



The Generative Change Community

Exploring, nurturing, and promoting generative dialogic change processes for an equitable and sustainable world

Context

In the past couple of decades, there has been a significant movement to embrace the idea of multi-stakeholder processes as a strategy for societal change.¹ This approach is appealing because it holds out the promise of constructive and creative engagement of different actors and interests, often across profound divides – sectors, nationalities, cultural and religious identities, as well as differences in wealth, education, and opportunity.² Institutions engaged in fields such as conflict prevention, peace building, human development, democracy building, global governance, and environmental sustainability have organized and sponsored multi-stakeholder processes in a wide variety of contexts.³

A field of practice has also emerged, as individuals and institutions seek to develop the capacity to conduct these processes effectively. Training programs and practitioner networks have sprung up in every region of the world.⁴ There are books and articles on theory and practice, and there has been a surge of innovation in process designs and process tools.⁵ Many practitioners call the focus of this field of work multi-stakeholder processes, but many others use different terms, for example, dialogue, deliberation, public engagement, participatory governance, participatory appraisal, participatory monitoring and evaluation, participatory action research. Without seeking to minimize the distinctiveness of these streams of work, our definition of “the field” embraces all of them under the heading of multi-stakeholder processes.

This surge of activity and field development provides the context in which the Generative Change (GC) Community was launched in 2005 as a global community of practice focused on strengthening the world’s capacity to address complex challenges collectively through dialogic processes. Following Einstein’s much-quoted insight that problems cannot be solved at the same level of thinking that created them, many people have noted that our ability to address the complex challenges we face today will largely depend on whether we can move to a new level of thinking about them. At the same time, we can be sure that new challenges, unknown today, will emerge to confront us in future.⁶ This presents a developmental challenge for humankind: to build our capacity to rise to a new level of collective thinking and action when needed.

The turn toward multi-stakeholder processes suggests that many people recognize the need for this capacity. The vision of change brought about by the heroic individual leader or elite team continues to inspire many, but an alternative vision has arisen along with the rise of multi-stakeholder engagement. As one practitioner has described it, “Through . . . dialogue you basically assure ownership of the process, and ownership is a commitment towards reform. Without ownership, reform remains a bit of a superficial exercise. But when that ownership is assured, people really take issues forward, and that produces remarkable results compared to other experiences.”⁷ From this perspective, the best hope for effective responses to complex challenges such as threats to food security, persistent poverty and inequality, widespread conflict, environmental degradation, and climate change lies in processes that engage stakeholders in collective decision making and action.⁸

Yet there is also recognition that assembling a diverse group of stakeholders is not, by itself, sufficient to deliver desired change outcomes.⁹ Another aspect of the current context, therefore, is a sense of urgency among many proponents of participatory processes to learn how to make them more effective and to understand more clearly the role they can play in different strategies for societal change. Indicative of these concerns are the intense preoccupation with monitoring and evaluation and the increasing focus on theories of change that has taken hold in recent years.¹⁰

One obstacle to this push for greater effectiveness is the emergent and quite fragmented state of the field. For example, among people using multi-stakeholder processes to address

different issues – conflict, HIV/AIDS, human rights, gender equity, disarmament, climate change, human development, water, etc. – there is a silo-like lack of connection and lack of awareness of each other and other approaches.¹¹ Within the issue silos, there is a plethora of theories of change in use with few efforts so far to understand the differences, similarities, and interactions among them.¹² Similarly, process experts in the field are still in the early stages of developing the collective understanding needed to support consistently wise match-ups between dialogic change processes and process tools and the contexts in which they are to be deployed. So far this effort has consisted primarily of cataloguing methods and their applications, while the links to larger change strategies and the underlying theories of change have yet to be made.¹³ The development of mastery remains a mostly individual pursuit.¹⁴ Practitioners in this field have yet to do the kind of rigorous analysis of collective experience that could uncover the shared assumptions and develop shared understanding about how and under what circumstances different dialogic processes can create change.

GCC Assumptions

The work of the GC Community is guided by four assumptions about what is needed to enhance the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder processes within the current context as we see it.

1. **OUTCOMES:** We assume there is significant potential to improve outcomes by improving the quality of interaction in multi-stakeholder groups. This includes both the emotional and the cognitive aspects of interaction, which we see as interdependent in effecting outcomes. In a high-quality interaction, the quality of communication – both words and actions – enables the participants to develop a level of mutual understanding that will enable and support coordinated action. We call the kind of processes that deliver this kind of interaction generative dialogic change processes.¹⁵ Participants in such processes experience fundamental shifts toward greater self, group, and system awareness, and these shifts create collective capacity to achieve greater coordination of understanding and alignment in joint action. The mission of the GC community—to *explore, nurture, and promote generative dialogic change processes for an equitable and sustainable world*—rests on the belief that this kind of process can both deliver the cultural and institutional innovation required for effective responses to the problems at hand and develop the capacities required to address future challenges as they arise.
2. **STRATEGIC FOCUS:** We also recognize the need to develop greater understanding of how the shifts that occur in individuals and groups in generative dialogic change processes can translate into the kinds of cultural and institutional innovation that can have a lasting impact on the problems society faces. This leads to our second guiding assumption: that focusing attention on the change strategies in which these processes are embedded presents another opportunity to increase effectiveness.
3. **PRACTITIONERS:** Our third assumption has multiple elements:
 - a. We define practitioners of dialogic change processes as all the agents of change – in every region and at every level – who promote, sponsor, convene, fund, design, facilitate, or otherwise enable multi-stakeholder engagement as a means of achieving that change
 - b. We assume that these practitioners collectively hold the knowledge and intelligence required to make multi-stakeholder processes more effective
 - c. We assume that there are a number of constraints that inhibit practitioners from undertaking the collective inquiry that could produce the knowledge needed to move the field toward greater effectiveness, for example:
 - i. The emergent and fragmented state of the field, described above
 - ii. A sense of urgency in addressing current problems that creates pressure on time, attention, and other resources to focus exclusively

on advancing change initiatives on the ground, reducing the resources available for learning activities

- iii. A general preference in the funding community for projects that are outcome-oriented over those that are process-oriented
 - d. We assume that creating spaces for generative dialogue among practitioners will mitigate those constraints and will create significant opportunities to tap the collective knowledge and mobilize the collective intelligence needed to raise the practice of multi-stakeholder processes everywhere to a higher level of effectiveness
 - e. We assume that the number of practitioners who are willing to invest time, energy, and relational capital to participate in and bring others into such spaces is sufficient to create the “critical yeast”^{*} needed to move the field as a whole
4. **IMPACT:** Finally, we assume that developing capacity in this field of practice and increasing the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder processes will contribute to building confidence and the political will needed to make this the preferred approach to problem solving and collective decision making at all levels in all sectors.

Current Objective

Our main objective and focus for the next three to five years is to support practitioners – broadly defined, as above – in developing the collective capacity to make multi-stakeholder processes generative of substantial, enduring, change. We frame this goal in terms of building virtuosity in the field. “Virtuosity,” write Barnett and Kimberly Pearce, “is what results when people follow their passions to know something well and to perform skillfully.”¹⁶ The Pearces specify that knowing something well means having the “ability to make perspicacious distinctions” among the different tools and skills involved in the activity.¹⁷ By definition, these are distinctions “based on keen awareness, sound judgment, and often resourcefulness, especially in practical matters”¹⁸ This means, in particular, knowing when and how each skill or tool can be employed to greatest effect. As the field develops and matures, we hope to see it take on this virtuosic characteristic, such that all practitioners become capable of developing effective strategies and making good process choices in response to the challenges presented by specific contexts.

A principle guiding the GCC approach is that context is of paramount importance in multi-stakeholder processes. There are no simple recipes for success. This is why we believe that helping the field to strengthen this key aspect of virtuosity, the distinction-making capacity, is an essential step toward raising our collective ability to get the greatest possible benefit from these processes.

Our objective flows from our assumptions about practitioners – about the knowledge and intelligence they hold collectively and the potential for tapping those by bringing diverse groups of practitioners into *generative dialogic learning processes*. We envision that in such settings, they can bring their different experiences and perspectives to bear on the task of drawing useful distinctions, for example, between

- different kinds of context
- different approaches to the question of whom to engage in a multi-stakeholder process
- different possible strategies, and the theories of change that inform them
- different outcomes that have resulted from choices made in specific contexts.

^{*} The concept of “critical yeast” amplifies the strictly numeric idea of “critical mass,” expressing the notion that a relatively small number of individuals can have an outsized impact due to their connections to an ability to influence key networks of people.

In this scenario, the diversity of experience in the field becomes an asset, increasing the opportunities for perspective taking. Practitioners who are open to examining their own assumptions and practice, and who are curious about the experience and perspectives of others will have an opportunity to cultivate virtuosity individually. And they can contribute to the collective intelligence that will build virtuosity in the field as a whole.

Approach

Our approach is engage practitioners in generative dialogic learning processes. After two years (2006-2007) of formative work with a core group of practitioners, the GC Community is now poised to connect to continue to connect to other individuals and networks.¹⁹ Building on the work of prior years, we have developed and piloted an initial version of a learning platform to help practitioners reflect on and share their experiences in a way that will

- Provide a common format for practitioners to share experiences -- a way of “telling the story” that allows to grasp quickly and then inquire more deeply into the case
- Enrich the stories told, to promote greater collective understanding
- Raise the level of conversation and the level of thinking in peer learning settings by promoting and supporting distinction making
- Deepen and broaden the collective thinking about change strategies by illuminating and distinguishing among underlying theories of change

We believe that the GCC platform for collective learning (see Appendix A), combined with basic principles of process design for creating high-quality interactions, will provide the basis for generative dialogic learning processes. We will continue to use and develop this learning process format with practitioners who have enthusiasm for peer learning and the ability to devote some time and attention to it.

Presently, we are pursuing engagement in a variety of areas:

- GCC Action learning engagements: currently we are planning work with GAN-Net (<http://www.gan-net.net>), EcoAgriculture Partners (<http://www.ecoagriculture.org/>), and Keystone (<http://www.keystonereporting.org>)
- The Global Action Learning Initiative: in 2008 we are working with Wageningen International – Programme for Capacity Development and Institutional Change (<http://www.cdic.wur.nl/UK>) to build partnerships and raise funding for a large-scale initiative to enhance the impact of multi-stakeholder change processes in governing for sustainability
- Sessions at conferences in related networks (Democratic Dialogue workshop, Philippines, September 2007; Canadian Conference on Dialogue and Deliberation, November 2007; Facilitating Social Change Conference, Australia, May 2008; International Association of Facilitators regional meeting, South Africa, July 2008; and National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, Austin Texas, October 2008).

We are also planning and seeking resources to develop a web presence for the GCC, through which we can

- Share and promote the outputs of our learning processes in a dynamic, user-friendly format that will inspire and support practitioners
- Engage others in further developing our framework for distinction making
- Provide a vehicle for regular communication about GCC activities
- Link to related communities and networks to contribute to field building around the theme of generative dialogic change processes

Appendix A

So far we have piloted the process of distinction making in a workshop module created by Philip Thomas and first used in a workshop in Manila, in September 2007. In this exercise, Thomas introduced the concept of theory of change with a group exercise. With masking tape, he delineated a four-quadrant box on the floor. He named and described each quadrant as a distinct approach to change focusing on changing individuals, relationships, structures, or culture (see diagram below). Thomas then invited the workshop participants to step into the quadrant that best represents the approach they are taking in their current work. The small groups within each quadrant then talked about the characteristics of their work that placed them there, why they believed that approach to be an effective one for bringing about societal change, and how it differs from the approaches in the other three quadrants. Other GC Community members and coordinators have since worked with and continued to develop this learning module: Dale Hunter, GCC Asia member in two facilitator workshops (Australia, October-November 2007); Philip Thomas and Bettye Pruitt at the Canadian Conference on Dialogue and Deliberation (Vancouver, November 2007); Minu Hemmati in the “Facilitating Multi-stakeholder Dialogue” training of the Collective Leadership Institute (Potsdam, March 2008); Philip Thomas at the Facilitating Social Change Conference (Melbourne, May 2008).

Four Dimensions of Broad, Sustainable Change²⁰

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Individual</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Personal transformation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help individuals grow and develop greater self-awareness • Education to broaden knowledge base • Training to broaden competency base • Attention to mental and spiritual health and growth • Make explicit and examine assumptions, mindsets, mental models <p>Transformations not only in “<i>what</i>” one knows, but “<i>how</i>” one knows (epistemology)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Relationships</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Transforming relationships</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconciliation / Conflict transformation • Building trust • Promoting respect and recognition • Increasing knowledge and awareness of interdependence • Changing patterns of dysfunctional relations
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Culture</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Transforming collective patterns of thinking and acting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing the “rules” and values that sustain patterns of exclusion • Exploring and transforming taken-for-granted collective habits of thinking and behavior • Promoting more inclusive, participatory culture of “civic engagement” • Transforming patterns of overly simplistic and distorted discourse 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Structures / Systems</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Transforming structures, processes, mechanisms</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobbying for more just policies, greater transparency and accountability, institutional rearrangements • Just and equitable allocation of resources and services • Reforming processes

¹The breadth of the movement to multi-stakeholder processes is clearly visible through the link available at the MSP Resource Portal of Wageningen International : <http://portals.wi.wur.nl/msp/?Links>. At the international level, this trend emerged with the cycle of UN Summits and Conferences in the 1990s and the World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002, which brought about increasing openness to stakeholder participation and emphasis on partnerships among stakeholders as an essential tool in addressing global challenges. See Minu Hemmati, *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability: Beyond Deadlock and Conflict* (London, UK: Earthscan, 2002). Multi-stakeholder engagement is also at the heart of the change strategy embodied in global action networks (GANs): see www.gan-net.net and Bettye Pruitt and Steve Waddell, *Dialogic Approaches to Global Challenges: Moving from 'Dialogue Fatigue' to Dialogic Change Processes: A Working Paper* (2005). The corporate sector has also embraced multi-stakeholder processes to an extent, particularly global companies engaged in the corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship movement. For example, the International Business Leaders Forum has made cross-sector work a hallmark of its approach since its formation in 1990. Similarly, the World Business Council on Sustainable Development, which emerged from the 1992 Rio Summit, has made multi-stakeholder cooperation a cornerstone of its approach. In this arena, the innovative potential of cross-sectoral processes is often emphasized. See N. Roberts and R. Bradley, "Stakeholder Collaboration and Innovation: A Study of Public Policy Initiation at the State Level," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27:2 (1991); Rosabeth M. Kanter, "From Spare Change to Real Change: The Social Sector as Beta Site for Business Innovation," *Harvard Business Review* (May-June, 1999): 122-132; J. Sabapathy, *Innovation through Partnership* (London UK: The Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility, 2000); Sandra Waddock, "Learners and Leaders: Evolving the Global Compact in North America," Learning from first North American meeting of GC in Palo Alto (Newton, MA USA, 2003). At the national level, multi-stakeholder engagement has become a critical element of strategies for sustainable development. See Barry Dalal-Clayton and Steven Bass, "National Strategies for Sustainable Development: the Challenge Ahead," a background paper prepared in support of donor-developing country dialogues on national strategies for sustainable development, a project of the OECD/DAC Working Party on Development Cooperation and Environment (London: International Institute for Environment and Development, 2000), pp. 19-20. Other national multi-stakeholder processes sponsored by a wide variety of institutions and focused on a wide range of issues are documented in Bettye Pruitt and Philip Thomas, *Democratic Dialogue: A Handbook for Practitioners* (2007) jointly published by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Organization of American States (OAS), and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

² For a discussion of principal benefits and risks of MSPs, see, for example, Hemmati, *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability*; and *Participatory Dialogue: Towards a Stable, Safe, and Just Society for All*, Report commissioned by UN DESA Department for Social Policy and Development (New York: United Nations, 2006). Based on her broad scan of multi-stakeholder processes, Hemmati suggests they are meant to enhance the quality of decisions; the credibility of decisions; the likelihood of implementation; outreach to constituencies; and, in the longer term, the quality of cross-sector relationships and social integration in societies.

³ In addition to the cases described in Hemmati, *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability* and Pruitt and Thomas, *Democratic Dialogue*, see the large body of cases compiled by the UNDP Regional Project on Democratic Dialogue at www.democraticdialogue.org.

⁴ Examples of networks include the US-based National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, the Canadian Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, practitioner networks hosted by the UNDP Regional Project on Democratic Dialogue (Latin America) and the UN DESA Department for Social Policy and Development, and the global network of the International Association of Facilitators. Examples of training programs include and online dialogue training developed by the UNDP Regional Project on Democratic Dialogue, to be used throughout the UNDP; the multi-stakeholder process capacity building program of Wageningen International, courses on facilitation of dialogue and conflict mediation offered by the Folke Bernadotte Academy in Sweden, the Bridging Leadership program offered by the Asian Institute of Management Mirant Center for Bridging Societal Divides in the Philippines, courses on facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogue offered in Europe, Africa, and Asia by the Collective Leadership Institute (Potsdam).

⁵ Various recent publications give a sense of both the widespread use and the wealth of process options for multi-stakeholder engagement. See Peggy Holman, Tom Devane, and Steven Cady, eds., *The Change Handbook: The Definitive Resource on Today's Best Methods for Engaging Whole Systems*, second edition (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2007); Marianne "Mille" Bojer, Marianne Knuth, and Colleen Magner, "Mapping Dialogue: A research project profiling dialogue tools and processes for social change" (Johannesburg, South Africa: Pioneers of Change, 2006); the comprehensive resources section of the web site of the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (www.thataway.org); and Pruitt and Thomas, *Democratic Dialogue*.

⁶ "Today's thinking may be the source of tomorrow's problems"—Jay Forrester.

⁷ Roel von Meijenfeldt, Netherlands Institute for Multi-party Democracy, quoted in Pruitt and Thomas, *Democratic Dialogue*, p. 28

⁸ This perspective is central to the large literature on a practice of participatory processes, much of which can be accessed through MSP Resource Portal of Wageningen International : <http://portals.wi.wur.nl/msp/>. See also Steven Waddell, *Societal Learning and Change: How Governments, Business and Civil Society are Creating Solutions to Complex Multi-Stakeholder Problems*. (Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing, 2005); and Danny Burns, *Systemic Action Research: A Strategy for Whole System Change* (Bristol, UK: the Policy Press, 2007). According to Burns (p. 1), "Effective whole system change has to be underpinned by processes of in-depth inquiry, multi-stakeholder analysis, experimental action and experiential learning, enacted across a wide terrain." Daniel Yankelovich (*Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Work in a Complex World* [Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1991], pp. 3-11) argues that the capacity of the American public for collective deliberation and decision making has been undermined by the predominance of leaders and experts in what he calls "the culture of technical control."

⁹ In her comprehensive overview, Hemmati describes an emerging set of "best practices" for many of the structural aspects of multi-stakeholder processes, for example, achieving inclusiveness in stakeholder representation,

anticipating power differentials, and linking the initiative to existing decision making bodies. But she also makes clear there is a gap in the process understanding required for moving participants into the desired "learning and change" mode and, more importantly, for ensuring results from the dialogue beyond making established policy-making bodies better informed of different stakeholder positions (Hemmati, *Multi-stakeholder Processes*, Chapter 7). Carmen Malena, "Strategic Partnerships: Challenges and Best Practices in the Management and Governance of Multi-stakeholder Partnerships Involving UN and Civil Society Actors," Background paper prepared for the Multi-stakeholder Workshop on Partnerships and UN-Civil Society Relations (February 2004) gives a similar impression of the state of the art, at least within the UN system.

¹⁰ See the web site of Keystone Accountability (<http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/about/background>); Irene Guijt, *Assessing and Learning for Social Change: A Discussion Paper*. Institute for Development Studies (UK) and Learning by Design (Netherlands), November 2007; and Doug Reeler, *A Theory of Social Change and Implications for Practice, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation* (Cape Town: Community Development Resource Association, 2007). Reeler writes (p. 5), "It is the season of accountability. Projects promise this. But over the past few years, almost every organisation or project I have visited is stressed with issues of monitoring and evaluation, anxiously shopping around for methodologies to measure and report on impact to satisfy donors. . . . Donors themselves face the same pressure to account to their back-donors, who in turn must report to their political masters (supposedly accountable to their electorate), who are, for good and bad reasons, asking harder questions and setting higher standards each year. In an age where the "speak" is becoming more participatory, bottom-up or horizontal there is, paradoxically, a strengthening of pressure for upward, vertical accountability to the North. But as practitioners, donors and back-donors, we might want to ask ourselves more honestly whether the real reason we are struggling to measure and report on impact might be that as a sector we are simply not achieving the results we have promised each other when we sign Project contracts." To a great extent the current interest in working with theories of change has come out of the funding sector and also reflects a deep interest in increasing effectiveness. See for example, International Network on Strategic Philanthropy, "Theory of Change Tool Manual" (May, 2005), p. 10, available at www.insp.etc.be; Organizational Research Services, *Theory of Change: A Practical Tool for Action, Results, and Learning* (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2004), available at www.aecf.org; and www.theoryofchange.org, co-developed by the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change and ActKnowledge.

¹¹ For example, within the UN system, there are at least two separate initiatives to develop capacities for multi-stakeholder dialogue: in the UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs, Department for Social Policy and Development, focused on social inclusion (see Hemmati, *Just Society for All*), and in the United Nations Development Programme, focused on democracy building (see www.democraticdialoguenetwork.org). Practitioner networks, such as the US-based National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (NCDD), the Canadian Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, and the International Association of Facilitators are important field-building initiatives, as is the MSP Resource Portal of Wageningen International. NCDD's "Streams of Engagement" model makes a start at exploring issue boundaries by categorizing process choices according to purpose (See <http://www.thataway.org/exchange/files/docs/ddStreams1-08.pdf>; and Sandy Heierbacher, "Dialogue and Deliberation," in Holman, Devane, and Cady, *The Change Handbook*, pp. 102-117). However, for most practitioners, the spaces available to talk with peers about dialogue applications occur in the individual sessions of conferences and workshops on specific issue topics.

¹² There are some notable exceptions to this generalization, none of which focuses exclusively on multi-stakeholder processes. For example, the Few People/More People strategy framework presented in Mary B. Anderson and Lara Olsen, *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners* (Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative for Development Action, Inc., 2003): 48-49; the work of Ilana Shapiro on theories of change in use in the conflict prevention field (see Ilana Shapiro, *Extending the Framework of Inquiry: Theories of Change in Conflict Intervention* (Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management/ Berghof Handbook Dialogue No. 5, 2006), online at www.berghof-handbook.net); and the work of the United Nations Development Programme initiative on HIV/AIDS, led by Monica Sharma, which used Ken Wilber's Integral Framework to bring together a diverse group of change initiatives and processes into a coherent strategy. (For a helpful overview and synthesis of many project reports, see Barrett C. Brown, *Use of the Integral Framework by the United Nations Development Programme in their Global Response to HIV/AIDS* (Denver: Integral University, 2005).

¹³ Early efforts to address this need are the NCDD Streams of Engagement framework, described in Heierbacher, "Dialogue and Deliberation;" Holman, Devane, and Cady, *The Change Handbook*; Bojer, Knuth, and Magner, "Mapping Dialogue;" Pruitt and Thomas, *Democratic Dialogue*, pp. 113-116; 214-224; and the MSP Resource Portal.

¹⁴ See the discussion of "method mastery" by Steven Cady in Holman, Devane, and Cady, *The Change Handbook* (pp. 28-30; 40-42). Cady presents the development of mastery as an individual pursuit of "the commanding knowledge, consummate skill, and intuitive sensibility that can be successfully applied to a particular situation or activity." Beyond mastery of a single process, he describes two higher levels, "blend mastery" and "invention mastery," both of which involve gaining knowledge of many processes (p. 30). At all levels, however, the emphasis is on the individual practitioner's informed intuition as the ultimate guide to process choices.

¹⁵ See Bettye Pruitt, "The Generative Change Community: Cases about the Meaning of 'Generative Dialogic Change Processes,'" *Reflections: the SoL Journal* 8:2 (2007).

¹⁶ W. Barnett and Kimberly A. Pearce, "Combining Passions and Abilities: Toward Dialogic Virtuosity," *Southern Communication Journal* 65 (2000): 161-175.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition (2000) accessed on line at <http://www.bartleby.com/61/40/S0374000.html>, May 1, 2008.

¹⁹ Members of the core group who were active in 2006-2007 include Ragnar Ångeby (Sweden), Tom Callanan (US), Thaïs Corral (Brazil), Mari Fitzduff (Ireland), Marc-André Franche (Canada), Ernesto Garilao (Philippines), Walter Link (Germany), Dumisani Nyoni (Zimbabwe), Theresa Ratnam Thong (Malaysia), Tom Rautenberg (US), Ralph Taylor (US), André van Heemstra (Netherlands), Steve Waddell (Canada), Jim Woodhill (Australia). Presently the responsibility for this engagement strategy is held primarily by a small team of community coordinators, including

Minu Hemmati (Germany), Bettye Pruitt (US), and Philip Thomas (US), working closely with our core funder, Ralph Taylor (Metanoia Fund).

²⁰ This table captures the framework developed by Philip Thomas for the Workshop on Democratic Dialogue in Manila, September 24-25, 2007. It represents an integration of two important streams of work. One stream is the literature on social conflict and conflict transformation, which identifies four dimensions in which conflict creates change and where change must occur for conflict to be transformed to lasting peace. (See John Paul Lederach, R. Neufeldt, et al., *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring, and Learning Toolkit* (South Bend, Indiana: The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame, 2007). The second stream is Ken Wilber's Integral Theory (see Ken Wilber, *Introduction to Integral Theory and Practice: IOS Basic and the AQAL Map* [2003]), which includes a four-quadrant model similar the one presented here.