Tapestry: Journal of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging in Education

Volume 2 | Number 1 Article 6

2024

Embracing Change with Power and Love: Shifting Organizational Paradigms Leveraging Systems Thinking

Brandi R. Muñoz
Abilene Christian University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/deie

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, Educational Leadership Commons, Leadership Commons, Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons, Organization Development Commons, Other Education Commons, Performance Management Commons, and the Training and Development Commons

Recommended Citation

Muñoz, B. R. (2024). Embracing Change with Power and Love: Shifting Organizational Paradigms Leveraging Systems Thinking. *Tapestry: Journal of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging in Education, 2*(1).

Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/deie/vol2/iss1/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Tapestry: Journal of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging in Education by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ ACU.

Embracing Change with Power and Love: Shifting Organizational Paradigms Leveraging Systems Thinking

A change agent plays a pivotal role in influencing and redirecting the decisions and strategies of a change agency, whether it be a higher education institution or a corporate organization (Rogers, 2003). When considering organizational changes, introducing novel and innovative ideas by a change agent can either bolster the organization's trajectory or impede its progress (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Rogers, 2003; Skea, 2021; Tenkasi, 2018; Unger et al., 2021). Consequently, this process may trigger a power struggle among stakeholders who resist deviating from established strategies in favor of uncharted territory or vice versa (Maes & Van Hootegem, 2022). However, it is imperative to recognize that change necessitates a delicate balance of *power* and compassion or *love* as the organization evolves and adapts to a new normal (Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012).

In the context of organizational development and leadership, love is defined as a commitment to fostering collaboration, empathy, and mutual respect among team members (Kahane, 2009; Skea, 2021). This form of generative love motivates individuals to support and uplift each other, creating a positive and productive work environment (Kahane, 2009; Shani & Coghlan, 2021). *Generative love* contrasts with *degenerative love*, where self-serving priorities undermine collective goals and hinder organizational progress (Kahane, 2009). Thus, every stakeholder is responsible for acknowledging their role in effecting change and comprehending the significance of maintaining a balance between power dynamics and love within the organization (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012).

The Nature of Power

Power is defined as the capacity to influence others and drive change within an organization (Kotter, 2012). *Generative power* supports collaboration, innovation, and personal growth, while *degenerative power* hinders progress and demoralizes employees (Kahane, 2009; Maes & Van Hootegem, 2022). Organizations that wield power to impede employee development may face retention and engagement challenges (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Kahane, 2009). Therefore, organizations must recognize and leverage generative forms of power to foster employee success and organizational effectiveness (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kotter, 2012; Rogers, 2003). Power can manifest generative and degenerative forms (Kahane, 2009). Generative power often drives individuals to accomplish tasks that advance their careers, such as completing projects on time (Kahane, 2009). Conversely, degenerative power involves exerting control over others in a manner that suppresses their self-realization, as seen in the historical context of war (Kahane, 2009).

Generative power can inspire employee development and growth in an organization while fostering workplace culture transformations. For example, a faculty member aspiring to become a dean may pursue mentorship opportunities or engage in advanced research projects facilitated by the organization's support (Kahane, 2009). In contrast, degenerative power takes on a different meaning when employees encounter obstacles in their career progression, such as challenges in climbing the tenure track ladder (Kahane, 2009). Furthermore, suppose an employee's request for leadership preparation courses is denied. In this case, the power to succeed is effectively transformed into power over the individual's ability to advance, leading to frustration and decreased productivity (Kahane, 2009; Skea, 2021).

The Nature of Love

In the context of organizational development and leadership, love is defined as a commitment to fostering collaboration, empathy, and mutual respect among team members (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009; Skea, 2021). Generative love motivates individuals to support and uplift each other, creating a positive and productive work environment (Kahane, 2009; Shani & Coghlan, 2021). Success often stems from generative love, fostering individual collaboration and celebration (Kahane, 2009; Shani & Coghlan, 2021). For instance, leaders prioritizing the organization's goals over personal interests can inspire their followers to embrace a similar ethos, propelling the organization toward a new direction (Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012). In this sense, leaders can act as change agents, leveraging their influence to promote love through professional relationships and connections.

When considering love, individuals typically do not associate it with their professional lives or colleagues (Kahane, 2009). However, love can be a powerful motivator, inspiring individuals to assist others, mentor, coach, and advance professionally (Shani & Coghlan, 2021). It is essential to recognize that generative love alone may not always yield tangible change without accompanying power (Kahane, 2009). Generative love requires the backing of power to drive initiatives forward through collaboration (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009). In contrast, degenerative love involves using power for self-serving priorities, often at the expense of others (Kahane, 2009). Unfortunately, what may begin as generative love can sometimes devolve into degenerative love, particularly when personal success precedes collaboration (Kahane, 2009).

Degenerative Love in Politics

Politics offers numerous examples of degenerative love, where elected officials initially appeal to constituents using generative love but ultimately prioritize self-serving agendas (Kahane, 2009). This diversion from genuine conflicts and interests stifles innovation and hinders the emergence of new social realities (Kahane, 2009; Rogers, 2003). Moreover, the refusal to engage in constructive dialogue from a position of power mirrors degenerative love and contributes to a lack of progress (Begeny et al., 2022; Kahane, 2009). For example, the response to the COVID-19 pandemic in various countries illustrated how political agendas sometimes overshadowed public health needs, leading to inconsistent policies and public confusion (Begeny et al., 2022; Chatzittofis et al., 2021; Krings et al., 2023; Villarreal-Zegarra et al., 2022). This lack of coordinated response exacerbated the health crisis, highlighting the consequences of degenerative love in leadership.

Another real-world example is the Black Lives Matter movement, where leaders combined empathy and power to advocate for social justice, resulting in significant policy changes and increased awareness about racial inequalities (Krings et al., 2023; Nardini et al., 2021). The movement demonstrated the power of collective action in addressing systemic injustices and promoting social change. Social movements like Black Lives Matter succeed when people collaborate with a shared purpose to address injustice and inequality (Nardini et al., 2021). The movement highlighted the unjust treatment of racial and ethnic minorities, prompting collective action (Begeny et al., 2022). Additionally, the political context created by the COVID-19 pandemic and Black Lives Matter protests influenced perceptions about social welfare policy and political participation (Krings et al., 2023). Thus, love is essential for facilitating positive

change when combined with generative power (Begeny et al., 2022; Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012).

The Balance of Power and Love

Kahane (2009) explained how the equilibrium between power and love shapes new social realities. However, distinguishing between power *to* love and power *over* love reveals two distinct dynamics that can significantly impact an organization's dynamics (Kahane, 2009). For example, when leaders embrace power-to-love dynamics to drive systemic change, they foster meaningful collaboration among stakeholders, empowering themselves and others (Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012). Decisions arising from such collaboration tend to be more impactful and influential due to the generative power inherent in collective efforts (Kahane, 2009). Furthermore, achieving a delicate balance between power and love can propel individuals toward self-actualization and career success (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009). When divorced from power, love may fall short of enabling followers to reach their full potential. However, integrating generative power and love creates a synergistic effect that enhances organizational effectiveness and employee satisfaction (Kahane, 2009; Shani & Coghlan, 2021).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, organizations like Microsoft and Google implemented policies to support remote work and mental health, showcasing the balance of power and love in action (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Teevan et al., 2021; Whiting, 2021). These companies provided resources and support to ensure employees felt valued and empowered, fostering a collaborative and innovative work environment (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Whiting, 2021).

As an alternate view, consider the scenario where leaders assume the mantle of mentorship and coaching, actively contributing to workforce growth and development (Kahane, 2009). Central to this process is the exchange of feedback for continual improvement, characterized by generative love rooted in a power dynamic essential for eliciting positive change (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009). Organizations stand to gain significantly by recognizing the feedback process as an opportunity to optimize career development paths for succession planning and workforce enhancement (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). Hence, maintaining a delicate balance between power and love emerges as imperative for fostering the evolution and growth of organizations, particularly within leadership ranks (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009; Skea, 2021).

Interconnectedness in Organizations: Embracing Systems Thinking for Strategic Insight

Systems thinking is a holistic approach to understanding and analyzing complex organizational systems. It involves examining the interrelationships and interdependencies among various system components rather than focusing solely on individual parts in isolation (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Cummings & Worley, 2019; Langstrand, 2016). This perspective recognizes that changes in one part of the system can have ripple effects throughout the entire system, influencing its behavior and outcomes (Kotter, 2012). Systems thinking also emphasizes the importance of feedback loops, where information about the system's performance is continuously monitored and used to adjust actions and decisions (Langstrand, 2016; Rösch, 2002). By considering both the internal dynamics of the system and its external environment, organizations can gain insights into how to improve their functioning and achieve their goals (Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019).

Furthermore, systems thinking encourages a long-term perspective, recognizing that short-term fixes may not address underlying systemic issues and could lead to unintended consequences (Kahane, 2009; Langstrand, 2016). Instead, it advocates for a proactive approach that anticipates and prepares for potential changes and challenges (Rogers, 2003). Overall, systems thinking provides a framework for leaders and organizations to navigate complexity, promote innovation, and foster sustainable change (Kahane, 2009; Langstrand, 2016).

A crucial aspect of systems thinking is its intersection with power and love. Generative power and love are integral to creating a balanced and effective organizational environment (Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012). Power without love can become oppressive and stifle creativity. In contrast, love without power may lack the force needed to drive meaningful change (Kahane, 2009). Therefore, integrating these concepts within a systems thinking framework allows leaders to harness the influence to make impactful decisions and the empathy to foster collaborative and supportive environments (Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Microsoft used systems thinking during the COVID-19 pandemic to adapt their operations to remote work. The urgent need for prompt implementation involved continuous feedback loops to monitor employee well-being and productivity, enabling the company to make data-driven decisions that balanced organizational goals with employee needs (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Langstrand, 2016; Teevan et al., 2021; Whiting, 2021). This approach exemplified the effective integration of power and love, ensuring that decisions are authoritative and compassionate.

Rottenstreich et al. (2007) explored the decision-making process of dual-system theory and its implications for how individuals respond to various situations. When individuals engage in system 1 thinking, decisions are typically based on past experiences, situational recollection,

and intuition (Rottenstreich et al., 2007). In contrast, system 2 thinking involves a more deliberate consideration of facts over feelings (Rottenstreich et al., 2007). The neuroscience behind decision-making suggests that people tend to make decisions either rapidly and intuitively or slowly and purposefully (Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019). Moreover, system 1 thinking predominates in daily decision-making for most individuals (Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019).

Rottenstreich et al. (2007) further delineated how system 1 thinking often leads to self-serving decisions as it relies on memory-based components, resulting in quicker but less thoughtful decisions that may impede team collaboration and innovation. For instance, organizational leaders prone to system 1 thinking may make impulsive decisions without adequately considering input from their teams. Conversely, leaders employing system 2 thinking take time to deliberate on various options and may seek input from others to ensure comprehensive data evaluation (Rottenstreich et al., 2007). Therefore, leaders serving as change agents may prioritize system 2 thinking over system 1 thinking to garner stakeholder buy-in (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). However, there are instances where system 1 thinking can positively influence decision-making, particularly in emergencies, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, where time constraints are paramount (Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019).

The Pitfalls of Overconfidence: Understanding Bias in Leadership Decisions

Overconfidence bias is a significant impediment to effective decision-making processes (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). This bias manifests through various sub-biases, including overprecision, overestimation, and overplacement (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). Overprecision may lead leaders to dismiss the need for hypothesis testing or overlook information that contradicts their preconceived notions (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). The pressure to make favorable decisions can exacerbate overprecision, prompting leaders to avoid confronting

inconvenient truths to preserve their public image (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Cummings & Worley, 2019). Similarly, overestimation can foster an illusion of control and inflated status among leaders (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). When leaders overestimate their decision-making prowess, it often leads to planning fallacies and self-enhancement biases, ultimately eroding their authenticity and credibility (Bazerman & Moore, 2012).

For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, several leaders underestimated the virus's impact and delayed critical responses, exacerbating the crisis (Chatzittofis et al., 2021; Villarreal-Zegarra et al., 2022). Furthermore, overplacement causes leaders to elevate their competitive stance excessively, often at the expense of themselves and others (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). Therefore, embracing an entrepreneurial style without heeding data-driven insights can trigger adverse outcomes (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). Consequently, overconfidence bias poses a substantial risk to leaders, diverting their focus from catalyzing change and maximizing human capital for optimal business outcomes (Shani & Coghlan, 2021).

However, integrating systems thinking can help mitigate overconfidence bias by encouraging a holistic view of the organization and emphasizing the interconnectedness of various components (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Langstrand, 2016). This perspective helps leaders recognize the ripple effects of their decisions and the importance of feedback loops in adjusting actions based on performance data (Langstrand, 2016; Rösch, 2002). Systems thinking advocates for considering both internal dynamics and external environments, thereby fostering a culture of continuous improvement and adaptability (Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019). Leaders who cultivate an organizational culture where the balance of power and love are valued create an environment that supports collaboration, innovation, and sustainable change (Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012). Moreover, generative power and love within a systems thinking framework can

counteract the detrimental effects of overconfidence bias by promoting an inclusive and holistic approach to leadership and decision-making (Kahane, 2009). As a result, decisions with a balanced consideration of authority and empathy enhance organizational effectiveness (Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Another strategy involves soliciting 360-degree feedback from peers, subordinates, and superiors to mitigate overconfidence bias. Constructive feedback serves as a reality check, facilitating intentional adjustments and leveraging strengths for organizational and personal development (Cummings & Worley, 2019). Additionally, engaging in personality assessments, conflict style analyses, and leadership evaluations can enhance self-awareness and refine decision-making processes in social contexts (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Skea, 2021). Thus, by integrating feedback mechanisms and fostering introspective practices, individuals can equip themselves with the necessary tools to enhance decision-making efficacy and achieve favorable career trajectories (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Whiting, 2021). Furthermore, overconfidence bias can significantly hinder effective leadership and decision-making. However, by embracing systems thinking and balancing power with love, leaders can mitigate these biases and foster a culture of continuous improvement and collaboration. This approach enhances individual and organizational performance and ensures that decisions are well-informed and aligned with long-term strategic goals.

Cultivating a Culture of Informed Decision-Making: Insights for Leaders

Effective decision-making is a cornerstone for future success as organizations transition under new leadership. Initially, selecting a methodology or tool becomes paramount in facilitating informed decisions regarding performance evaluation, business strategy, and human

capital planning (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Skea, 2021). For example, Microsoft utilized data-driven strategies to manage remote work efficiently during the COVID-19 pandemic, emphasizing the importance of up-to-date insights over historical precedents (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Teevan et al., 2021). Addressing knowledge gaps necessitates strategic hiring decisions and the engagement of external experts to infuse fresh perspectives and enhance competitiveness (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). Instead of relying solely on historical precedents, leaders must leverage current data to ensure decisions are rooted in up-to-date insights (Bazerman & Moore, 2012).

Organizations like Google adapted to new challenges by continuously updating their strategies based on real-time data, ensuring informed and agile decision-making (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Teevan et al., 2021; Whiting, 2021). Furthermore, leaders and stakeholders should engage in introspection, acknowledge their biases, and commit to acting as change agents to drive strategic shifts in decision-making paradigms (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). This level of commitment includes fostering awareness of various biases among all stakeholders to promote understanding and facilitate healthy conflict resolution (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Kahane, 2009). Moreover, stakeholders should establish a dedicated committee tasked with market research to discern competitors' strategies, thus positioning the organization for success.

For instance, many companies have continuously formed task forces to monitor market trends and competitor actions during the pandemic, allowing them to pivot quickly and effectively (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021). Such endeavors contribute to cultivating an environment where decisions are

informed by a balanced consideration of power and love (Kahane, 2009). Ultimately, stakeholders should exemplify and nurture an ethical workplace culture where sound decision-making is prioritized (Bui & Galanou, 2022; Kahane, 2009; Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019). Thus, effective decision-making is the linchpin of organizational planning processes, with strategic planning bridging decisions for actionable plans (Bui & Galanou, 2022; Kahane, 2009; Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019). Furthermore, credible decision-making forms the cornerstone of strategic planning endeavors, creating value for stakeholders and endorsing organizational initiatives (Bui & Galanou, 2022; Kahane, 2009; Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019). Consequently, project plans emerge as instrumental tools for translating decisions into tangible actions (Bui & Galanou, 2022; Kahane, 2009; Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019).

Implications

The insights from this discussion have several critical implications for organizational leaders and stakeholders:

Enhanced Decision-Making

Integrating systems thinking into decision-making processes can significantly enhance the quality of decisions leaders make. This approach ensures a holistic view of the organization, considering internal dynamics and external environmental factors (Bui & Galanou, 2022; Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019; Langstrand, 2016).

Balanced Leadership

Emphasizing the balance between power and love in leadership practices can lead to more effective and sustainable organizational change (Skea, 2021; Tenkasi, 2018; Unger et al., 2021). Leaders who leverage generative power and love can foster a more inclusive and

innovative workplace culture, ultimately driving long-term success (Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012; Skea, 2021; Unger et al., 2021).

Mitigating Biases

Recognizing and addressing overconfidence bias and other cognitive biases is crucial for improving leadership effectiveness. Implementing feedback mechanisms such as 360-degree feedback and engaging in reflective practices can help leaders make more informed and unbiased decisions (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Shani & Coghlan, 2021; Skea, 2021).

Strategic Planning and Adaptation

Organizations must prioritize strategic planning and adaptability, especially amid unprecedented challenges like the COVID-19 pandemic. Utilizing data-driven insights and monitoring market trends can help organizations remain agile and competitive (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Whiting, 2021).

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should delve into the practical applications of systems thinking in various organizational contexts to understand its impact on decision-making and innovation (Bui & Galanou, 2022; Langstrand, 2016). Investigating how systems thinking can help integrate power and love within organizational structures is essential for fostering holistic and sustainable change. Moreover, examining the long-term effects of balancing power and love in leadership can provide deeper insights into fostering sustainable organizational cultures (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009; Skea, 2021). Further studies on mitigating overconfidence bias through reflective practices and feedback mechanisms can enhance our understanding of effective leadership strategies (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Shani & Coghlan, 2021; Skea, 2021).

Moreover, exploring how these strategies integrate into a systems thinking framework will be valuable in promoting informed and balanced decision-making processes. Also, investigating the role of artificial intelligence (AI) technology in supporting data-driven decision-making and innovation in the post-pandemic era will be crucial for future organizational development (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Whiting, 2021). Understanding how generative AI can help leaders facilitate the balance of power and love and mitigate overconfidence bias will be pivotal in creating resilient and adaptable organizations.

Conclusion

Change is inevitable in organizational dynamics, necessitating a balance between power and love to drive meaningful progress. This article explored the interplay of these elements, emphasizing how leaders, associates, and stakeholders must empower themselves and others to foster collaboration and make informed decisions that resonate with future success (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kahane, 2009; Kotter, 2012). Leveraging generative power and love strengthens relationships and ignites innovation internally among workgroups and externally with clients. Conversely, succumbing to degenerative power and love poses significant risks to an organization's mission, vision, and core values (Kahane, 2009; Maes & Van Hootegem, 2022).

A culture of informed decision-making is critical for organizational success. This requires selecting appropriate methodologies and tools, addressing knowledge gaps through strategic hiring, and leveraging current data for decision-making (American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2021; Bazerman & Moore, 2012). Establishing dedicated committees for market research and fostering awareness of stakeholder

biases ensures a balanced consideration of power and love in decision-making processes (Kahane, 2009; Whiting, 2021). Such strategies bolster organizational advancement and promote sustainable change and innovation.

Understanding dual-system thinking is paramount. System 1 thinking, which relies on intuition and quick decision-making, can lead to less thoughtful decisions. In contrast, System 2 thinking is more deliberate and involves careful consideration of facts. Leaders should prioritize System 2 thinking to enhance decision-making efficacy and garner stakeholder buy-in (Bazerman & Moore, 2012). Recognizing biases and understanding how overconfidence can impede personal and collective advancement is essential for effective leadership. Reflective practices and expert recommendations can help align strategic planning with overarching organizational goals (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Shani & Coghlan, 2021; Skea, 2021).

Ultimately, integrating systems thinking with a balance of power and love and mitigating overconfidence bias through reflective practices and feedback mechanisms can significantly enhance decision-making processes. These strategies not only improve individual and organizational performance but also ensure that decisions are well-informed, agile, and aligned with long-term strategic goals, thereby fostering a resilient and adaptable organization (Bui & Galanou, 2022; Kannengiesser & Gero, 2019; Langstrand, 2016).

References

American Psychiatric Association Foundation & Center for Workplace Mental Health. (2021). A top priority: Employee mental health & well-being during & beyond COVID-19. In *https://www.workplacementalhealth.org/*. Retrieved June 18, 2024, from https://www.workplacementalhealth.org/getmedia/8a954e5a-45ed-4f25-80f9-5d28514306a3/WPMH-Employee-Mental-Health-and-Well-Being-COVID-19#page=4.35

Bazerman, M. H., & Moore, D. A. (2012). *Judgment in managerial decision making* (8th ed.). Wiley.

Begeny, C. T., Van Breen, J., Leach, C. W., Van Zomeren, M., & Iyer, A. (2022). The power of the Ingroup for promoting collective action: How distinctive treatment from fellow minority members motivates collective action. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *101*, 104346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2022.104346

Bui, H. T., & Galanou, E. (2022). Translation of systems thinking to organizational goals: A systematic review. *Journal of General Management*, *47*(4), 233–245. https://doi.org/10.1177/03063070211035749

Chatzittofis, A., Constantinidou, A., Artemiadis, A., Michailidou, K., & Karanikola, M. N. K. (2021). The role of perceived organizational support in mental health of healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.707293

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2019). *Organization Development and Change* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Kahane, A. (2009). *Power and love: A theory and practice of social change*. Berrett-Koehler

Publishers.

Kannengiesser, U., & Gero, J. S. (2019). Design thinking, fast and slow: A framework for Kahneman's dual-system theory in design. *Design Science*, *5*(e10), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2019.9

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Press.

Krings, A., Wathen, M. V., & Kilbane, T. (2023). How COVID-19 and racial justice protests influenced social workers' perceptions of policy and political participation. *Social Work Research*, *47*(4), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svad019

Langstrand, J. (2016). The missing link in systems thinking: The impact of infrastructure on organizational change. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, *8*(2), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-09-2015-0061

Maes, G., & Van Hootegem, G. (2022). Power and politics in different change discourses. *Administrative Sciences*, *12*(2), 64. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12020064

Nardini, G., Rank-Christman, T., Bublitz, M. G., Cross, S. N. N., & Peracchio, L. A. (2021). Together we rise: How social movements succeed. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *31*(1), 112–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1201

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Rösch, E. (2002). Lewin's field theory as situated action in organizational change. *Organization Development Journal*, *20*(2), 8–14. https://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2002-13489-001

Rottenstreich, Y., Sood, S., & Brenner, L. (2007). Feeling and thinking in Memory-Based versus Stimulus-Based choices. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *33*(4), 461–469. https://doi.org/10.1086/510219

Shani, A. B., & Coghlan, D. (2021). Researching change and changing: Integrating collaboration

and action through interiority. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *57*(4), 478–483. https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863211026094

Skea, R. (2021). *Leadership, organizational change and sensemaking*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003022503

Teevan, J., Hecht, B., & Jaffe, S. (2021). The new future of work: Research from Microsoft into the pandemic's impact on work practices. In Microsoft.com. Retrieved June 18, 2024, from https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/uploads/prod/2021/01/NewFutureOfWorkReport.pdf#page=55.09

Tenkasi, R. V. (2018). Re-visiting the past to re-imagine the future of organization development and change. *Organization Development Journal*, *36*(4), 61–75.

Unger, C., Mosley, D. C., Jr., Gillis, W. E. B., & Maes, J. D. (2021). The tree of organizational change: Historic narrative overview. *Organization Development Journal*, *39*(3), 55–66.

Villarreal-Zegarra, D., Reátegui-Rivera, C. M., Sabastizagal-Vela, I., Burgos-Flores, M. A., Cama-Ttito, N. A., & Rosales-Rimache, J. (2022). Policies on mental health in the workplace during the COVID-19 pandemic: A scoping review. *PloS One*, *17*(7), e0272296. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0272296

Whiting Kate. (2021, October 6). Microsoft has found we're working longer and collaborating less during COVID-19. World Economic Forum. Retrieved June 18, 2024, from https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/10/microsoft-study-covid19-work-hours/