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Abstract

This study is aimed at examining how convergence can be used for appreciative inquiry in the process of building an appreciative organization. Exploratory research was conducted which involved reviewing of secondary information from various scholarly materials that relate to convergence, social constructivism, positive psychology, the process of appreciative inquiry, and the leadership characteristics needed for the formation of an appreciative organization. The study hence focused on Kenneth Gergen's Social constructivism and positive psychology and its use in the modern organizations. The study also explored convergence in a wider scope, sought to define appreciative inquiry, it uses, and appreciative organization in general. Finally, the study evaluated how convergence can be utilized in the process of building up an appreciative organization through the application of social constructionist concepts and appreciative inquiry.
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CHAPTER 1: SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM & POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

1.1 Social constructivism

There have been numerous global transformations that were triggered by humans and witnessed by society in the late 20th and the 21st century. The technological advancement that emerged and extensively developed during the past two decades has resulted in an economy that can be referred to as postindustrial. Moreover, society witnessed the turning of the world into a ‘global village’ due to the ease of transport and communication across the world (Castells, 2010). All these factors have been affecting the functioning of the society itself and have led to a more dynamic setting in the society which can be labeled as more ‘fluid’ with new social factors emerging which can be described as ‘new voices’ (Webster, 2005). At the same time, the global economy can be observed to be changing from a manufacturing economy to more of a service oriented economy, an economy that is basically based on experience and knowledge (Castells, 2010). The post-industrial economy can, therefore, be defined by information and knowledge as opposed to capital and labor that characterized the industrial society (Webster, 2005).

These changes in the societal setting have also affected organizations and generated the need for new ways of organizing the working environment in organizations followed by the necessity of changing organizational practices and by a raising need to retrain the people that work in organizations in order for them to be able to adapt to these changes (Huseman & Miles, 2016). Together with the emergence of new means of communication such as social media, which have been proliferated by the rise in the use of the Internet, came customers’ desire and requirements to be involved more in the productions of products and services and to have a
voice. As a consequence, present day organizations are required to be more interactive and keep in permanent contact with their clients so as to be able to create value in the process of doing business and not only deliver the final product (Huseman & Miles, 2016). It is therefore essential for organizations to adopt more inclusive approaches in the way they do business in the current setting so that they can easier accommodate the needs expressed by the various stakeholders and be able to co-create value with them (Huseman & Miles, 2016).

The different scholars mentioned above highlight the changes that continue to affect the society in the present times and how those changes are also affecting the way organizations conduct their businesses and function on a daily basis. In this new context and having to cope with diversified expectations, many organizations have developed new tools to restructure and adapt well to current societal changes; however, many organizations continue to base their change processes on old philosophies and concepts and this might eventually inhibit the full transformation in those organizations. In this regard, social constructionism, a concept and theory that was developed by Kenneth Gergen, has been hailed as a postmodern approach to the changes that affect an organization (Gergen, 1994).

Social constructivism focuses on triggering social change in an organization and the present society in general (Gergen, 1994). This innovative theory and approach utilizes alternative philosophies when constructing reality and producing knowledge. Social construction concerns itself with the historical situation of knowledge in cultural values and practices of various racial and ethnic groupings of the human race (Gergen, 1994). According to the social constructionism theory meanings are, therefore ‘social constructed’ through the diverse experiences of people in their interactions with one another. Meaning can, therefore, be described as dynamic and fluid (Burr, 2013). In other words, each individual and each
organization, be it small or large, can construct meaning and create value and each action and reaction will diversify the meaning. As a result of this approach, social constructionism has led to the emerging of many innovative practices in organizations such as encouraging organizations to focus on their strengths and what has been proven to work instead of devoting much of their time and resources on what does not work and how to fix it (Brinkmann, 2005). Another particularity of social constructionism is that it also places much emphasis on varying perspectives instead of encouraging the usage of similar ideas, promotes decentralized decision making in organizations and the formation of trans-disciplinary teams, supports flexibility in formulating policies in organizations and highlights the importance of appreciation of multicultural environments (Burr, 2013). At the same time, through a postmodern approach, social constructionism challenges some modern assumptions regarding the production of knowledge such as individual rationality, the narrative of progress, evaluating circumstances empirically and the uses of language to represent circumstances (Brinkmann, 2005). As a result of this, according to the constructionist approach individual rationality is a consequence of cultural convention rather than a result of different way of thinking. In this context, the meaning of rationality, therefore, arises through coordinated actions across different people and throughout different levels of society or within an organization. Consequently, the constructionist approach proposes the use of other ways to evaluate knowledge production, methods that bypass rationality and call for creativity and involvement so as to promote change in organizations and in the society in general (Burr, 2013). With regards to empirical evaluation, the constructionist approach tries to understand how several realms of the world are usually ignored in this method of assessment and how they are always socially constructed. The constructivist approach encourages alternative conceptualization of the world and varying
phenomena (Brinkmann, 2005). Looking at it from another angle, constructivism can also be said to concern itself with broadening the possibilities of understanding phenomena rather than focusing on how to persuade people to use specific tools to correctly interpret events. In general, the language, which can be referred to as a fundamental aspect when knowledge is being produced, is normally defined as describing and representing the world. However, the constructivist approach defines language in a different way and from another perspective: language is seen as a means of perceiving the world by being a tool of social action. In other words, constructionist theorists, argue that language acquires meaning depending on how it is used in a given social context (Burr, 2013). The constructionist review of many current assumptions, therefore, influences knowledge production in organizations in that it allows the members of a given organization to continually critique the traditional practices in the organization and the society in general, observe their implications and come up with better methods (Brinkmann, 2005). Moreover, social constructivism also promotes practical and theoretical reconstructions that can bring about social transformation in organizations (Burr, 2013). In addition to this, social constructivism also encourages different ways of presenting and producing knowledge that go beyond the original use of texts and calls as just a form of expressive language (Brinkmann, 2005). Social constructivism also emphasizes the importance of the context in which knowledge is produced and where it will be applied. Furthermore, social constructivism calls for more consultation between researchers and those who implement given research results by urging the users of given knowledge to actively be involved in its production (Burr, 2013).
1.2 Implications of social construction in the professional context.

The constructionist perspective views organizations as potentially fluid fields that create meaning (Burr, 2013). Gergen (2009) argued that organizations are regularly immersed in ongoing processes of development. The constructionist approach to the understanding of organizations has several implications for professional practice in organizations as well as in the research fields.

Social constructionism brings to light many concepts that are currently being used in professional practices within organizations such as dialogues, co-creation, meaning making and imagination (Gergen, 2009). In addition to the usage of these concepts, social constructionism enables managers, group leaders, or consultants to create hybrid toolboxes that could be used as resources when intervening to solve many organizational challenges (Gergen, 2009).

1.2.1 Dialogue

Dialogue is viewed as a continuous interactive process that occurs during a conversation and focuses on multiple potential options that can be implemented in a constructionist perspective (Huseman & Miles, 2016). In this context, dialogue welcomes varying opinions and views regarding given topics. The dialogue concept borrowed from the social constructionism approach supports the idea that finding the best solution does not result from observing and describing the reality accurately but rather that finding the best solutions entails a constantly changing process that considers both the historical and cultural aspects that may be present in a
given society (Huseman & Miles, 2016). When compared to debating, it can be said that dialogue differs from debating in that during the process of debating people with opposing views and positions are involved with the most rational argument being adopted. Dialogues also differ from persuasion in that persuasion takes a soft approach to get to convince people to favor a given side in an argument (Huseman & Miles, 2016). Dialogues hence create a space for conversation and encourage the participants to bring varying opinions which will be used to co-create new realities (Gergen, 2009). In the context of social constructivism, the process of dialogue never focuses on looking for the right way to address a given problem but rather addresses the developing of generative ways in which all the parties involved in the process of dialogues can get involved and feel connected such that they will be responsible for given projects (Huseman & Miles, 2016). Therefore, when seeking to transform organizations using dialogue, the instigators of the process should seek to involve a large group of people in trying to solve a particular issue; a large group consisting of different types of individuals with various character traits will give different ways of evaluating the problem and will provide multiple solutions that will help with fixing the problem. Dialogue, therefore, allows different understandings which can be used to create new options and alternative actions which are created consequently (Gergen, 2009).

1.2.2 Imagination

Social constructivism also favors imagination especially in the process of dialogue in that there will be many possibilities to find a solution to given problems due to the more fluid, spontaneous flow of thoughts and ideas (Brinkmann, 2005). By encouraging the use of more imagination, the constructionist perspective allows meanings to gain more freedom and new
knowledge to subsequently arise. Moreover, by inviting many participants who voice their views in discussions within organizations, the potential for meaningful experiences is created (Gergen, 2009). Additionally, by favoring the use of imagination, social constructivism favors the occurrence of future possibilities and generates many possibilities for social change. In other words, social constructivism invests in the idea that by allowing and encouraging the use of imagination, social change is more likely to be driven and that this change will have a positive impact on organizations and their structure. Organizations should hence view dialogues as processes that are full of imagination and can help transform normal thoughts and talks into processes that build new meanings and lead to the establishment of new practices that will gradually be used to create new organization realities (Burr, 2013). Imagination and dialogue, therefore, make organizations become more inclusive and generate a sense of co-responsibility and belonging amongst all stakeholders (Burr, 2013).

1.2.3 Co-creation

The constructivist perspective opines that co-creation is a fundamental part of organizational processes in today’s network society. This is because, as a result of technological advancement, new forms of participation have emerged in the society with the general public not being mere receiver of information anymore but also an active participant in the process of communication (Brinkmann, 2005). Considering this major change in the role of the public from a passive role to a more active in organizational communication processes, co-creation can help organizations build solid relationships with their customers. However, organizations should only view the new interactive technologies just as tools designed to bring people together and not as shift in relations with their clients (Gergen, 2009). For example, during the process of dialogue,
organizations can encourage co-creation as an approach to boost up new relationships and interactions among their stakeholders. This will involve appointing facilitators or coordinators who will moderate the co-creating process, promote dialogue and persuade all those involved to use their combined imagination to create stories which describe them and their environment in order to help generate new ideas and at the same time raise their commitment to an organization in a process called relational responsibility when projects are being developed (Burr, 2013).

At a closer look, co-creation can be described both as a concept and as practice in the social construction perspective. As a concept, co-creation argues that people are relational by nature, which makes them co-create at all times regardless of context and situation. Co-creation is hence referred to as an ongoing relational process that upholds social construction and that this process is a property of the social system (Gergen, 2009). When looked at as a practice, co-creation is described as a creative process that is facilitated and designed in such a way that it encourages experimentation with new communication means, fosters the embracing of ambiguity and promotes the pursuing of new ideas and solutions for a problem (Brinkmann, 2005). As a consequence of this view, co-creation is seen as a practice that helps trigger imagination in people and leads to a larger variety of solutions for problems that are affecting organizations. While seeking to use co-creation, organizations should, therefore, pose several questions to their stakeholders who will help them brainstorm and come up with solutions to their various challenges (Gergen, 2009).

As described and explained, dialogue, co-creation, and imagination play important roles in organizational development and usually help deconstruct old patterns of thinking about varying subjects that affect the organizations by bringing up new meanings and helping organizations transform and adapt to their current environment (Burr, 2013). The social
constructivism approach can hence be said to create space for dialogue by use of imagination and that this creation of dialogue can speed up change processes through co-creating new possibilities (Huseman & Miles, 2016).

In order for organizations to easier adapt to new societal context and evolve from a constructivist point of view, the concepts of dialogue, co-creation and imagination have been brought together and combined into a methodology known as appreciative inquiry. Appreciative Inquiry is a freshly emerged method that is developed under constructionist approaches and is used in many organizational interventions (Gergen, 2009). Appreciative inquiry conceptualizes organizations as human constructions which are alive and places its focus on the positivity in an organization’s local environment, on what energizes the stakeholders, and on what would better work in the given organization (Gergen, 2009). As part of its methodology, appreciative inquiry begins with evaluating what is presently working well in a given organization and what resources are available that could and would be used to make the organization stronger such that it can pursue a specific strategic plan in its quest towards transformation (Brinkmann, 2005). At the same time, also as part of its methodology, appreciative inquiry never focuses on the already existing problems in a given organization or on what may be going wrong in that particular structure. In other words, appreciative inquiry is used to explore the stories of satisfaction, positive feelings, experiences and accomplishments that might have been experienced by various stakeholders in a given organization. Subsequently, a particular set of conditions is created and these conditions are later on used to set goals and define a future that will be founded on the abilities of a particular group in a motivational and collaborative way (Burr, 2013). Appreciative inquiry is hence a necessary and useful method that should be used in organizations as it helps
facilitate the process of decision-making, resolve conflicts and create a strong sense of cooperation within an organization (Gergen, 2009).

1.3 Positive Organizational psychology

As reviewed in the previous sub-chapters, the use of constructionist approaches such as dialogue, co-creation and imagination results to a methodology known as appreciative inquiry. Appreciative inquiry on the other hand works by focusing on the positive aspects of an organization among all its stakeholders and seeking to strengthen the positive aspects while ignoring all the negative aspects (Gergen, 2009). Since the positive aspects are a basic focal point for appreciative inquiry, it can be said that appreciative inquiry heavily relies on positive psychology in order to achieve results within a given organization. Positive psychology interventions can hence be adopted in given organizations while the appreciative inquiry methodology is being used. The next paragraph will attempt to describe positive organizational psychology and highlight its importance in relation to appreciative inquiry in the process of transforming an organization.

Positive organizational psychology can be defined as a science that deals with the positive individual traits, positive institutions and the positive subjective experience (Donaldson, Dollwet & Rao, 2014). In addition to this definition, positive organizational psychology can be considered to be an important part of positive psychology, a designated category that focuses on work and organizational issues (Fernández-Ríos, 2009). As part of positive psychology, positive organization psychology concerns itself with the study and application of positive psychology to try and improve the quality of life and the effectiveness among all the stakeholders in a given organization. According to Miller (2008), positive psychology topics will all fall in three main
pillars. The first pillar is mainly concerned about the positive subjective experience: this includes a given individual being hopeful, optimistic, happy, having pleasure and having positive emotions in a certain context or situation within an organization. The second pillar of positive psychology encompasses positive traits that can be found in individuals such as talent, creativity, values, interest, wisdom, purpose, strength in character, courage, meaning and growth (Miller, 2008). The third and final pillar of positive psychology encompasses positive institutions and helps facilitate the first two pillars and promote excellence in organizations (Miller, 2008).

In today’s society, there is almost always a very high level of competition in the current workplace and this is making it difficult for employees to hold on to their jobs and at the same time come up with new ideas and be successful in what they are doing. To survive in the current working environment, employees are hence required to put in a higher than average performance on a day-to-day basis (Donaldson et al., 2014). The current operating space of organizations is characterized by cutthroat competition and ease of access to information globally which has been precipitated by technological innovations such as the internet (Meyers, Van Woerkom & Bakker, 2013). As opposed to earlier times when technology and social structures developed and changed at a lower pace, modern organizations cannot afford be able to maintain a cutting edge over their competitors by raising entry barriers or bringing in technological breakthroughs mainly because all these advances are happening at a rate that is hard to cope with. As a consequence, modern organizations need to ‘break the rules’ and challenge traditional assumptions and existing paradigms in order to be able to stay on the market and get a chance to evolve and advance (Bowling, 2010). A modern organizations can hence gain a cutting edge over their competitors in the modern times through appreciative inquiry of what is being done right and seeking to build on their strengths so as to become successful (Meyer et al., 2013).
1.3.1 Positive traits

Over centuries, many scholars have often endorsed certain personal traits as being essential when it comes to enhancing human performance in their activities and at their workplace. These particular personal traits include mental ability and intelligence (Donaldson et al. 2014; Miller, 2008; Bolier et al. 2013; Fernández-Ríos, 2009 and Luthans & Youssef 2007). However, in the present times, in the study of positive organizational psychology three research streams have been developed which try to understand the most important positive traits for workers in a given organization that functions and is successful in the context of society today. These research streams include the Big five personality traits, core self- evaluations and positives psychological traits (Luthans & Youssef 2007).

First on the list, the big five personality traits include emotional stability, extroversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience and agreeableness (Luthans & Youssef 2007). Through research and long analysis, these traits have been proven to strongly relate to performance. The Big Five traits help bring out many individual level outcomes for example physical and psychological health, identity and also affect the interpersonal relationships of a person with their family, peers or spouses (Bowling, 2010). Most importantly, the Big Five traits affect the organizational and social level outcomes of a given individual such as career choice, performance, involvement with the community, political ideology, satisfaction with life and criminal activity (Luthans & Youssef 2007). In addition to this, the big Five personality traits also relate to the entrepreneurship ability of a person, their satisfaction when working in teams, and their cultural intelligence (Bowling, 2010). People with the big five traits will also be less
prone to undesirable characteristics such as burnout (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006 as cited in Luthans & Youssef 2007).

Next, core –self-evaluations are different types of positive traits that affect work-related outcomes. There are four main core-self evaluations and these are locus of control, self-esteem, self-efficacy and emotional stability (Levene, 2015). Core-self evaluations are important and very useful because they can be used to predict goal setting, performance, motivation and how one is satisfied with their life (Erez & Judge, 2001 as cited in Luthans & Youssef 2007). For example, an individual with high self-evaluation will regard themselves highly and be more contented with their character as a whole (Bolier, Haverman, Westerhof, Riper, Smith, and Bohlmeijer, 2013). This set of positive traits is important to be understood and evaluated mainly because, similarly to Big Five traits, individuals with high self-evaluations will also possess less undesirable outcomes such as burning out (Miller, 2008).

The third stream proposed by researchers suggests six categories of positive psychological traits which highly influence the productivity of an individual. First of all, the initial category involves wisdom and knowledge which affect curiosity, creativity, perspective and open mindedness (Luthans & Youssef 2007). The second category of positive psychological traits comprises courage and includes persistence and, most importantly, having integrity (Donaldson et al., 2014). The third category of positive psychological traits involves humanity and includes social intelligence, the ability to show love and being kind (Bolier et al., 2013). The fourth category of positive psychological traits involves justice and includes leadership traits, fairness and citizenship (Levene, 2015). The fifth category of positive psychological traits involves temperance and includes the ability to show mercy, forgive, be humorous, be self-disciplined, be humble and finally be modest (Erez & Judge, 2001 as cited in Luthans & Youssef
The sixth and final category of positive psychological traits involves transcendence and includes the trait to be hopeful, humorous, grateful, spiritual and being able to appreciate beauty (Bowling, 2010). All these traits are important and may determine the many aspects of an individual in the work setting or in an organization. However, none of these classification categories of traits should be viewed as fully exhaustive and independent of others (Luthans & Youssef 2007).

1.3.2 Positive state- like capacities.

When talking about positive organizational psychology one has to mention also positive state-like capacities. Positive state-like capacities are different from positive traits in that they are not as stable in an individual but rather can be changed and developed throughout the life and career of a given individual (Luthans & Youssef 2007). In other words, some of these traits might be innate and become undermined over time and some can emerge and advance in a particular stage during lifetime and exceed expectations. These characteristics of positive state-like capacities are essential in the modern day workplace which demands that workers be swift and flexible so that they can be able to grow and develop so as to match the fast-paced and unpredictable working environment in the modern days (Donaldson, Dollwet & Rao, 2014). By developing positive state-like capacities in their workers, companies can be able to gain a competitive edge over their competitors (Miller, 2008). These positive state-like capacities that can be so useful for any organization include efficacy, optimism, resilience and hope (Donaldson et al., 2014). These state-like characteristics can be improved or developed over time in a given individual (Meyers, Van Woerkom & Bakker, 2013). All these positive state-like capabilities can be grouped in the positive psychology discipline of positive organizational behavior (POB).
Positive organizational behavior can be defined as the application and the study of positively oriented psychological capacities and human resource strengths that can be evaluated, developed and managed effectively so as to improve the performance in the modern workplace (Luthans & Youssef 2007). Not all positive traits qualify to be included as positive organizational behaviors with the capacities which are included having to have extensive theories that support them and valid measures (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006 as cited in Luthans & Youssef 2007).

The positive traits that qualify to be included in positive organizational behavior must above all be open to development and improvement and be easily manageable so as to improve performance in organizations and add more value to the organizations themselves (Levene, 2015). With all these considerations, the following state-like psychological resources capacities meet the inclusion criteria into the positive organizational behavior discipline: self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency (Erez & Judge, 2001 as cited in Luthans & Youssef 2007). When the interaction of all these characteristics is studied it forms a construct known as PsyCap (Bolier, Haverman, Westerhof, Riper, Smith, and Bohlmeijer, 2013).

Self-efficacy in the workplace can be defined as the confidence of a given individual in their abilities that includes the motivation, cognitive capacities, and skills of a person to execute a given task in a particular work context (Luthans & Youssef 2007). Self-efficacy will enable a given worker to be able to work across diverse cultures, be able to make moral and ethical decision in their work activities, be creative in work process, make the right decisions in relation to their careers, be eager to learn new skills or ideas and finally be great from an entrepreneurial point of view (Donaldson, Dollwet & Rao, 2014). Self-efficacy can also be operationalized to self-motivation, setting goals and challenging them, being involved in challenging tasks, working towards mastering given tasks, working to accomplish the set goals and always persevering when
faced with given obstacles. Individuals with self-efficacy will hence be proactive in various situations as opposed to less-efficacious people who are reactive and may be more prone to despair, failure and loss of confidence when faced with challenges (Miller, 2008). Self-efficacy can be nurtured and developed through mastery experiences, social persuasion, vicarious learning and modeling, physiological arousal and psychological arousal (Meyers et al., 2013). Mastery experiences typically occur during training for a given job with the given tasks being varied in their level of difficulty so as to allow the individuals who are being trained to practice and achieve success (Bowling, 2010). Training programs, both formal and informal are usually very effective when trying to build efficacy in trainees. Positive feedback, encouragement, group support, trust, and respect are also important actions that could go a long way in developing efficacy in a given individual (Ang et al., 2007). The physical wellbeing of a given individual which is attainable through maintenance of an adequate work-life balance, maintaining a proper diet, using preventative healthcare methods and maintaining happiness also affect self-efficacy of a person and consequently their level of productivity in a given job (Levene, 2015). The development of self-efficacy can hence take place in training programs and informal settings such as through a supportive organizational culture (Bowling, 2010).

In the same category, hope is also a state-like psychological resource capacity which is defined as a positive motivational state which is observed in individuals who direct their energy to given goals, plan to meet their targets and have urgency and resiliency (Erez & Judge, 2001 as cited in Luthans & Youssef 2007). By having hope, a given individual will be more determined and motivated to accomplish a given goal. Hopeful people will also set quality goals which they can be able to accomplish and alter them effectively depending on the changes in realities that the given individual encounters (Bolier et al., 2013). Hope is state-like in nature in that it can be
developed in a given individual through recognized interventions such as goal setting training exercises which include stretch goaling, stepping and re-goal (Miller, 2008). In more general setups, hope relates to performance: for example in academics, athletics, and coping beliefs and skills (Levene, 2015).

Next to hope, resiliency is also a state- like psychological resource capacity that is highly important in this context. Resiliency is defined as the ability of a given individual to rebound from given adversity, failure or even handle positive events well and be able to progress and adapt to increased responsibility (Donaldson et al., 2014). The disciplines of positive organizational behavior perceives that resilience is one trait that, even when not innate, can be learned and developed over time and transform the individual into a more valuable worker (Levene, 2015). Resilience is hence classified as a state-like trait in positive organizational behavior discipline. Scholars have described resilient people as the individuals who can accept reality and be able to hold on strongly to particular stable values and beliefs even in hard and complicated situations (Ang et al., 2007). According to studies, resilient individuals are also adaptive in that they can improve and cope with unexpected situations while still pursuing their goals (Bowling, 2010). In workplaces, resilience is always needed with increased responsibility and more accountability demands. Workers who lack resiliency may view such requirements as threats, but resilient employees will see various demands in the workplace as challenges that can be solved with the right combination of qualities (Miller, 2008). In the positive organizational behavior discipline, resiliency is viewed as a proactive characteristic which allows an individual to see adversities and setbacks as opportunities to learn and grow and develop (Ang et al., 2007). Resilient people will hence be adaptable and be guided by strong belief systems that are strengthened by ethical values. These belief systems will make the individual fully focus on
achieving personal and organizational goals (Luthans & Youssef 2007). Due to this, scholars have highlighted resilience as an important characteristic that can and should be developed and managed in a workplace (Bowling, 2010). To sum, all the highlighted positive traits and state-like characteristics are important in the process of building positive organizations which will be more suited to doing business in present times and maintain a competitive advantage over their competitors. Managers who are aware of the advantages that arise from using the knowledge on this topic are more likely to be able to build up a team that is highly efficient and productive and will bring success to the organization. As mentioned above, positive traits can make a difference in terms of mentality, both for individuals and organizations, as well as structure of an organization, it can lead to easier and faster development and more accomplishments.
CHAPTER 2: MEDIA CONVERGENCE

2.1 Definition

Convergence is a popular term in the present times and has been used by various scholars in different disciplines to describe and analyze the change processes that lead to uniformity or union (Gershon, 2012; Dupagne & Garrison, 2006; Ernest Zhang, 2008; Jenkins, 2013; Diehl & Karmasin, 2013 and Dwyer, 2010). The term has been increasingly used over the past decade in different sectors and various fields of research. While being applied in the communications sector, convergence is referred to as media convergence and includes the use of different approaches and insights to try and understand, characterize and describe the digital creative economy (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). The digital creative industries are defined as industries that are comprised of economic activities that involve the generation of information and knowledge (Gershon, 2012).

Being a term that can be used in various domains of expertise, the concept of convergence has generated several definitions among many scholars who wish to study it, define it and explain how convergence works and can be used in the ongoing change of society. For example Gershon, (2012) defines convergence as the interlinking of information and communication technologies, computing technologies, media content and communication networks which have occurred as a consequence of the development and popularization of the Internet. Convergence has hence led to the emergence of activities, services, and products that converge in the digital media space (Ernest Zhang, 2008). In addition to this, convergence can be explained to have resulted from many social and institutional activities in various sectors such as
health, education, and journalism being conducted across numerous information and communication technology devices (Jenkins, 2013).

Dupagne & Garrison (2006) define media convergence as a phenomenon that is specified by the digitization of content and the technologies that are used to carry and display the digital content. This digitization of content has been resulting in the blurring of the traditional distinctions in the media formats and in the way the standard media formats generate content, aggregate it and distribute it to their audiences (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). As a direct result of this change in process, media convergence generated a substantial increase in media content that is available to audiences on online platforms (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). The online media sources that have to deal with media convergence include traditional broadcasters who have taken their content to online platforms, social media networking sites and online platforms such as Youtube and itunes (Dwyer, 2010). As a consequence of the use of media convergence, media sources will be available to a broad range of connected technological devices such as smartphones, tablets and personal computers (Dwyer, 2010). The rapid growth and development of media convergence has also been precipitated by the availability of high-speed internet among a large number of the world’s population which gives the audiences ease of access to the digital content (Dwyer, 2010).

According to Gershon, 2012; Dupagne & Garrison, 2006; Ernest Zhang, 2008; Jenkins, 2013; Diehl & Karmasin, 2013 and Dwyer, 2010 convergence can be looked at and understood in four main dimensions. These dimensions include the technological aspect, the industrial side, the social aspect and the textual dimension. Firstly, the technological aspect of convergence is highlighted by the characteristics of convergence that are related to combining computing, communications and media content around the digital media platforms which are networked
(Gershon, 2012 and Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Secondly, the industrial dimension of convergence is highlighted by the emergence of digitally based companies in the modern times such as Apple, Microsoft, and Google (Ernest Zhang, 2008 and Jenkins, 2013). Moreover, the industrial dimension of convergence is also highlighted by the continued engagement of established media stations in the digital media space and the rise of other significant content providers in online platforms (Jenkins, 2013). Thirdly, the social dimension for convergence is highlighted by the rise of numerous social networking sites such as Twitter, YouTube and Facebook and the steady increase in popularity of user generated content (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013 and Dwyer, 2010). Last but not least, the fourth dimension is the textual dimension of convergence which can be highlighted by the characteristic of stories and media content to be presented in many multimedia formats such as sounds, videos, images and written texts and then be dispersed across multiple media platforms. This dimension has been termed as the trans-media model specifically because the same content can be accessed from multiple platforms and in multiple formats (Gershon, 2012 and Ernest Zhang, 2008).

The current developments in the field and the increase in use of convergence, together with digitization and marketing have encouraged many scholars, especially those focused on economics, to argue that there is a rise of a techno-economic paradigm which has challenged traditional business models, organizational structures, and policy settings (Dwyer, 2010). Convergence has hence disrupted the status quo in organizations as it has challenged the previously established organizational and social arrangements. As modern day organizations are trying to adapt to convergence, disagreements and conflicts will always emerge, and there is a growing need to address these challenges (Jenkins, 2013).
**2.2 Characteristics of media convergence**

Media convergence has been characterized by many phenomena across the world. The most notable aspect of media convergence has been the globalization of media platforms including their services and content (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). The convergent media has resulted in content from the developed countries such as the U.S dominating the global media scene. This new type of media domination has raised concerns of cultural imperialism and cultural domination of the developing countries by the developed countries (Ernest Zhang, 2008). The emergence of digital media distribution channels which can traverse national boundaries has also been a defining characteristic of convergence with these content distributors who include Youtube and Apple iTunes, for example, allowing content to be available from any location globally (Gershon, 2012).

In addition to being a phenomena around the world, Media convergence has also been defined by the acceleration of innovation that has led to the economy being referred to as the ‘knowledge-based economy’ (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). In this knowledge-based economy, innovation and ideas are the primary drivers of economic growth as opposed to physical resources (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). The media industry has been one of the main recipients of these innovative ideas with radical transformations being witnessed in the production, conveying and publishing of media content (Gershon, 2012). Moreover, media convergence has also been defined by the rapid rise in user generated content which has converted receivers of media messages from being just audience to being actual participants in the process of sending and receiving media messages (Ernest Zhang, 2008). The increase of user generated content can be credited to the rising number of social media platforms and to the increasing use of those social
media platform. The use of these platforms converts the audience into active recipients of media messages as they can provide real-time feedback about given topics or even create their own content (Dwyer, 2010). The ability of the modern day audiences to set up their content has made them more powerful in that they can control the media more and make conscious decisions instead of just accepting what they are being given. Audiences in the modern days have greater control over what they consume and, most importantly, they can customize the content they consume more readily (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). When looked at from another perspective though, media convergence has also resulted in significant challenges for media regulators. Most of the time, they will find it harder to impose age-based distinctions mainly because, due to the emergence of the internet, they cannot be able to control the audiences’ access to media content anymore (Jenkins, 2013).

2.3 Implications of Convergence

Convergence has occurred and continues to occur in four main categories: the economic category, the political category, the social-cultural category and the technological category (Gershon, 2012; Dupagne & Garrison, 2006; Ernest Zhang, 2008; Jenkins, 2013; Diehl & Karmasin, 2013 and Dwyer, 2010). All these categories of convergence will affect the media and organizations in different ways and the implications of convergence will be major short term as well as long term.

The first main category that has to deal with convergence and learn to make use of its implications is the technological one. Technological convergence has emerged early on and has resulted in the formation of universal digital codes which are shared across electronic mass media and telecommunications devices (Ernest Zhang, 2008). The common protocols that are
used are called Internet protocols and are referred to as IP. These IPs are used in the running of different technological platforms such as mobile phones and make the service on devices function as an integrated service. A good example for this sort of technological convergence is the smartphones with the TV capability (Dwyer, 2010). The changes made in the common protocol in media devices which allows for the ease of sharing of information is referred to as terminal convergence and network convergence (Jenkins, 2013). Convergence can hence be hailed to have resulted to digitization. Convergence promotes diversity and plurality of integrated services, terminals, and networks. Convergence has made the digital platforms more flexible in that there are various services for the audiences which are provided at lower costs as compared to the analog technology (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Convergence can hence be said to help increase flexibility on the supply side of the media leading to the proliferation of media products (Ernest Zhang, 2008).

Economic convergence has also influenced the communication sector. This has resulted in the rise of new business models among media organizations which is referred to as corporate convergence (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). Media organizations also have been looking to change adapt to the effects of convergence by coming up with new ways to relate with their stakeholders and be profitable (Ernest Zhang, 2008). The media marketplace has also been converged thus leaving many media outlets with a quest to define their markets afresh. A significant area of concern has also arisen with arguments unto whether convergence has resulted in increased competition among media outlets as the various options available compete or whether it has led to reduced competition for different media products complement each other and cooperate more (Dwyer, 2010). As a result of convergence, more media organizations have therefore merged to create big conglomerates globally. Traditional media and telecommunications industries have
therefore been forced to adapt new business models and reorganize internally so that they can remain competitive and realize profits (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). Media convergence has led to current challenges and dilemma among organizations as old business models do not work. Organizations will hence be forced to experiment with new models of doing business which have not been tested. For example, many media organizations have resulted in establishing multimedia newsrooms and moved only to seek employees who are qualified and have the right skills to run newsrooms. This has led to a rapid improvement in the quality of media products (Ernest Zhang, 2008).

Political convergence has also occurred in the current times, and it is being witnessed by the changes in policies and regulations affecting the media. The traditional policy model was based on the separation of telecommunications and the mass media (Jenkins, 2013). As convergence emerged, policy makers and researchers became restricted by the traditional policy model which took telecommunication and the mass media as separate entities. Eventually, policymakers and scholars were able to combine all telecommunications and media policies to one major national and international communications policy through policy convergence (Dwyer, 2010). Policy convergence has eventually led to integrated regulatory agencies and laws which govern the communication sector as a whole and cover both the telecommunications and media industries (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Convergence has led to the rise of new regulatory responsibilities which have continued to grow in importance such as the protection of intellectual property, regulation of domain name systems and the freedom of speech (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). Due to convergence policy makers have experienced challenges in trying to balance sociocultural and economic regulations which have resulted from the blurring of boundaries between the media (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Convergence has led to the rise of a new design
of governance for the convergent communications market which advocates for self-regulation and co-regulation (Dwyer, 2010).

Social- cultural convergence has been dubbed as the convergence of culture. The convergence of culture is closely related to the digital creative economy with many researchers arguing that social- cultural convergence is constituted of socio-cultural practice and technology. Various scholars have studied socio-cultural convergence while focusing on changes in social practice which have led to changes in phenomena, for example, the emergence of transmedia storytelling and genres of content that can be distributed across various media platforms and channels. Rhetoric convergence has also emerged which is focused on language and the emergence of new types of media (Ernest Zhang, 2008). By studying the convergence of culture, scholars can raise discussions on the impact of convergence on popular culture. Cultural convergence is focused on how the modern people work, connect, learn and change to be more participatory which have led to audiences being referred to ‘prosumers’ as opposed to just consumers (Ernest Zhang, 2008). Cultural convergence also focuses on the co-production of media texts which have resulted in the integration of user generated content and generation of collective intelligence among the press and their audiences (Dwyer, 2010). Cultural convergence also focuses on the impact of convergence on the media culture with researchers focusing on the managerial challenges which arise from convergent newsrooms and the changing in working conditions which have resulted due to convergence in newsrooms (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Cultural convergence also focuses on how the content has been redesigned in modern times as a result of convergence and how convergence has influenced creativity in the dynamic workplaces witnessed in the current times (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Cultural convergence has also led to the rise in of new concepts such as receptive convergence which is concerned with the change in
reception patterns among media audiences and how media consumption patterns have changed over time (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). Cultural convergence has also led to the rise of the spatial convergence concept which tries to explain the rising cross-border services and uniform technology across the world (Dwyer, 2010).

2.4 Perspectives that define convergence

Various scholars have sought to explain convergence from multiple theoretical perspectives. However, the Co-evolutionary perspective has been widely accepted as the most appropriate theoretical perspective that describes the interdependencies of the various levels of convergence (Dwyer, 2010). The co-evolutionary perspective helps draw different conclusions concerning convergence and adequately describes the evolving and complex media convergence phenomenon (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). In addition to this, the co-evolutionary perspective adopts a scientific foundation to studying media convergence. Moreover, in a co-evolutionary perspective, media convergence is conceived and perceived as being innovation driven. A co-evolutionary approach to convergence hence considers the economic, socio-cultural, political and technological aspects of convergence and this approach leads to additional insights on how convergence affects the policy, corporate and commercial realms of various organizations (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). The new digital media can hence be hailed as an outcome of convergence and also as the central driver of the digital economy (Ernest Zhang, 2008). The various stakeholders in media industries will hence use convergence concepts to try and explain the different aspects of media change that are being witnessed in the current times (Dwyer, 2010).
2.4.1 Interactivity as a major result of the convergent media environments

The various defining characteristics of media convergence have already been explored in this paper and attention has been paid to how they affect the media environment. However, interactivity has been one of the main features of convergence when referring to characteristics. Interactivity being an important characteristic of media convergence makes it applicable in appreciative inquiry in the process of building an appreciative organization.

In communication theory, interactivity has been defined by the concept of interaction that is the relationship between people who will adapt their behaviors and actions for each other mutually to cope with varying situation (Jensen 1998 as cited in Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). In the current times, the interactive ability of a given media medium is defined by the feedback potential of a given medium and the power of the consumers of the given medium to influence the content of the communication being mediated (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). In order to understand interactivity, scholars have continued to use a three-dimensional approach which considers the technological aspects of a given medium, the user perception the given medium generates and the context of communication setting represented by the communication process (Kiousis 2002; McMillan and Hwang 2002 as cited in Diehl & Karmasin, 2013).

Based on the various approaches of interactivity, researchers have come up with different types of interactivity which have been classified as human-to-human interactivity, human-to – computer interactivity and human -to -content interactivity(Gershon, 2012; Dupagne & Garrison, 2006; Ernest Zhang, 2008; Jenkins, 2013). The human- to -computer interactivity focuses on a
variety of aspects such as personalization tools, search functionalities, navigation and hyperlink structures in its study of interactivity. The human –to- human interactivity has also been referred to as user –to –user interactivity and tries to conceptualize interactivity as a form of social interaction among various participants. This type of interactivity will hence be focused on how individuals might interact with each other using computers. Such interactivity can be found in chat sessions, reader polls on current issues and newsgroup forums (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). The ability to conduct business online has been hailed as the ultimate form of human to computer interaction, this also being the second type of interactivity (Gershon, 2012). The third and final form of interactivity is the human –to- content interactivity that is usually about the interaction between a given medium’s users and the content of the computer-mediated communication. In other words, in this type of interaction, users will hence be free to contribute to a given website's content for example by commenting on articles and posting messages in various chat rooms. In addition to this, users may also be allowed to post multimedia content such as upload images, video content or audio content (Ernest Zhang, 2008). In reference to all these types of interactivity, interactivity can hence be conceptualized as a multidimensional concept that covers a range of media characteristics (Jenkins, 2013). Nowadays, in order to keep up with the developments and changes happening in the digital world, numerous media organizations had to undergo changes in order to ensure the implementation and development of interactivity for example through the expansion of online newspapers and the creation of organizational websites (Jenkins, 2013).

Over the past years, interactivity has been increasingly been considered as a positive characteristic of the new media. This idea was theorized and investigated by many scholars and this has made organizations want to promote interactivity at a new level, in their relationship
with various stakeholders. By pursuing this view, researchers have found out that audiences and stakeholders in different media organizations feel satisfied as a result of free interaction with the content and the communication that the organizations may send out (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006; Ernest Zhang, 2008; Jenkins, 2013). According to Rafaeli 1988 as cited in Diehl & Karmasin, 2013 when audiences have the control over the content in given websites or other means of interactive media they have more positive attitudes towards such media and these attitudes help the organizations to be able to reduce unwanted information. Interactive features can also help audiences increase their information processing and knowledge of individual organization issues or news in the case of media outlets (Jenkins, 2013). The use of customized features on many media outlets websites can also increase satisfaction among audiences and various stakeholders (Ernest Zhang, 2008).

Apart from the positive effects, interactivity may also have negative implications for the audiences of media outlets and on their various stakeholders. Having access to numerous interactive features can make audiences feel over stimulated and hence make them respond negatively to certain given media content or communication from organizations. This would be a direct reaction to feeling overwhelmed (Gershon, 2012). In order to be able to overcome this sort of reactions among audience, many interactivity scholars have suggested that media outlets should balance the levels of interactivity in order to ensure that they do not overburden their audiences (Ernest Zhang, 2008).

In the cause of their business, many organizations assume that the increase in interactivity which has resulted from media convergence will automatically lead to increased purchases from given media, customers referring others to the given media, and returning to the given media in the future (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). However, to ensure that they benefit from the
interactivity of new media, organizations must uphold certain standards. These include respecting the needs of their audiences in a way that they will be able to create suitable and interactive forms of media such as websites. Organizations should hence conduct researches on their audience’s needs and preferences and work on providing interactive features according to their audience's interests (Gershon, 2012). Moreover, organizations should diversify their interactive features to appeal to different audience members and their varying tastes. Organizations should also seek to build credibility with their stakeholders and embark on educating their stakeholders on how to use the interactive features that are present on their media outlets (Ernest Zhang, 2008).

According to Murschetz 2011, as cited in Diehl & Karmasin, 2013 interactivity can also enhance business values in organizations in different ways such as improving consumer choices and thus increasing the perception of customer value. The customers will also become more satisfied as a result of perceived service and product quality. By encouraging interactivity, organizations may be able to reduce transaction costs and gain a competitive advantage over their competitors (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Interactivity will hence boost consumer trust and loyalty which is important when trying to create appreciative organizations (Gershon, 2012). Therefore interactivity is of great importance to the converging media environments and the way it is implemented and assessed will determine the level of success of the appreciative inquiry process so as to build an appreciative organization.
CHAPTER 3: APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY

3.1 Definition

To be able to define appreciative inquiry one must first understand the meaning of the word ‘appreciate.’ Oxford English Dictionary defines ‘appreciate’ as an act of recognizing the excellent people in the world around us. An inquiry is defined as the act of exploration and discovery of phenomena or specific occurrences. In addition to this, an inquiry is also defined as the process of asking questions and being open to seeing new potentials and possibilities (Oxford English Dictionary, 2016). Appreciative Inquiry can thus be defined as the co-evolutionary search for excellent people in their particular organizations and the relevant world around them (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). Furthermore, appreciative Inquiry seeks to systematically discover what makes organizations have ‘life’ so that they become highly efficient, and constructively capable in economic, human and ecological terms (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). Appreciative Inquiry can hence be referred to as the practice and art of asking questions that will strengthen a given organization and its capacity to anticipate, apprehend and increase its positive potential (Whitney, Stavros, & Cooperrider, 2008). Moreover, inquiry will be used to come up with positive questions and may involve a large group of people who are of concern to a given organization. The appreciative inquiry process thus encourages innovation and imagination in solving of organizational problems as opposed to criticism, negation and spiraling diagnosis (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Appreciative Inquiry also seeks to create a constructive union among all the people in a given organization by considering their past and present capacities such as their assets, innovations, strengths, unexplored potentials, benchmarks, elevated thoughts, lived values, opportunities, strategic competencies, stories, elevated thoughts, achievements, their
insight into a given corporation’s spirit and how they express their wisdom (Barrett & Fry, 2005). When looking at Appreciative Inquiry from another angle, it is easy to see that this is deliberately based on positive change and takes organizations as living systems which have untapped and inspiring positivity. As a direct effect of this, Appreciative Inquiry hence seeks to bring changes to organizations by linking the power of positivity to the change agenda to achieve changes which would be impossible by use of standard organizational processes (Ludema, Whitney, Mohr, & Griffen, 2003). A specific characteristic of Appreciative Inquiry is the fact that the use of it makes the change process to be owned by all of the involved stakeholders in a given organization that will make them motivated to effect the change through positive engagement (Ludema et al., 2003). As earlier explored in the first chapter of this paper, it can hence be stated that Appreciative Inquiry uses the social constructivist approach of focusing only on the positive aspects of a given organization to spark the required changes within an organization. Therefore, one of the main principles of Appreciative Inquiry is Social constructivism.

3.2 The Appreciative Inquiry Method

According to Cooperrider & Whitney (2005), Appreciative Inquiry involves four phases that are commonly referred to as the 4D model. The four phases will be implemented only when the affirmative topic has been chosen in the Appreciative Inquiry process (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). The affirmative topic refers to the focus of the inquiry that varies across the numerous issues that may be affecting a given organization. For example increasing customer satisfaction in a given organization or making operations more efficient. The affirmative topics in Appreciative Inquiry are however typically phrased in lively and inspiring language. For
example, increasing customer satisfaction would be phrased as ‘inspiring fanatically loyal customers’ (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). The four phases of the Appreciative Inquiry process include; discovery, dream, design, and destiny or delivery.

Figure 1: The Appreciative Inquiry Model.

3.2.1 Discovery

Discovery is the first step of appreciative inquiry and it occurs once the affirmative topic has been determined and chosen. During this stage of Appreciative Inquiry, the participants of the process will reflect and hold discussions about what is the best approach to the objects of
inquiry (Whitney et al., 2008). During the discovery phase, the participants of the Appreciative Inquiry process will be interviewed and encouraged to share their own best experiences and stories. For example, they can be asked about the time they felt most satisfied with their work and how a given organization or part of an organization was being managed. An interesting and productive characteristic of Appreciative Inquiry is that it allows a given organization’s stakeholders to be both the interviewers and interviewees in the discovery phase so as to fully get them engaged with the issue at hand (Barrett & Fry, 2005). During the discovery phase, the Appreciative Inquiry also encourages the listening to and telling of important personal stories so that widespread engagement can be created and relationships established which will be helpful in sparking the change process (Ludema et al., 2003). The affirmative topic will hence be turned to a question in this phase and answers that are obtained from the positive stories identified and shared.

3.2.2 Dream

The next phase of Appreciative Inquiry after discovery is the dream. During this phase of AI, participants are encouraged to imagine the given organization they work in or the community they live in or even a particular group they belong to as their best in reference to the affirmative topic which was raised (Bushe, 2012). The coordinators of the Appreciative Inquiry process will thus attempt to identify the common aspirations of the stakeholders in a given organization from their responses and symbolize it in a given way (Bushe, 2012). The dream phase will hence result in a symbolic product like a graphical representation of aspirations rather than something as complex as a mission statement (Bushe, 2012).
3.3.3 Design

Once the dream or strategic focus has been stated which will normally be comprised a vision for a better world, a completing statement of intent, and a powerful purpose, the attention of the coordinators of the Appreciative Inquiry process will turn to the creation of the ideal organization which was dreamt about (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). The stakeholders of a given organization who are participating in the Appreciative Inquiry process will hence be requested to create a concrete proposal for the organization they dreamt off (Whitney et al., 2008). Social, architectural processes will hence be employed in this phase to create a model of design elements which will be utilized to identify the categories which participants can use to set up and organize change proposals (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Change proposals are also referred to as design or possibility statements.

3.3.4 Destiny

In the earlier years of appreciative inquiry, development - the final phase of AI - was referred to as “delivery” rather than “destiny” as it is known today. However, the use of the word deliver was changed by Cooperrider, an AI scholar who argued that the word “deliver” did not fully embody the effects of Appreciative Inquiry within the organizations that adopted it (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). The liberation brought about by AI to organizations was too big to be referred to as just delivery. He argued that organizations were able to achieve what they had actually always dreamt about by using AI (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005) and that organizations were hence reaching or fulfilling their destiny by using the Appreciative Inquiry process (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005).
Appreciative Inquiry accelerates the interactions and consequently brings a breakthrough in organizations. AI does not interfere with historical and positive traditions in a given organization but strengthens them to create what can be referred to as a convergence zone between the old positive practices and the newly adopted practices (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Appreciative Inquiry hence facilitates the re-patterning of human systems in an organization collectively (Bushe, 2012). The destiny phase of Appreciative Inquiry is hence characterized by the emergence of network-like structures that liberate an organization’s positive core elements and qualities and creates a convergence zone in which the various stakeholders in a given organization can be able to empower one another to cooperate, connect and co-create (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Appreciative Inquiry is hence able to mobilize changes in organizations democratically by letting the stakeholders in a given organization tap into the power of positivity and let go all accounts of negativity (Ludema et al., 2003).

### 3.3 Principles of Appreciative Inquiry

The practice of Appreciative Inquiry is guided by five principles that include: the constructionist approach, the principle of simultaneity, the poetic principle, the anticipatory principle and the positive principle (Barrett & Fry, 2005; Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Bushe, 2012; Ludema et al., 2003). Two of these principles, the constructionist approach, and the positive approach have already been discussed in detail in Chapter one of this paper. By relating the two positive principles to AI, it is logical to say that Appreciative Inquiry borrows much from social constructivism and positive psychology.
3.3.1 The constructionist principle

The constructionist approach, as high highlighted by Gergen (1994), states that human knowledge and a given organization's destiny are highly connected and intertwined. Therefore, in order for leaders of a given organization to be effective and be able to act as change agents, they must be highly skilled in reading, understanding and analyzing the organizations they lead as living human constructions (Gergen, 1994). Gergen hence places the knowledge of a given organization at the center of any attempt at change. In addition to this idea, constructionism has replaced the absolutist claims that used to encourage the ‘final word’ with the endless collaboration to try and understand and construct varying options for a better living (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Appreciative Inquiry hence uses generative theories to anticipate and articulate the future without paying much attention to the past (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Constructionism emphasizes the communal basis of knowledge and questions the objective perception of knowledge. Furthermore, constructionism encourages generative knowledge (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). The constructionist approach hence suggests that what individuals believe as true will determine their actions in the future and have an impact on the results of their actions. In other words, our thoughts and actions emerge from our relationships with one another (Bushe, 2012). By the use of language and day-to-day interactions various stakeholders will hence be able to co-construct the organizations they work in. As a result, Appreciative Inquiry will hence stimulate new ideas and content such as stories and images and all these will generate new possibilities for individual actions (Ludema et al., 2003).
3.3.2 The Principle of Simultaneity

The principle of simultaneity argues that inquiry and change are not separate occurrences but that instead they occur simultaneously (Whitney et al., 2008). Additionally, inquiry is taken as an intervention that results in change on the long run. Moreover, inquiry results to people thinking, talking, discovering and getting involved in dialogue so that they can be able to co-create the future together (Whitney et al., 2008). Inquiry hence sets the stage for change by providing questions that lay the foundations of the findings and the discovery later on. These discoveries will later become the data or the materials in which stories will be constructed from and the future conceived, talked about and created (Bushe, 2012). The principle of simultaneity in Appreciative Inquiry hence proposes that inquiry sows the seed of change (Whitney et al., 2008). The principle of simultaneity also proposes that the questions asked during the process of inquiry should not be neutral but fateful such that the social systems concerned can be able to change through the influence of the questions asked and discussed (Barrett & Fry, 2005).

3.3.3 The poetic principle

The poetic principle of Appreciative Inquiry proposes that human organizations are more like open books rather than machines made up of many parts (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). The organizational stories are hence consistently being co-authored over time. The present, past and future of an organization are hence taken as endless sources of learning which can be interpreted differently to inspire certain actions like the way a great piece of poetry does (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). In addition to this, the poetic principle of Appreciative Inquiry implies that we can be able to study any topic with human experience in organizations. As a
consequence of this, Appreciative Inquiry can be used to explore any area in organizations such as morale of the employees, their enthusiasm levels, efficiency and even joy among other topics (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Moreover, the poetic principle of Appreciative Inquiry proposes that through the telling of stories among the members of a given organization daily, the story of an organization is constantly co-authored (Bushe, 2012). The words and topics that are chosen for Appreciative Inquiry should hence invoke sentiments, worlds of meaning and understandings. The Appreciative inquiry process should hence use words that inspire the best among the people in particular organizations (Ludema et al., 2003).

3.3.4 The anticipatory principle

Another principle that has to be explained and described when talking about Appreciative Inquiry is the anticipatory principle. The anticipatory principle of Appreciative Inquiry proposes that the great imagination and discourse about the future that is found in human beings is an infinite resource that should be used to generate constructive organizational change (Barrett & Fry, 2005). Anticipation will make the people in an organization have a particular image for the future which will guide their current behavior and most likely have a positive impact on the outcome of their actions (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). According to the anticipatory principle of Appreciative Inquiry, human systems have a tendency to continuously project ahead of themselves and hence have expectations that they will express in their language and make the future be felt in the present and thus mobilize change (Ludema et al., 2003). Due to this, Appreciative Inquiry should hence be conducted in ways that foster anticipation so that positive images can be formed in which people in given organizations will work towards achieving (Barrett & Fry, 2005). The positive images of the future will therefore make people in given
organizations act positively which is an important function of Appreciative Inquiry (Bushe, 2012). All in all, the anticipatory principle of Appreciative Inquiry argues that the actions of given people in an organization in the present are a guide to their image of their future (Ludema et al., 2003).

3.3.5 The positive principle

Next, the positive principle of Appreciative Inquiry proposes that to have the ability to build and maintain a momentum of change within organizations, significant amounts of positivity and social bonding are needed (Barrett & Fry, 2005). These type of social bonds and positive attitudes will include having sentiments like giving hope, creating excitement, inspiring others, caring for others and sharing happy moments as a result of creating something meaningful as a group (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). According to the positive principle of Appreciative Inquiry, such sentiments will promote strong connections and great relationships between people especially among groups which are conflicting in organizations. Positive questions hence need to be asked in the Appreciative Inquiry process in organizations so that they can result in more sustainable and fruitful change efforts in organizations (Barrett & Fry, 2005).

3.4 The process of Appreciative Inquiry.

In order to better understand how the Appreciative Inquiry works and can be applied, one has to have a look at the several steps which are involved while conducting an appreciative inquiry in a given organization. This step-by-step process will typically include a chosen group of individuals from a given organization who are committed to Appreciative Inquiry. The designated group may have a facilitator who will train them as researchers (Brice-Nicolson,
After having received proper training, the selected group will then use their knowledge of a given organization to come up with questions that will provoke positive stories, core values and what works well for a given organization (Brice-Nicolson, 2009). Next, same group will then spend some time having conversations using the questions that they had drafted earlier with the different stakeholders in a given organization and collect information which may be referred to as evidence (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002). The core group will then embark on reviewing the information they received and may use it to propose improvements which should capture the positive aspects identified by various stakeholders in an organization. A proposal will then be compiled using the information gathered from the interested parties in a given organization that will be used to enact changes in the organization structure using the process of appreciative inquiry (Brice-Nicolson, 2009). Appreciative Inquiry can hence be used also in large system process changes such as mergers and restructuring (Brice-Nicolson, 2009). AI has also been widely employed in relational processes such as management or relationships and is also essential when organizations are being engaged in strategic planning and assessment. Many organizations have also used Appreciative Inquiry to shift their team-based processes from a hierarchical structure to a horizontal one, one that facilitates communication and encourages personal and team growth (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002). In addition to all of these characteristics, many trainers also use Appreciative Inquiry to transform training courses into powerful learning experiences mainly because Appreciative inquiry makes use of special tools in the design of productive workshops and coaches members of given organization on how to develop and achieve their goals (Brice-Nicolson, 2009).
3.5 Advantages of Appreciative Inquiry

Appreciative Inquiry offers a multitude of advantages to its users and many of those can easily be spotted in the previous chapters. First of all, and probably one of the most important advantage of Appreciative Inquiry is the fact that it helps build upon a given organization's strengths by celebrating the things that have been conducted well in the organization so that the confidence, morale, and esteem of individuals and groups in a given organization can be raised (Barrett & Fry, 2005). During Appreciative Inquiry the participants of the process can also become motivated and energized as they feel valued and appreciated in the organization. Moreover, Appreciative Inquiry also gives a chance of reach to every member of a given organization because of its conversational style of questioning (Brice-Nicolson, 2009). Another advantage that comes along with the use of Appreciative Inquiry is that it will help build trust among members of a given organization while making them more resilient and creative due to their integration in the thinking process in an organization (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002). In addition to this, Appreciative Inquiry also provides a particular attraction to the dream in a given organization and this will provide the stakeholders of the given organization the energy and commitment to be able to produce certain improvements (Brice-Nicolson, 2009).

3.6 Disadvantages of Appreciative Inquiry

As any type of process that has to be undergone in order to achieve change and progress, aside of its above-described advantages, Appreciative Inquiry also comes with some disadvantages. One downside of using Appreciative Inquiry is the fact that it can be time-consuming to implement this type of approach in given organizations. Additionally, the core groups that convene the process of appreciative inquiry need to be well motivated so that they
can involve large groups of people in the Appreciative Inquiry process. This can pose certain challenges and it is a process that requires again time and energy and, most of all, determination. Appreciative Inquiry may also be challenging when many groups of stakeholders are involved in the process, and hence it may be hard to coordinate and come up with a rigid solution to certain issues (Brice-Nicolson, 2009).
CHAPTER 4: APPRECIATIVE ORGANIZATION

4.1 Differences between the traditional organization and the Appreciative organization

Over the past decades, several challenges have emerged which affect the modern day organizations on a local and global scale. Most of the modern day organizations are more fragmented through expansion into vast geographic regions and numerous mergers that have resulted in diversified organizations (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). The technological innovations that have occurred in the current times have also led to information accumulating more rapidly while becoming more complex and less reliable. Moreover, information also becomes outdated more quickly than before because of the change in speed of data and news transfer. The speed of change in government policies, economic conditions, and public opinions has also outpaced the rate in which they are assimilated into organizations in the modern times (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). Long-term strategic planning has therefore become increasingly ineffective in organizations. In the contemporary society the competition and cooperation means of institutions has also been profoundly influenced by the rapid rise of new organizations, new products, and new communication systems (Simmons, 2007). The modern day organizations also experience a high diversity of stakeholders as compared to past organizations. This diversity includes cultural, ethical and ethnical diversity that is vital in the process of creating of a given organization’s culture. The cultural, moral, and ethnical diversity of organizations in the modern times hence provides an opportunity for both conflict and growth (Simmons, 2007). In the modern day, the various stakeholders in given organizations have become less committed to the organizations which have resulted in the erosion of trust and long-term understanding among them. Many young workers have even begun to question the ideals such as customer loyalty
(Kassam & Bushe, 2005). The opinion climate has become more volatile for the modern day organizations that must be more sensitive to such climates to be able to succeed in their business. The present day organizations have also come under much pressure from their stakeholders to enact workplace democracy (Anderson & Taos Institute Publications). The geopolitical environment of doing business has also become more unpredictable with terrorist attacks, issues of global warming, ecological disasters, civil wars, and shifting political alliances across the world which influence organizational activities in ways which cannot be easily predicted (Lewis & Moore, 2011).

All these challenges have made it hard for organizations to do business in the modern times. Therefore, there is a need for organizations to adopt mechanisms that could help them deal with the current dynamics of the business environment adequately. The traditional organizations that were defined by solid pyramidal structures with the orders coming from the top to the bottom of the organizations have therefore come into heavy jeopardy as a result of present-day changes. Traditional organizations may hence face several challenges which may form a kind of boundary which separates such organizations from the outside world (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). Such organizations are usually characterized by those in command trying to come up with certain coherent views of the organizations, it practices and goals which they will seek to force onto various stakeholders (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). The executive directors of traditionally set organizations may also provide the vision of the organization which may undermine the creativity and initiative of their subordinates to be able to chart out the future of a given organization and hence cannot be involved in renewing the organization’s capabilities (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). Many of those traditional organizations have already well established hierarchical structures which heighten competition across all the members of a given
organization as the concerned members will avoid cooperating with one another and only seek to advance their own interests and goals (Simmons, 2007). Moreover, in such a context, employees will also tend to pass only the information that favors them rather than communicate extensively and amiably throughout the organization. Traditional organizations may also encourage diversification of functions that will only generate ignorance of functions that are no assigned to particular members instead of fostering teamwork (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Furthermore, a rigid organizational structure may only favor fixed flow of communication within organizations and this type of communication may deter differing perspectives that could eventually lead to the growth of organizations. Considering all these challenges of the traditional organization that are hard to be tacked and are hard or impossible to solve by normal approaches and by using traditional tools, it is hence essential for organizations to adopt newer strategies and more appreciative approaches which would make them cope better with the requirements of the modern and ongoing evolving environments.

In order to better understand how a traditional organizations work one has to firstly see that the traditional organization conceptualizes the human being as the central character that uses their brain to set goals, plan and make decisions and then executes them using their body (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). However, this concept of organizations falls short in that it proposes that the employees in a given organization have different mental and physical ability and hence are not equal. Most importantly the concept of human beings being central to the functionality of an organization ignores the importance of the relationships among the different stakeholders in an organization (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). The relationship between the various interested parties in a given organization can play a vital role in unleashing the potential of the organization or restricting the growth of the organization (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).
The understanding of the relationships between the members in given organizations can hence make organizations more suited to the contemporary market. In order to understand the functions and importance of relationships in appreciative organizations four basic ideas have been proposed by scholars. These include the following propositions: organizations exist in worlds of meaning, the meanings that organization assign to the world will be seen in their actions, the meanings will be constructed in the cause of the relationships within the organizations, and that shared meaning will rely a lot on appreciation (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004; Avital & Cooperrider, 2004; Simmons, 2007 and Kassam & Bushe, 2005).

Traditionally, organizations were thought to function in real worlds which were made up of production lines, salaries, inventories and factories (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). However, although these realities affect organizations how they are constructed is what will enhance the survival or weaken the chances of a given organization succeeding in a given market (Simmons, 2007). In some organizations, those in charge may be viewed as leaders while they may also be seen as tyrants in other organizations. The products produced in given organizations may also be seen as of high or low value that will depend on the meaning assigned to them by the stakeholders. One can also argue that there never exist problems in organizations except in particular constructs of meaning (Simmons, 2007). The problem of a given individual in an organization may also be an opportunity for others. In an appreciative organization the realist view of the world that perceives the world as it is, is hence replaced by the constructionist view of the world that sees the world as having a particular meaning for us (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). The constructions of the different stakeholders in a given organization will hence determine the future of the organization. The meanings that various stakeholders assign to their world will also be seen in their actions in a given organization (Kassam & Bushe, 2005).
Therefore, in trying to create appreciative organizations the stakeholders must be able to view the organizations as valuable, their duties towards the given organizations as reasonable, and their goals as worthy (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). The employees also have to feel that they are esteemed and their identity valued by the organizations they work for. Employees who may feel underpaid and underappreciated may therefore not perform well for their companies and their constructed meaning will consequently affect their actions (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004).

In Appreciative Organizations meanings are constructed during relationships among the various stakeholders. These relationships will directly affect the effectiveness of given organizations (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). Through gesturing, talking and acting together people in the larger society and organizations as whole will be able to determine what is valuable and real to them. In the cause of the relationships in Appreciative Organizations, meanings will also be shared when various stakeholders appreciate each other more (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Meanings will hence be typically born out of affirmation from others around us in that they will agree to our ideas and argue with us so as to co-create meaning. Mutual appreciation will hence ignite enrichment and growth of meaning (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).

4.2 The results of Appreciative Organizing

Appreciative organizing will bring numerous benefits to a given organization that would be difficult to achieve in traditional organizations by using traditional tools. The relationships that are encouraged in appreciative organizations will result in untapped resources for the organizations (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). Mainly, appreciative organizing will lead to innovation, flexibility, integration, collaboration, affiliation, engagement and coordination of organizations with the outside world (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).
In addition to this, appreciative organizing will lead to innovation as views and values will be allowed to circulate more freely within a given organization, within all its levels and functions (Simmons, 2007). The members of a given corporation or specific organization will hence be exposed to numerous ways of understanding the structure and functions of an organization and the challenges that have to be faced. An attitude of appreciation will also encourage the various stakeholders in organization listen to each other more and combine different ways of understanding the challenges that face their organizations (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). This free exchange of ideas, opinions, and understandings will consequently foster creativity which is will be born out of the intersections of the different views of the workers in given organizations (Kassam & Bushe, 2005).

Moreover, appreciative organizing makes organizations be more flexible in that they can process new information continuously through constant dialogue. The practices and plans of the appreciative organizations will hence become more sensitive to change. The members of appreciative organizations will gradually become more prepared to face and embrace changes and movement as opposed to being rigid and sticking to a defined organizational structure even if it doesn’t work (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004).

Additionally, appreciative organizing will also lead to integration in that a given organization will allow an integrated diversity of viewpoints within its boundaries (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). Integration will hence encourage diversity of ideas and information that will reduce the probability decision-making from just the leadership of the organization which may be insufficient (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Integration will thus allow every member of a given organization to contribute positive ideas which will ensure that the organization always adopts the right decisions (Kassam & Bushe, 2005).
Another benefit that comes along with the use of appreciative organizing is collaboration fostering. Appreciative organizations usually adopt collaborative decision-making models so as to grow meanings in the process of developing appreciative relationships (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). The appreciative organizations will thus understand the value of commitment and the necessity of interdependence during the struggle towards realizing their set goals (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Appreciative organizing will also lead to high levels of affiliation among members of a given organization. The members of appreciative organization will thus be encouraged to work together as a team in the different levels of the organization (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). This will build trust and make the members of the organization feel connected in creating the organization together.

In terms of employee commitment, appreciative organizing will also raise the levels of engagement of the members of a given organization so that they can achieve the organizational purposes. This is because each member of a given organization will be able to recognize their dependence on others in the process of achieving organizational goals (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). The employees of appreciative organizations will hence not just sit and wait for orders but rather be proactively engaged in pursuing the goals of a given organization (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).

As all organizations are context and society dependent, appreciative organizing also helps organizations to coordinate constructively with the outside world by not undermining the importance of this connection (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). This happens through engaging a wised range of dialogic participants and incorporating their diverse views in organizations (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Combining diverse views in organizations will help the organizations to become
fully integrated with the surrounding culture of its area of operation, which will make it more connected to the external community (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).

4.3 The Building of Appreciative Organizations

In order to be able to build appreciative organizations, the leaders of organizations have to encourage the creation and development of certain environments. These include fostering relational interdependencies, supporting multiple realities, promoting dialogues, encouraging imagination, calling the members of organizations to act within the moment and helping members of the organization to keep the conversations about various issues that affect organizations going (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Newman, 2011). Fostering relational interdependencies is important in organizations as it enhances the flow of meaning within the organization. This shared meaning will help organizations leaders to be able to coordinate opposing groups in the organization and, make them work together towards the achievement of common goals (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). The sharing of meanings also encourages greater creativity and flexibility among the members of an organization (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004).

Additionally, in order to create appreciative organizations, the leaders in various organizations should also encourage multiple realities (Simmons, 2007). Leaders from organizations should avoid looking for absolute truths in relation to different organizational issues or challenges but encourage varying perspectives to organizational problems (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). By promoting, absorbing and reflecting upon alternative views, organizations will be able to come up with new realities and solutions to organizational challenges (Simmons, 2007).
Organizational leaders should also promote dialogue in their quest to build appreciative organizations (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Newman, 2011). Leaders in organizations should, therefore, avoid being fearless leaders who only think of themselves and who make decisions unilaterally without consulting others. To build appreciative organizations leaders should deliberate various issues with members of the given organization and promote dialogue that results to multiple realities for organizations. The sharing of ideas will make them generative and more inclusive (Simmons, 2007). Dialogue is hence central to appreciative organizations and enhances trust among the members of an organization. Leaders who do not promote dialogue will thus just raise suspicion and alienation in their organizations that will affect productivity negatively (Simmons, 2007).

To build appreciative organizations, leaders should also encourage imagination in organizations which will enable the members of the given organization to come up with new ideas, visions, and desires for the future which will promote new actions and new solutions to organizational challenges (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Newman, 2011). Within an appreciative organizations, members should, therefore, try to be less reactive or worrying about how they are going to negotiate disasters but put more effort in cultivating imagination to solve more organizational challenges (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).

Furthermore, to be able to build efficient appreciative organizations, the leaders should also act more within the moment and hence avoid holding too much on past constructions such as established policies or long term plans (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). Though long-term plans may be beneficial to organizations, just sticking to them blindly may lead to the insensitivity towards the complexities of the daily organizational challenges (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Appreciative organization leaders should hence be open to new insights into various
situations in organizations change. Moreover, leaders should plan on how to respond to different crises in an organization while taking the steps as just a part of the process of resolving crises and not just focus on the only solution (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Newman, 2011). Finally, to establish appreciative organizations, leaders should also encourage the members of their organizations to keep conversations about the various issues affecting the organizations going (Simmons, 2007). This is because decisions have to be frequently made in organizations and hence constant ideas are needed to solve organizational challenges. Actions in appreciative organizations also need to remain continuously open for reconsideration (Kassam & Bushe, 2005).

4.4 The six freedoms of appreciative organizations

Appreciative organizations can also be defined by six freedoms that are generated by the appreciative inquiry process and help unleash the potential of individuals in a given organization and the organization as a whole. These freedoms include the freedom to be known in relationship, the freedom to dream together in a community, the freedom to be heard, the freedom to support certain initiatives in an organization, the freedom to be positive and the freedom to choose whether to contribute (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Newman, 2011).

A special characteristic of appreciative organizations is that through the use of appreciative interviews it can foster personal and relational relationships (Simmons, 2007). In other words, appreciative organizations give their members freedom to be in a relationship. Moreover, appreciative organizations offer their members an opportunity to recall when they felt best in an organization and felt that they were most engaged and proud of the organization (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Appreciative organizations will thus encourage their members to share
proud moments with their co-workers and other members in the larger organizational area that will enhance respect among the co-workers, affirm the relationships that are already present in an organization, and promote the formation of new relationships in an organization. Through the use of appreciative inquiry, the appreciative organization will also benefit from the equal distribution of power and authority across the organization (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).

Through the use of appreciative inquiry appreciative organizations also promote the freedom to be heard among their members (Trosten-Bloom & Whitney, 2004). In traditional organizations, the leaders of the organization may be found in contempt of not listening to their stakeholders without really taking a step to comprehend what they are saying or noting their concerns. However, appreciative organizations enhance relational hearing in that the leaders in such organizations are encouraged to listen to organizational members with curiosity, compassion, and empathy. The leaders are hence encouraged to know and understand their subordinates’ story and also pass the culture of hearing one another across an organization (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).

Appreciative organizations also allow all their members the freedom to dream in a community and come up with new models of service that are compelling to their targeted audience and will hence gain momentum more quickly (Simmons, 2007). Appreciative organizations will thus allow the people in them to unleash the energy which was already in the organization but had not been utilized and use it to make the organization explode into its next level (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). Appreciative organizations also give their members the freedom to choose whether they will contribute to the appreciative inquiry process and give them the freedom to join the process when they become curious, inspired or stimulated by the tasks associated with the appreciative inquiry (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). The workers in appreciative
organizations will thus choose when to get in the appreciative inquiry process such as whether to get on board at the beginning of the process or later on in the process (Simmons, 2007). Appreciative organizations will hence never be involved in coercing members into activities which encourage free will in organizations and hence motivates the stakeholders of given organizations to always make decisions which favor an organization (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). Additionally, appreciative organizations also offer their members opportunities to both support or not support certain organizational acts. This will lower the apathy and distrust that may be experienced in an organization due to the democratic value that is installed by the appreciative inquiry process (Simmons, 2007). Appreciative organizations are hence able to obtain feedback from their customers and stakeholders and also evaluate the level of support that they enjoy from the stakeholders and decide on what to change in the organizations (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004).

Most importantly, appreciative organizations give their members the freedom to be positive and shun all the negative thinking and talking that may be present in the organization (Simmons, 2007). The process of appreciative inquiry encourages members to avoid negative work environment behaviors such as blaming one another, complaining and criticizing one another. Appreciative organizational will hence be filled with people who focus on the positives of the organizations to build working relationships that will improve cooperation and gradually the productivity of a given organization (Avital & Cooperrider, 2004). The employees of appreciative organizations will normally be proud of their working experiences and this will go a long way in boosting the morale of workers in an appreciative organization.
CHAPTER 5: USING CONVERGENCE IN THE PROCESS OF BUILDING UP AN APPRECIATIVE ORGANIZATION

5.1 Building an Appreciative Organization

In the process of building up an appreciative organization, the appreciative inquiry process, the positive view of the world by use of social constructivism and a conversational convergence need to be sustained over an extended period of time. In other words, the process cannot be completed in a very short period of time but requires a rather lengthier period and much involvement. However, the process is worth it as the appreciative inquiry will help organizations sustain the positive changes adopted through the social constructivist approaches by creating a continuous conversational convergence around the constantly evolving directions and futures of an organization (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). Through conversational convergence, language will be used to create and sustain change over long periods of time hence making it central to the process of appreciative inquiry in building up appreciative organizations. Conversational Convergence will use language and interlink all the information and communication technologies, computing technologies, media content and communication networks which are available in an organization through the utilization of the internet and other mediums to sustain change in an organization (Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013). The people in charge of the appreciative inquiry process in an organization therefore need to be aware of the corporate conversational streams and work to positively influence these streams by use of positive psychology and social constructionist perspectives and converge this conversational streams by use of technology so as to sustain the change process over an extended period of time in an organization and lead to the emergence of an appreciative organization (Schall, Ospina,
Godsoe, and Dodge, 2004). Conversational Convergence is hence used to fuel the appreciative inquiry in the process of building up an appreciative organization. Moreover, conversational Convergence is employed in appreciative organizations to influence individuals such that they commit to appreciative leadership principles (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). Conversational Convergence is also applied at the corporate levels of an organization so that it can be used to incorporate appreciative design elements into the structure of a given organization to convert it fully into an appreciative organization (Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013).

For many organizations implementing the organizational vision that has been initiated by the appreciative inquiry process is usually challenging. The staff may become stressed and fatigued due to the many activities involved in the appreciative inquiry. Negativity may also creep into the people involved in the appreciative inquiry process and make them not to be inviting and hospitable as they are supposed to be under the appreciative inquiry process (Schall et al., 2014). This can result in the formation of camps and internal conflicts in an organization. What is wrong in an organization can also begin to gain more attention than what is right, and the members of an organization can grow tired of the appreciative inquiry process (Schall et al., 2014). There is therefore a need to come up with methods that can be used to sustain the forward movement that has been initiated by the appreciative inquiry process to form appreciative organizations. In this situation, conversational convergence helps sustain the changes that are initiated by the appreciative inquiry process and make them continuous and permanent in an organization hence leading to the formation of an appreciative organization (Schall et al., 2014). Conversational Convergence hence makes an appreciative inquiry to be more than just an intervention tool in an organization but a long lasting impression by sustaining the changes that are adopted by the AI process towards the formation an appreciative organization (Bushe, 2012).
Through the use of appreciative inquiry, organizations will naturally work and dream towards positive futures. However, organizations do not possess the ability to predict the exact time in which their visions will be realized and when they will achieve their dreams. Moreover, organizations are never truly aware of how long their success can last. As a consequence of this sort of uncertainty, organizations strive to sustain the changes adopted by an appreciative inquiry by working towards a certain defined future but remaining responsive and adaptive to the surprises the future may throw at them (Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013). By use of conversational convergence organizations try to sustain positive changes brought about by the appreciative inquiry process while being flexible to any challenges that may face their resultant appreciative organization. The changes brought about by the appreciative inquiry process which can be referred to as appreciative changes are hence sustained in an organization by shaping the organization's conversational streams and making appreciative inquiry a continuous philosophical approach in an organization rather than a one-time or periodical intervention technique (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). The sustainability of the changes brought about by appreciative inquiry is also facilitated by the organization design and leadership development in a given organization (Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013).

5.2 Principles for sustainability of the appreciative inquiry process when building an appreciative organization.

There are three main principles that determine whether the appreciative inquiry process results to an appreciative organization or fails in a given organization. These principles include shaping conversations through conversational convergence, fostering appreciative leadership, and creating an appreciative organizational design (Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013; Rickketts & Willis, 2012; Schall et al., 2004).
5.2.1 Shaping conversations through conversational convergence

Language is one of the main tools that are used to develop appreciative leadership and appreciative organization designs through conversational convergence (Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013). The instigators of the appreciative inquiry process should hence adopt practices that will shape the conversations of individuals and organizations as a whole to enhance the sustainability of the appreciative inquiry process. These practices include paying attention to the dominant discourse in an organization and other conversational streams and identifying their origin and paths that they take and the influence that such conversations have on individual members of a given organization (Bushe, 2012). The overseers of the appreciative inquiry process in an organization should also evaluate the direction that personal conversations are likely to lead an organization to and their strength that relates to the amount of power they exert on the members of a given organization (Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013). Additionally, the supervisors of the appreciative inquiry procedures in an organization should also reveal the vision they have for a given company that made them install the appreciative inquiry process and the obstacles that may be encountered while trying to achieve the highlighted vision. The instigators of the appreciative inquiry process in an organization should also listen to the discussions of the development of the change process in an organization and hence be able to react to any challenges that may arise in the course of building an appreciative organization (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). To sustain the appreciative inquiry process in an organization, organizational leaders should encourage conversations of opportunity and possibility in their organizations so as to inspire the other members of the given organization to move in the direction of the desired future. The stakeholders of a given organization will hence be attracted to the vision of the
organization when leaders involve them in the conversations of success and hope that will make them be more imaginative and creative toward achieving the set goals (Bushe, 2012).

The instigators of the appreciative inquiry process in an organization should also evaluate how different conversations in the organization influence each other in the process of appreciative inquiry and discourage diverging conversations and conversations that may be competitive (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Newman, 2011). Supervisors of the appreciative inquiry process should also evaluate the positive or negative impact of the primary organizational conversations and the initiatives that have been set up by appreciative inquiry. By use of conversational convergence, the instigators of appreciative inquiry processes in organizations should continuously consider all the voices of the whole system and include a broad spectrum of stakeholders in building shared meanings (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). This will make appreciative organizations be able to access a lot of information quickly while making all stakeholders in the organization to be more committed to pursuing a given vision or innovation in an organization. Instigators of the appreciative inquiry process in a given organization should also use conversational convergence to continually seek shared meaning-making as various members of an organization join and leave conversations (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). By including an ever-increasing number of voices in the appreciative inquiry process, the overseers of the appreciative inquiry process can improve the quality of change by fostering shared meaning and collective action among the members of a given organization. The instigators of the appreciative inquiry process in a given organization can also enhance conversational convergence through the use of modern communication tools such as social networking sites which include Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube (Diehl & Karmasin, 2013). Emails can also be used to pass written documents. Written communication pieces will play a significant role in
extending the dialogue during the appreciative inquiry process to the future and hence making the changes that are adopted during the AI process to be sustained over long periods of time as new meanings will be continuously created in the process of dialogue (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006).

5.2.2 Appreciative leadership

Appreciative leadership is an important pillar of an appreciative organization as it would be impossible to use the appreciative inquiry process to build appreciative organizations if the leaders in the organization do not follow the principles of appreciative leadership. To create an appreciative organization, the leaders in an individual organization have to incorporate various appreciative concepts into their leadership commitments and personal intentions (Schall et al., 2014). These appreciative principles include a strong belief in possibility, unconditional positive regard, a radical inclusion of others in conversational convergence and fostering positive inquiry at all times in an organization (Schall et al., 2014). Appreciative leaders should have a strong belief that positive change will be possible and that the vision that they hold for the future of a given organization is real so that they may be the authentic origins of change in a given organization (Kassam & Bushe, 2005). Appreciative leaders will hence be able to connect with their positive values and beliefs so that they may become part of them that will be seen in their actions and the relationships they form in the organizations they lead.

Appreciative leaders should also have unconditional positive regard which should be based on their belief that all the members of a given organization have a unique intrinsic worth and that each stakeholder can be able to provide a positive contribution to the development of a given shared organizational vision (Schall et al., 2014). Appreciative leaders will hence make all
the people in a given organization contribute to the appreciative inquiry process as people will only participate in various organizational activities when they feel that they are valued and that their opinions will be considered (Rickketts & Willis, 2012).

In their quest to build appreciative organizations appreciative leaders should also continuously include the members of the given organization in the conversations that are important to the organization or the main conversational streams (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). The continuity in including members of a given organization in significant organizational conversations is important because during the cause of the appreciative inquiry process, several new members may join the organizations while many old corporate members may leave (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Newman, 2011). Appreciative leaders will hence seek to include various members of organizations in organizational conversations by personally inviting them, being hospitable to them, affirming their opinions and respecting them on the basis of an unconditional positive regard (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). Additionally, appreciative leaders will practice radical inclusion of organizational members to the corporate conversations without considering the time that it may take or the self-sacrifice it might require of them.

Appreciative leaders should also foster positive inquiry in organizations at all times even during the times of conflict. Moreover, appreciative leaders should continually focus on the value of the different members of certain organizations despite their different opinions (Schall et al., 2014). Appreciative leaders should also be interested in the best qualities and characteristics of their subordinates which can be utilized to recreate meanings and spark collective actions in a particular organization (Rickketts & Willis, 2012).
5.3.3 Appreciative Organizational Design

In order for appreciative inquiry to lead to the formation of an appreciative organization that can be sustained over a long period of time, the structure of traditional organizations has to be changed to more specific appreciative organizational designs (Rickketts & Willis, 2012; Gustafsson & Schwarz, 2013; Rickketts & Willis, 2012; Schall et al., 2004). As expected, appreciative organizational designs have specific design elements that distinguish them from traditional organizational designs. These design elements include the presence of processes that encourage the developing of shared visions, goals and efforts in the organizations that are aimed at developing appreciative leadership, the presence of organizational structures that encourage inclusion and finally the availability of process that encourages continuous inquiry into positive core (Schall et al., 2004).

An appreciative organizational design has processes that develop shared visions and goals across the organization. Therefore, the organizational vision is not created by just only the leaders of a given organization like in traditional organizations but also through a collaborative process that makes it rich and more likely to be implemented and sustained by the members of a given organization (Rickketts & Willis, 2012).

Additionally, an appreciative organizational design is characterized by efforts to develop appreciative leadership across all the departments of a given organization and among all its stakeholders (Lewis & Moore, 2011). The leadership training programs in appreciative organizations will therefore include developing skills among the trainees such that they would be able to convene a wide range of stakeholders in conversations which focus on the positive
aspects of the past of given organizations and come up with processes which develop a shared vision among stakeholders (Lewis & Moore, 2011). The leadership training programs in appreciative organizations should also develop an ability of leaders to shape conversations that improve the organizations and strengthen the relationships between the various members of the given organizations (Lewis & Moore, 2011).

Appreciative organizational designs should also be founded on structures that encourage inclusion. Structural inclusion in organizations facilitates the participation of all members of a given organization in conversations that positively grow the organization and enhance shared meanings and common purpose among the members of a given organization (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006).

Furthermore, appreciative organizational designs also encourage the formation of processes that support the continuous inquiry into a positive core. This is done through the use of the four main steps of the appreciative inquiry process that include discovering, dreaming, designing, and destiny (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). The continuous appreciative inquiry will hence make the changes that are adopted in an organization during the process of appreciative inquiry become sustained over a long period of time which will lead to the formation of an appreciative organization (Rickketts & Willis, 2012).

5.3 How to apply the principles that will sustain the appreciative inquiry process when building an appreciative organization.

As previously stated in this paper appreciative change can only be sustained in organizations by ensuring that organizational conversational streams are convergent and by
making appreciative inquiry a continuous philosophical approach in an organization which is facilitated by the organizational design and the leadership of a given organization (Schall et al., 2014). The appreciative inquiry should thus never be taken as a periodic intervention technique or a one-time solution to organizations in crisis but rather as a long-lasting method of sustaining growth and development of organizations. Therefore, it can be said that appreciative organizations are built by shaping conversations, by enhancing conversational convergence through relational leadership and by enhancing conversational convergence through organizational design (Kassam & Bushe, 2005; Schall et al., 2014).

I. The process of shaping conversations in appreciative inquiry so as to build appreciative organizations.

First of all, in the process of shaping conversations during the appreciative inquiry in an organization, the overseers of the AI process should listen attentively to the dominant discourses across the organization while considering various conversational streams (Lewis & Moore, 2011). Moreover, leaders of a given organization should be aware that the sustainability of appreciative change is based on the social constructionist perspectives that words are responsible for creating and shaping the world (Gergen, 2009; Brinkmann, 2005). These worlds that are created by words emerge and evolve as people join and leave conversations. In the process of appreciative inquiry as conversations flow within and around an organization a sense of a world that is evolving is created within an organization (Gervase, 2013). The overseers of the appreciative inquiry process in a given organization should hence identify the sources and the paths that various conversational streams take and explore the factors which influence such conversations so as to interpret the directions and strengths of such conversations in bringing and sustaining change in organizations (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). The conversations that arise from
the appreciative inquiry process are essential in revealing the vision of an organization, the direction that the given organization intends to take in the future and how the change process develops across the organization (Anderson, 2008). Appreciative leaders should hence remain watchful of the conversations in their organizations and be aware that shared meaning requires constant engagement between members of a given organization throughout the appreciative inquiry process (Anderson, 2008).

Those in charge of the appreciative inquiry process in organizations should always encourage organizational members to only join conversations of that promoted possibility and opportunity. According to Ludema, Whitney, Mohr, & Griffen, (2003), the questions which organizational members ask and the dialogues they will be involved in are subjective. This means that people will choose the conversations that they want to participate in their organizations (Ludema et al., 2103). The members of organizations will also choose how they want to engage in dialogue. Organizational members can thus choose whether to focus on the negative issues affecting an organization that are deconstructive. Such conversations can make the members of a given organization compete with one another on how to solve particular problems rather than work together to make to solve the challenges that face organizations (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). However, when the members of a given organization focus on the positive aspects of an organization and engage in conversations of hope, success, and possibility they will move in the direction of an envisioned future together while sharing each other’s vision and drawing out creativity and imagination from one another (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). The personal engagements between the members of appreciative organizations should hence be exercised with positive and generative conversations. Positive and generative conversations will make organizational members imagine, create and move in the direction of a particular shared
vision of what can exist in a given organization and what should exist (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). To encourage positive and generative conversations in their organizations, appreciative leaders should hence evaluate conversations constantly within an organization and focus the limited personal and organizational resources to positive conversations that will lead to the achievement of an organizational vision rather than wasting resources on competitive and destructive conversations (Rickketts & Willis, 2012).

Appreciative leaders should also identify and attend to conversational cross-influence and balance across the appreciative organization. Additionally, appreciative leaders should seek to attend to conversational cross-influences in a timely way in their organizations so as to positively influence them towards convergence rather than letting divergence set in in organizations that may develop into competition in the long run (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). By being aware of how conversations flow in a given organization and their cross-influence change agents in various organizations can be able to de-personalize competitive conversations which may be divergent and determine the positive and negative impacts of such conversations in a way that achieves conversational balance (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). Conversational balance hence discourages antagonism in organizational conversations and encourages organizational members with differing opinion and ideas to discuss them openly with others so as to reach compromises and co-create meanings (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006).

Change agents in appreciative organizations should also continuously consider the voices of the whole system. These include the voices of the senior management in an organization, opinions of the administrative leadership, opinions of the staff and other stake holders in an organization (Schall et al., 2014). The inclusion of the voices of all the members of a given organization in the change conversation during the process of appreciative inquiry enables the
members of the organization to understand the need for the change, analyze the current realities of given organizations and make decisions on what should be changed, generate ideas on how the existing process should be changed, and begin to support and implement the change efforts (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). Considering the voices of all stakeholders in a given organization will hence build shared meanings and help the change agents access more information and be able to progress more quickly in pursuing innovation and building commitment of all stakeholders to the change process (Rickketts & Willis, 2012).

The change agents in an organization should also continually pursue shared meaning making as different organizational members join and leave conversations during the appreciative inquiry process (Anderson, 2008). Continuous meaning-making will help sustain the appreciative change as various people enter and leave a given organization. The continuous pursuit of shared meaning making increases the number of voices and improve the quality of change witnessed in appreciative organizations (Anderson, 2008).

Change agents in organizations should also expand conversations with written documents such as business plans and position papers. Such written documents will be essential when new people are involved in change conversations so as they can be incorporated into the change dialogues (Gervase, 2013). Written documents will also spark future dialogues and ensure the sustainability of the changes that are brought about by the appreciative inquiry process.

II. Enhancing conversational convergence through relational leadership in the process of building up an appreciative organization.

Organizations can also be able to sustain appreciative changes by incorporating belief, regard, movements and inclusion qualities among their leaders and other organizational members.
The belief in possibilities is an important characteristic that is central to sustaining appreciative change in organizations. The leaders in various organizations that want to be more appreciative together with their organizational members should hence be optimistic about solving certain organizational challenges and explore a wide range of ideas that will broaden their possibilities of solving certain organizational challenges (Anderson, 2008). Appreciative inquiry hence encourages intuitive knowledge of what is possible rather than what is true (Schall et al., 2004). Intuitive knowledge also focuses much on what might happen rather than what has already happened. Appreciative inquiry hence relies on the ability of human beings to project their expectations ahead of themselves and bring the future powerfully into the present as a causal agent (Schall et al., 2004). Therefore, hope for the future becomes a powerful catalyst for the change and transformation of appreciative organizations. In this context, appreciative change agents should live and act with a sense of excited anticipation of the unexpected in the future. Additionally, a change agent in an organization should hence stimulate collective imagination across the organization and aspirations which will create images of new possibilities that will, later on, guide the actions of the members of the particular organization (Schall et al., 2004).

Leaders in appreciative organizations can also be the primary sources of appreciative change in their organizations and at the same time also ensure that it is maintained throughout their company by viewing others with unconditional positive regard. Such leaders and the instigators of the appreciative inquiry process will believe that each end every maker of a given organization has an intrinsic worth and can be able to contribute to the development of a shared vision (Anderson, 2008). Leaders who view others with unconditional positive regard will therefore be able to encourage ideas and opinions that originate aside from the mainstream.
corporate conversations and which are essential to the continuation of the process of appreciative inquiry in organizations and the consequent rise of an appreciative organization (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). In order to maintain the appreciative inquiry process in their organizations towards the building of appreciative organizations, leaders should use in such a context appreciative language as a way of reducing resistance to promote and drive change among their organizational members and preparing them to adopt appreciative changes that will gradually result in appreciative organizations (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Leaders in organizations and the overseers of the appreciative inquiry process can also promote and create a positive atmosphere across the organization as members at all levels of an organization will respond positively to affirmation from their leaders and be able to connect more, create and amplify generative conversational streams which will lead to a compelling vision and positive goals being imagined and implemented through a given organization consequently making it an appreciative organization (Ludema et al., 2013). As leaders and the overseers of the appreciative inquiry process in organizations approach people in their organizations with unconditional positive regard, they can inspire higher values among organizational members. As a consequence, such organizational members will see similarities amongst them despite the differences in culture, religion, race and geographical locations (Ludema et al., 2013). Approaching people with unconditional positive regard in an organization will hence make organizational members focus on a set of shared ideas and tap into important values such as mutual respect, cooperation, living in community, justice, hospitality, fairness, peace, dignity of work and the stewardship of the natural environment (Ludema et al., 2013). By sharing such important ideals, such organizations will be able to become more appreciative for an extended period of time.
Leaders who want to create appreciative organizations should also seek to build conversational convergence which would be essential for the continued strength of their organizations by radically including as many people in an organization as possible into the conversational stream (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). The constant inclusion of various organizational members into the appreciative inquiry conversational streams is also important for appreciative organizations because it ensures the continuity of such organizations as new people join the organizations and other organizational members leave (Schall et al., 2004). Leaders and overseers of the appreciative inquiry process should hence invite all members of their organization to conversations especially by convincing them of their great intentions regarding organizations (Schall et al., 2004). A radical inclusion of all members of a given organization will thus mean that the overseers of the appreciative inquiry process and the leaders in a given organization will go beyond their farthest limits of time and self-sacrifice to make sure they include all organizational members in appreciative organizational discussions. Personal self-sacrifice of leaders of prospective appreciative organizations is also important in the building of trust across such organizations and communicating to the organizational members that the mission of a given organization is of greater significance than the personal agenda of the leaders of the organization and all the other subordinates (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). By use of current technology leaders of appreciative organizations can also radically include as many organizational members as possible to organizational conversations especially through the use of written communication. Written communications can play a vital role in the conversational convergence in organizations by distributing the organization's vision beyond individuals’ relational impact (Schall et al., 2004).
In the process of building appreciative organizations leaders in organizations can also enhance relational leadership by always promoting positive inquiry in organizations especially in the times of conflict. Such leaders should hence continually refocus on the value of others and inquire into the best during conflict so that they can provide a platform in which meaning can be created and collective action taken (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). Realizing that conflict and discomfort are a normal part of the human relationships appreciative inquiry will hence provide leaders with a reliable method with which they can constantly use to navigate through conflict and suggest the same method to the organizational members in their quest to build an appreciative organization (Ludema et al., 2013).

Leaders who want to build appreciative organizations should also chart organizational conversations that will give the leaders a powerful roadmap to determine how or when they move towards various stakeholders in a given organization. Leaders of appreciative organizations should hence draw up conversational maps which will help them rise above the emotions that come with conflicts in their organizations and be able to take an objective view of varying conversations which affect given conflicts in a corporation (Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). By being conscious of the conversational streams in their organizations leaders are hence able to choose which dialogues they can join, connect to, influence, strengthen, avoid or redirect in order to affect the desired outcomes. An appreciative leader will hence understand that the endless flow conversations in an organization and its larger environment requires a watchful, and anticipating individual who is aware that shared meaning requires a lot of continuous engagement (Ludema et al., 2013). Moreover, appreciative organizations are built on the conversational convergence among all their organizational members rather than excluding some organization members from conversations which will only broaden the divergence and create an
environment for competition in the organizations (Rickketts & Willis, 2012). When people in
given organizations compete for resources rather than cooperate and strive to be more visible and
seek to grow more personally rather than in a team they may become easily worn-out and
gradually lose interest in an organization and its functions (Ludema et al., 2013). To build
appreciative organization, leaders should therefore be always at the forefront of conflict
resolution to ensure that their organizational members learn and grow together in the process of
achieving specific organizational goals.

III. Enhancing organization convergence through organizational design.

Organizations can also be able to sustain appreciative changes by adopting appreciative
design elements into their organizational structures. These design elements include maintaining
openness to shared visions and goals, working to develop appreciative leadership, working to
develop intentional structural inclusion and committing to the continuous appreciative inquiry
(Fiol and Marjorie, 2015).

For an organization to be able to sustain appreciative changes it should create its
organizational vision through collaborative processes that will make it more implementable and
to be sustained for a long period (Oliver, 2011). By allowing organizational members to come up
with a given organization’s vision an organization can make the vision more compelling to the
organizational members and hence make it easier for them to implement it and feel passionate
towards it (Fiol and Marjorie, 2015). By collaborating with one another to create a shared vision,
the change process is also made easier in an organization as people will accept changes that they
are more familiar with more easily and hold onto such changes for a long time making the
changes to be sustainable (Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin, 2013). Appreciative changes in
organizations are also sustained by cross-level and cross-divisional creativity which will draw from a large number of voices across the organizations and produce a vibrant vision which improves sustainability and make the appreciative process last in organizations (Aldrich & Herker, 2011).

To maintain appreciative changes organizations must also make efforts to develop appreciative leadership. These will entail leadership training that includes skill development and involving all stakeholders in changing a system rather than making unilateral decisions (Fiol and Marjorie, 2015). Appreciative leadership will hence be essential to sustaining appreciative changes. Appreciative leadership includes reaching out to include various stakeholders in a given organization in conversations to review the past and borrow the best from it, coming up with a shared vision, and engaging in difficult organizational design tasks (Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin, 2013). Appreciative leaders are also aware of the conversational streams in a given organization and will work to invest in positive conversations throughout the organization while maintaining an intended balance across the different conversational streams in the different levels of an organization (Aldrich & Herker, 2011). Appreciative leaders are also motivated by positive psychology and social constructionist approaches in their organizations so as to always keep the members in a given organization motivated and enthusiastic to solve organizational challenges (Oliver, 2011).

Maintaining an organizational structure that encourages inclusion is one of the main steps which encourage appreciative change in organizations turning them into appreciative organizations. To ensure that an organization is structured in such a way that it is inclusive appreciative inquiry can unleash freedom and local initiative that enable sustainable solutions (Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin, 2013). Appreciative organizations can hence be said to go local
in that appreciative inquiry liberates local staff to innovate and thus pushes decision making from the central leadership. Appreciative inquiry thus allows all the members of an organization to dream and design their organizations and their social realities on local levels (Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin, 2013). Appreciative inquiry promotes inclusiveness by allowing people to dream and design in their organizations and their particular social realities at the local levels. This characteristic of appreciative inquiry is particularly advantageous for international organization’s development where local solutions will normally be the most appropriate for given local challenges (Oliver, 2011). Businesses that have their local teams close to their customers will also benefit from the appreciative inquiry characteristics of allowing people to solve problems from their particular social realities (Oliver, 2011). To encourage inclusion in appreciative organizations, the instigators of the appreciative inquiry process and the leaders of a given organization should try to maintain openness to discovery rather than trying to predetermine or control the outcomes of various situations (Aldrich & Herker, 2011). To build appreciative organizations leaders in given organizations should also identify the change agents and strengthen their change efforts and adopt processes which will help transfer the role of sparking change from the individual change agents into whole systems (Aldrich & Herker, 2011). Leaders in appreciative organizations should therefore constantly support the change agents in their organizations so that they may not grow tired of looting for a change. This is because it will take some time for an organization to adopt appreciative inquiry practices such that the organization can be able to sustain itself (Fiol and Marjorie, 2015). In a move to change organizational structures so as to encourage appreciative inquiry organizations should negotiate and create balanced scorecards for their different team members. These scorecards will be used
to define and measure the key activities that are required to move the goal and mission of the organization forward (Oliver, 2011).

For appreciative inquiry to succeed, organizations have also have to change their structures such that it encourages continual inquiry into the positive core. This means that all the members of a given organization will have to focus on the positive aspects of the organizations in addressing present and future challenges of the organization (Aldrich & Herker, 2011).

5.4 Conclusion.

With the modern trends of globalization, the rise of the mass culture, and increased unpredictability in the global markets it is essential for organizations to adopt organizational structures that are adaptable to the volatile modern business environments. Appreciative inquiry provides organizations with the needed stable organizational structure in the contemporary times. By use of social constructivism, positive psychology and convergent approaches organization can hence be able to improve the efficiency of the appreciative inquiry process and be involved in continuous progression towards their dreams and aspirations. Appreciative organizations can thus be referred to as the future organizations.
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