumptions been in effecting change?

- Considering the stories you have just read, what sorts of things could you do to improve your ability to adapt to different or changing circumstances?

THE FAILURE OF SUCCESS

It is not easy to learn your way into a new assumption set. Some illustrations may help.

Bill was hired as a senior executive by a fast-growing company. He was excited about his new job but troubled by the fact that a few members of the hiring committee believed he did not have the requisite abilities. Wanting to prove that he was the right man for the job, he made a commitment to work harder than he had ever worked in his life. His commitment paid off. Within a short time, everyone agreed that Bill was the right choice.

Over the next several years, Bill noted that the harder he worked, the more recognition he received. He felt great satisfaction in his work and in the contributions he was making. This led him to work even harder. He was on an upward trajectory.

One day, Bill's wife expressed serious concern about his lifestyle. He was leaving for work at 4 A.M. and not returning home until late at night. Bill listened patiently but made little change. When confronted a second time, Bill promised not to leave for work until after breakfast and to be home in time for dinner. But he began working out of his briefcase from 4 A.M. until breakfast and from the end of dinner until it was time for bed.

Bill also noticed that his coworkers were sending subtle signals of displeasure. His performance was falling off and he was becoming more caustic. He felt trapped. His sense of ascent was gone. He was now on a downward trajectory.

One of Bill's associates suggested that he attend a retreat on the West Coast. He grudgingly agreed.

During the retreat, the participants were asked to draw a picture of something on the beach. Gazing around, Bill sat down to draw a picture of the withered, dying old pine tree in the dunes.

On the last day, the participants were asked to create an object that represented the week. Halfheartedly, Bill picked up a small log with a split in it and stuck a tumbleweed in the split. Holding up his creation, he caustically said, "Here is my week."

Suddenly he was struck by how much the tumbleweed resembled the dying pine tree he had drawn, and he was overwhelmed by a powerful insight. "I realized that I was that dying old pine tree and that I was denying my need for nourishment of the self."

In that moment Bill had an expanded consciousness. He could see his old self from outside his old self. He could see that his assumptions were responsible for his own downward trajectory.

Here is what he realized: As he attacked his challenging new job, he had grown and developed. For a time, there was a feedback loop between his efforts and his energy level. It was a self-reinforcing virtuous cycle; the more he worked, the more successful he became. At some point, however, his efforts began to bring diminishing returns. The virtuous cycle became a self-reinforcing vicious cycle. The harder he worked, the less effective his efforts, so he worked harder, thus becoming even less effective.

Often, when we find ourselves in situations that require us to adapt, we choose instead to distort reality, to deny what the world is telling us. Like the horse breakers, we hold tightly to our assumptions and tend to work harder within them when they are challenged.

Psychologists tell us that as our stress level increases, our attention span tends to diminish. We seek to solve new problems with the same methods by which we solved old problems. Instead of responding creatively, we increase our commitment to old patterns. At the very moment when innovative action is most needed, we implement our most ingrained response. To adapt, we must change our assumptions, but to do that we must have the courage to move forward, trusting that we can learn in real time.

Think About It

- Have you ever been in a position where your normal way of doing things stopped producing good results? How did you react?

- At a time when you were under stress and pressure, did anyone suggest ways you might be able to change yourself? What did you think of those suggestions?

BREAKING THE LOGIC OF TASK PURSUIT

Bill was following something we might call the *logic of task pursuit*. The logic of task pursuit is a mindset best illustrated by an old management parable.

A hermit would cut enough wood each summer to heat his forest cabin through the winter. One day, he heard on his shortwave radio that an early winter storm was heading his way. He rushed to his woodpile.

Examining his dull and rusty saw, he realized that it needed sharpening. Worried about the approaching storm, however, he began to cut. As he worked, he noted that the saw was getting increasingly dull and that he was working harder and harder. He told himself repeatedly that he needed to stop and sharpen the saw, but he continued to cut. As the snow began to fall, he sat exhausted next to a sizable pile of uncut wood.

This man was not ignorant. He knew his saw desperately needed sharpening. He also knew that the more he cut, the duller the blade would become. Yet, like Bill, he could not bring himself to stop and sharpen the saw. He was trapped in his routines and distracted by stress.

For most of us, when we are under pressure the pursuit of our immediate task drives out any thought of employing an alternative strategy. Careful planning becomes less important than keeping busy. I refer to it as the “tyranny of the in-basket”—the illusion that we have too much to do to take the time necessary to do what we really need to do.

Think About It

- How often do you, or the people around you, use busy-ness as an excuse to avoid important changes? Why?

- Have you ever realized you needed to make a change, but chose not to because you felt as if there wasn't enough time? Do you think you were being honest with yourself? What was the result?

- Our individual drive toward task completion often hides the need for deep change. How might you find time to work on necessary personal changes?

The logic of task pursuit affects organizations as well as individuals. An organization is a collective entity that exists to accomplish specific tasks. Every organization is a group of systems—a cultural system, a strategic system, a technical system, and a political system. In an environment of constant change, each of these systems—like the hermit's saw—tends to become less efficient over time.

When an organization discovers that its systems need realignment, I am often asked to make a diagnosis. Senior executives seldom argue with my diagnosis, but

they almost always argue with my recommendations. Often I am told, “What you don’t understand is that we don’t have the time to make the deep change you are recommending.” This statement is supposedly about time. It is not. It is about work avoidance. Deep change is adaptive work. It requires that we learn to do things we do not know how to do. Learning to do new things in real time is frightening. It is like asking a horse trainer to learn a new way to gentle a horse or suggesting that Bill balance his life.

Like most people, executives prefer to stay where they are comfortable. But they need an excuse to do so. “We have no time” neutralizes personal responsibility. That mentality lets the executive trade deep change now for a crisis that will occur in the future. Yet confronting a future crisis appears far more desirable than making a deep change now. It could take years for the crisis to occur, and by then the executive might be somewhere else. Making deep change is risky, and few executives are willing to introduce the possibility of failure.

Like the hermit and the senior executives, most of us tend to ignore warning signals that suggest a need for change. As performance levels fall, our stress goes up, and our vitality and drive wane. Our focus narrows, and we increase our commitment to existing strategies, making it difficult to change. To avoid the experience of feeling stuck, we must have a change in consciousness. We have to make a deep change.

In the chapters that follow, you will learn to transcend your normal assumptions and make the shift toward increased consciousness. If you read carefully and think deeply, as you listen to the voice of your own conscience you will begin to get outside yourself and see that your assumptions and strategies do not match the actual context in which you are embedded. If you reflect on times when you were at your best, you will be filled with positive emotions that will give you the energy to reexamine your motives and discover how to live in a more committed way. When you make this realignment, your fears will be replaced with confidence. When you are committed to your highest purpose, you will move forward through the fear of conflict, and you will begin to live in a generative state of learning and contribution. Instead of repeating what you have done in the past, you will find a new way. You will learn how to make deep change at the personal level and how to make deep change at the collective level. You will become like Monty Roberts, able to change the emerging future by acting with that future. You will become a master of the deep change process.

Personal Reflection and Application

REFLECT

While the chapter is fresh in your mind, quickly write down the 4 to 6 points, concepts, or ideas that most stand out for you.

WATCH A FILM: *NORMA RAE*

In this film, we see a man named Reuben change an organization. He does this by mentoring a woman named Norma Rae through the process of deep personal change. As she moves forward she has to make new assumptions about who she is and what she can do. In the process she is transformed and she becomes a leader.

Questions to Consider

1. Normal relationships are based on expectations of exchange (I give you something and you give me something in return).

- What was the expected exchange between Norma Rae and each of the following people or groups?

Her lover

Her father

Her boss

Her peers

Her fiancé

- How did these external expectations determine the expectations Norma Rae had for herself?

- What important external expectations determine the expectations you have for yourself?

2. Extraordinary relationships transcend the norms of exchange.

- What did you find to be Reuben's most surprising statements to or actions toward Norma Rae?

- How is Reuben different from the other people in Norma Rae's life?

- What did Reuben do to help Norma Rae become a transformational leader?

- Have you ever influenced people the way that Reuben influenced Norma Rae?

3. After being fired, Norma Rae walks through the factory and then jumps up on the table and holds up a sign with the word *Union* on it. This was her defining moment.

- How did Norma Rae know that holding up the sign would work? When did she plan the process?

- What are some transformational moments you have witnessed?

4. Norma Rae's husband tells Reuben that Norma Rae has changed and he does not like it. Reuben responds, "She stood up on a table. She's a free woman. Maybe you can live with it, maybe you can't."

- Explain what Reuben meant. What does it have to do with becoming a leader of deep change?

- Can you think of a time when you felt powerful and free?

- Do you believe you can be powerful and free? Why or why not? What does this belief have to do with your capacity to lead?

5. This film is about Norma Rae's transformation, but it is also about organizational change.

- What did you learn from the film about the connection between individual change and organizational change?

- What key connections do you see between the movie and the concepts in this chapter?

-
6. List the key insights you gained from the movie and briefly describe life experiences that you associate with these insights.

7. A very effective way to learn about deep change is to mentor someone through the deep change process. Before you begin Chapter Two, prepare yourself to take on the assignment of becoming a transformational mentor like Reuben. Who will you work with?

MAKE A JOURNAL ENTRY

Read the following statements. Check the 2 or 3 that resonate most with you.

- 1. Research reveals that 50 percent of all organizational change initiatives fail.
- 2. We are trapped in our assumption that hierarchy, control, linearity, expertise, achievement, and recognition are the best measures of success.
- 3. We often find ourselves in situations that require us to adapt, but choose to distort reality and deny what the world is telling us.
- 4. To adapt we must change our assumptions, but to change our assumptions we must have the courage to leave our comfort zone and move forward, experimenting and paying attention to feedback in real time.
- 5. We can only be excellent if we are not doing what is normal; to be excellent, we have to be at the edge, a place of uncertainty and learning.
- 6. When we become a more effective version of ourselves, we become empowered individuals and more empowering members of our community.
- 7. Assumptions of hierarchy become latent as people learn together in networks of equality.

- ___ 8. A master of deep change tends to have a universal theory of change, believing that he or she can bring about a transformation in nearly any situation.
- ___ 9. If we try reaching back, reflecting on when we were at our best, we will be filled with positive emotions and find the energy to reexamine our motives and live in a more committed way.
- ___ 10. When we are committed to our highest purpose, we move forward through the fear of conflict, and begin to live in a generative state of learning and contribution.

Now circle the number of the single statement you most resonate with. List some life experiences that you associate with that statement. Then write a paragraph that expresses the importance of one of those life experiences.

Life experiences:

Paragraph:

WRITE A MEMO

Based on your insights, your responses to the questions about the film, and your journal entry, write a short note to someone you know. Help the person understand the essence of what you have learned in this chapter.

APPLY THE LEARNING

What are one or two actions you will take from what you have learned in this chapter to get started on your journey of mastering the deep change process?
