USING APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY TO CHANGE PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE SATISFACTION OF ORGANIZATION MEMBERS' NEEDS

Ştefan COJOCARU
Constantin BRĂGARU

Ştefan COJOCARU
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Social
Work, Faculty of Philosophy and Social Sciences, "Alexandru
Ioan Cuza" University, Iaşi, Romania
Tel.: 0040-744-788.779
E-mail: contact@stefancojocaru.ro

Constantin BRĂGARU
Lecturer, PhD, Department of Business Administration
and Marketing, Faculty of Economics, "Nicolae Titulescu"
University, Bucharest, Romania
Tel.: 0040-758-776.213
E-mail: costin_bragaru@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study explored the innovative use of appreciative inquiry (AI) in the organizational environment for changing the perception concerning the satisfaction of its members' needs. The experiment started from the assumption that organizations are social constructions generated by the interpretations social actors have about this entity and about themselves, being the result of human interactions. The experiment used the appreciative inquiry as form of intervention, run in the four stages of the 4-D cycle. The results of the intervention show that, although appreciative inquiry was directed chiefly towards changing the perceptions concerning the satisfaction of the need for security, the interpretations given by organization members changed with regard to the satisfaction of all needs (security, basic needs, belonging, esteem and self-actualization). The study shows that motivation can be changed through an appreciative approach of events, through their reinterpretation within a process of dialogue and consensus; the reinterpretation of the organization as a text and the application of appreciative inquiry principles results in an organizational reconstruction as a process that can be run in a relatively short period of time. The positive changes of the organizational environment were also a result of the way the organization was researched. The appreciative interviews resulted in individual reinterpretations of organizational contexts, which were negotiated and assumed in the environment of the collectivity. The changes were supported by the organization members' involvement in building a shared vision, in making a plan in which every person is a voice in the organization, and in developing attachment and ownership in relation to the developed plans.

Keywords: appreciative inquiry, needs, motivation, constructionism, security, organizational development, vision, intervention, experimental situation.

1. Origins of the appreciative inquiry

In 1987, Cooperrider and Srivastva launched the concept of appreciative inquiry, as a response to the action research developed by Lewin in the 1940s; appreciative inquiry aimed to be an instrument for social change, chiefly for organizational change. From the point of view of the authors, one of the failures of action research was caused by focusing on the problem, which leads to a shortage of innovative potential. They considered that this focus on the problem leads inevitably to a restraint of imagination and reduces the possibility of creating new theories. The vision of appreciative inquiry turns the problem-focused approach upside-down, taking into account what goes well in an organization, its successes, as identified by its members. Any organization faces problems, but researching the problem with the purpose of solving it increases its development; the questions asked during the inquiry become courses of action. Focusing the questions on identifying the problems in the organization, during an organizational investigation, directs the organization's actions towards deepening the problems. The appreciative inquiry does not deny the existence of problems in an organization or community, but, in order for them to be alleviated, positive aspects are identified, cultivated and promoted. Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) built the appreciative approach based on Kenneth Gergen's constructionism (1985; 1994); Gergen sees reality as a social construction and a permanent reconstruction on the interactions between individuals (Gergen, 1999). From the constructionist perspective, any organization is a human construction, generated by the interpretations the social actors have about this entity and about themselves, being the products of human interactions, and a social construction (Cooperrider, Barett and Srivastva, 1995, p. 157). Some authors place categorically the base of the appreciative inquiry in the foundation of social constructionism, asserting that the appreciative inquiry is a way of thinking about change, built on the assumption of the social construction of an organization's reality (Murrell, 2001, p. 92). In order to change an organization, action must be directed to the way individuals interpret the organization; the appreciative inquiry seeks to identify the best of "what is". Appreciative inquiry can generate new knowledge, help create a collectively desired vision of the future, as well as assist in choosing the actions that can result in the desired future (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1994, p. 207). From the description given by the authors, it follows that, in order to expand the domain of knowledge, we must find "the best of what is" in the organization's experience and, on the basis of these successes, create a collective vision of "what could be". "What is" does not concern only the present, in the sense of a reality manifesting itself, but also actual interpretations given by agents to past events. "What is" represents a social construction in the moment of analysis, but this can also be a result of the interpretations given to past events. From this perspective, the present is what people think at this moment about the organization.

Other authors have seen the appreciative inquiry as an instrument that can be used to direct change in an organization or in a community (Burke, 2011; Cuyvers, 2010; Lustig and Ringland, 2010). From its introduction, the appreciative inquiry has

been applied in numerous domains beyond the area of organizational development: healthcare (Hirunwat, 2011; Rubin, Kerrell and Roberts, 2011), evaluation (Cojocaru, 2008; Messerschmidt, 2008; Ojha, 2010; Kavanagh *et al.*, 2010), therapy (Sandu and Ciuchi, 2010; Donaldson and Ko, 2010; Rubin, Kerrell and Roberts, 2011; Gałązka, 2011; Wendt, Tuckey and Prosser, 2011), education (Kumar and Chacko, 2010; Kelly, 2010), research methodology (Cojocaru, 2005; Kluger and Nir, 2010; Cowling and Repede, 2010), human resources development (Rattanaphan, 2010; Bushe, 2010). Appreciative inquiry can be viewed as an instrument of organizational transformation that focuses on learning from success. Instead of focusing on deficiencies and problems, the appreciative inquiry focuses on discovering what works best, why it works and how can success be expanded in the organization (Johnson and Leavitt, 2001, pp. 129-130); the authors state categorically the need to learn from success and the necessity to abandon the orientation manifested in the action research, which aims to identify deficiencies, problems, shortcomings and constraints.

Bushe reconsiders the concept of appreciative inquiry, building a definition that makes good use of the constructionist perspective on social reality, as a result of creating a collective image about a desired future (Bushe, 1995). In his definition, the author underlines the role of a common vision, a "common reading" of the organization and of its future (Elliott, 1999, p. 76).

The perspective of the appreciative inquiry is a constructionist one, summarized in a few essential elements (Cooperrider and Srivastva *apud* Cojocaru, 2003, pp. 203-204): (1) Social order is permanently in a dynamic equilibrium that has an unstable character, and this order is the product of a negotiation or convention between people; this order is generated by the negotiation process itself (Powley *et al.*, 2004); (2) Human actions are prescribed by ideas, beliefs, intentions, interests, purposes and means, values, habits and theories; the transformation of human behaviour is achieved by changing conventional ideas, beliefs, intentions, interests, purposes and means, values, habits and theories; all these action generators are the result of social construction and have a strong effect in the reconstruction of the future interpretation and action frameworks (Chapagain and Ojha, 2008); (3) Social action is interpreted differently by individuals, who, from actors become social constructors (Cojocaru, 2010); from this perspective, social change means a reconstruction of the social architecture, through the negotiation of individual interpretations and the construction of a common positive vision (Asif and Klein, 2009; Sandu and Ciuchi, 2010); (4) The actional models developed in the organization can be found in various forms, due to the different individual interpretations, to the permanent negotiations in the organizational environment and to the constant change of social contexts (Kanaskie, 2011); (5) The transformation of conventions and interpretations into norms, values, purposes and ideologies is the result of dialogue, of the consensus expressed through language (Fitzgerald, Oliver and Hoxsey, 2010); the latter becomes a map preceding the territory; (6) Deep changes in social practices can be generated by changes in linguistic practices (Andrus, 2010); (7) Social theory can be viewed as an elevated

language possessing its own grammar; it can be used as a linguistic instrument capable of creating new models of social action (Sandu, 2011); (8) Any theory is normative, irrespective of whether this is intended or not, and it has the potential to influence social order, irrespective of whether people have or do not have reactions of acceptance, rejection or indifference (Aldred, 2011); (9) Every social theory has a moral significance: it has the potential of influencing and regulating interpersonal relations in everyday life (Cojocaru, 2008); (10) Social knowledge resides in collective interaction: it is created, maintained and used by people in interaction (Somerville and Howard, 2010); (11) Constructionism can be applied for introducing change in approaching organizations, communities, or any other form of social organization (Dick, 2011; Aldred, 2011), by going beyond the dualisms of subject-object, true-false, good-evil etc. (Marshak and Grant, 2008).

2. The principles of appreciative inquiry

Cooperrider *et al.* (2000, pp. 3-27) consider that the appreciative enquiry is based on five principles:

1. The constructionist principle. This principle asserts that organizations are a result of human creation, or, better put, of the collective interaction among individuals and of the permanent reconstruction generated by our knowledge, beliefs and ideas. The organization is a manifestation of the interactions between our mental models concerning it, constructed socially in a relational process. From this perspective, the organization itself is a reality generated by multiple interpretations, and changing an organization through appreciative inquiry means, in fact, changing these interpretations and building a shared, collective and coherent image.

2. The principle of simultaneity. This principle concerns the fact that at all times research in the organization and change in the same organization are simultaneous. Cooperrider considers that any organization or social system changes in the direction towards which the researcher's attention is focused, calling this a "heliotropic process" (2001), because, "the same as the sunflower turns to follow the sun, so the organization turns to follow its positive image" (Johnson and Leavitt, 2001, p. 130). Action research also considers that the questions asked by research generate changes in the organization due to the presence of the researcher and of the imagination it activates (Miftode, 2003, p. 393). According to the simultaneity principle, "even the most innocent questions trigger changes" (Cooperrider and Whitney *apud* Cojocaru, 2003, p. 206). This principle, formulated by Cooperrider and Whitney (1999) cancels the myth according to which we first analyze the situation and then decide the change, because when we inquire about certain aspects of the organization, we effectively start a change process inside it.

3. The poetic principle refers to the fact that any organization is a result of the multiple interpretations given by people, expressed through language, which, in its turn, has a formative character, being part of the constructed world. Language is not only an image of the world, but truly a form of social action. Ideas, representations, images,

histories, stories, metaphors, generate events, depending on their emotional charge and on the way they are interpreted. The metaphors describing the organizations are ways of social action for structuring these organizations. All these metaphors describe ways of organization and operation, ways in which their members relate, and also avenues of intervention for change; for example, changing an organization structured as an organism makes us think about it as about a living being, which cannot be turned off in order to be changed, and all changes must happen on the go; the interpretation of an organization as a mechanism gives us a picture of programmed operation, of change that can be achieved by turning the mechanism off, dismantling and modifying it etc. Organizations are "like a poem" (Elliott, 1999, p. 14) or "can be thought as a text" (Elliott, 1999, p. 15) that can be interpreted permanently, and the beauty and the senses of this poem are given by the interpreters.

4. The principle of anticipation states that the destiny of a community is the positive future image constructed through the individual creations that influence present events. One may say that the best way of predicting the future is building it, starting from the desired images, because the map precedes reality: "It is not the territory preceding the map, and it does not survive it, instead the map preceding the territory also generates it (…)" (Wachowski *apud* Felluga, 2003, p. 84). In order to argument this principle, Cooperrider uses the example of the placebo effect used in medicine and the Pygmalion effect, which prove that the image the teachers have about pupils is a strong predictor of the performances of these pupils.

5. The positive principle concerns the potential and the power appreciation has in organizational development, by discovering the positive aspects and by achieving innovative change in correlation with the anticipation of a positive future (Whitney, 1998; Gonzales and Leroy, 2011), because classical change management focuses on the analysis and diagnosis of organizational problems and deficiencies. Because oftentimes the positive vision is left out in favour of analyzing obstacles, resistances and deficiencies (Whitney, 1998, p. 5), management nowadays is a prisoner of the dysfunctional perspective. Formulating and asking the questions is one of the most impacting actions of the agent for change, because what we ask we shall later find in the organization.

3. The process of appreciative inquiry

In order to use the appreciative inquiry technique, Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) developed the 4-D model (the 4 D-s represent the initials of the stages of the appreciative inquiry: Discovery, Dream, Design, Destiny), which explains the stages of the inquiry.

1. The first stage (Discovery) of the appreciative inquiry is the stage where "what is best" in the organization is identified and consists in finding positive "histories", personal and organizational experiences considered successful. This stage involves cross-interviews or focus groups so that people can share their positive experiences

related to the research theme. One relatively frequent form of appreciative inquiry uses as initial manner of finding positive aspects and of documenting them a list of questions that generate positive interpretations, handed to every member of the organization (More, 2011; Hirunwat, 2011). Thus, the individuals have the opportunity and the time to reflect on their experiences, on those of their peers and of the organization. After this first stage, group cross-interviews and focus groups are organized, in which questions from the initial meetings are asked again. The cross-interview involves writing an interview guide, which is supplied to all the participants, and each of them can ask the others questions during the group meetings organized for this purpose in the stages of the appreciative inquiry. Starting from the hypothesis that an organization evolves in the direction it is researched, choosing the research topics and constructing the questions become crucially important.

2. The second stage (Dream) is the stage where people describe their desires and their dreams related to work, motivations, work relationships, the organization etc. This stage aims to construct a collective vision of "what the organization could be like" in the future, even as an ideal image. The vision is a collective construction of the organization members, drawing on the organization's potential. An important watchword for this stage is "thinking outside the box", overcoming the limits of the usual thinking about what has been and constructing images, beliefs and representations about the organization, generated by individual positive desires, and articulating them in a coherent collective image (Boerema, 2011). These representations occur in the shape of "provocative propositions" (Van der Haar, 2002), ambitious, pushing the organization's or the community's limits, being at the same time reachable, because they rely on past experience, described as excellence.

3. The third stage (Design) aims to build a new organizational architecture, oriented towards "what could be", designing new organizational structures, processes and relations capable of bringing the organization closer to the imagined vision from the previous stage. According to the poetic principle, in this stage the infrastructure and the management system needed in order to support the system vision are designed. It represents a process of reinventing the organization, based on imagination. Starting from the idea that any organization can be interpreted and reinterpreted as a text, Elliot considers that the metaphors concerning the organization represent our interpretations in presenting facts, and that "the construction is not isolated from the present and the future" (Elliott, 1999, p. 36). This construction is the result of a permanent "negotiation with the others", of the interpretations based on the members' memory and imagination. In order to reach the positive vision imagined in the previous stage, the reconstruction of the past is necessary, using imagination (because we can choose different ways of interpreting the same reality) and establishing by consensus concrete short-term and long-term objectives that can lead to the fulfillment of dreams, desires and projects.

4. The fourth stage (Destiny) is the stage of implementing the plans established in the previous stage and involves the establishment of roles and responsibilities, the development of strategies, the construction of new interaction networks within the organization or community, the use of resources in order to obtain results. Having gone through the previous stages, the people in the organization or community become agents for change, having a thorough understanding of the purposes, objectives and tasks that have been constructed through dialogue and consensus. (Yoon *et al.*, 2011).

4. Methodology

The "half-full glass" approach may be considered an experimental-type intervention, examining the way in which appreciative inquiry can change the organizational environment. The appreciative inquiry was applied in a seven-member non-governmental organization active in the area of child protection (Holt Romania – Iaşi Branch), and involved the application of the 4-D cycle for the organization and running of the appreciative inquiry, the aim being to measure how the structure of perception of motivational factors changes within the organization. The independent variable introduced in this "half-full glass" approach was the reconstruction through consensus of the definitions and interpretations regarding motivation inside the organization. In order to be able to measure the changes in terms of how the satisfaction of needs was perceived, a questionnaire was applied to the organization members at two different times: before starting the intervention and a week after it ended. The appreciative inquiry-type research took place over one month and went through several stages: (1) questionnaire application in order to measure the structure of the initial motivation and the perception of need satisfaction; (2) development of an interview guide with a number of questions aimed at identifying the members' personal "stories"; (3) distribution of the interview guide to all the members and request to answer the questions in an appreciative manner; (4) collection of data from the subjects and interpretation of gathered data; (5) organization of focus-groups in which the agent of intervention was the moderator; (6) application of the questionnaire one week after the conclusion of the appreciative inquiry in order to measure the structure of the initial motivation and the perception of need satisfaction.

5. Data collection

In order to collect data we used questionnaires and focus-groups. In terms of intervention techniques we used focus-groups and the appreciative inquiry. The focus-group was organized also in order to introduce the intervention, as a form of collective construction of interpretations. In the appreciative inquiry used, the data collection techniques are also intervention techniques, as a form of collective construction of collective interpretations.

Questionnaire: We used a questionnaire in order to capture the employees' opinions concerning their personal needs and how well they are satisfied within the organization.

We used an attitude scale that included a set of 20 close-ended questions with seven degrees of agreement (totally agree, agree, partially agree, do not know, partially disagree, disagree, totally disagree). The questionnaire is an adaptation of the motivation assessment test (Gordon, 1991, pp. 175-176). The questionnaire was self-administered, as the staff's training and education level is high (with the exception of one person in administration, all the personnel has a university degree in the area).

Focus-group: The focus-group interview applied is a group interview, focused on the topic of motivation in the organizational environment, conducted by a moderator; it is a qualitative method of data collection used in order to analyze perceptions, motivations, feelings, needs and opinions. This technique was used in the form of a planned group discussion, organized in order to obtain perceptions related to staff motivation, and run in a permissive environment; the discussion was relaxed, pleasant for all the participants. Thus, they shared their ideas and perceptions and influenced each other, responding to the others' ideas and comments. The interview guide included a series of questions presented in a logical funnel-shaped sequence (the questions went from general to very specific), allowing us to cover all the established objectives and to collect a large enough volume of information for analysis, as well as in-depth information concerning the topic under study. The interview was of an appreciative type and included questions along the lines of "What is best?", "What should be?", "What could be?", "What needs to be done?".

6. Application of appreciative inquiry

After the questionnaire was applied, all team members received an interview guide containing a list of questions, in order to have the time to identify success stories. The meeting for organizing the first focus-group (Discovery) was scheduled for the following week. After discovering positive experiences and significant stories concerning motivating situations, we organized a second focus-group, one week later, in order to proceed to the next stage, Dream. During this meeting, images of the future were generated; the team members recreated the circumstances that had resulted in success, viewed from a needs perspective: the basic needs, of security, of belonging, of esteem and self-actualisation. The data analysis showed that the attention of the team members had been focused especially on the need for security. They identified a number of successes, of moments when they enjoyed themselves the most in close relation to the need for security. This confirmed the data obtained from the application of the questionnaire; the data analysis points out that the need for security is perceived as the least satisfied.

> "I like what I do and I feel good when I manage to solve a difficult case or when I see in the client's eyes that "something" that can never be expressed through words; it is a spiritual satisfaction that compensates many other situations, less pleasant ones, related to the clients we work with. I enjoyed very much the time when we were a large team, we had long-term funding and things were very secure."

"The most active moments, those when I felt most satisfied, were at the time when we had funding for a costly program, foster care, which was an innovative one. It was always difficult to get the approval of the Child Protection Committee in order to place the child in a foster home, but I felt safe, because I knew we were doing the right thing and we could monitor the quality of the services provided; the foster carers were paid by us and they were answerable to us. It's very important to feel safe, and at the time this was how I felt (…)."

"The times when we had funding for running new programmes was for me one of the most rewarding ones. The funds were enough for organising activities, for being constantly dynamic and active. I remember the feeling of security given by the fact that we had a secure funding for a longer period of time (…)."

The questions used during the focus-group were not directed to the need for security, however, the process of discovering positive moments showed some of them as referring to the need for security. After the data was analyzed, a third focus-group was organized in order to build through dialogue the projection of a desired future, expressed appreciatively through "provocative propositions", formulated in the present tense affirmative, as if they were already a reality. The meanings of these provocative propositions were "negotiated" by the organization's members in order to encourage participation in this construction process (Repede, 2009; Repede 2011). They do not represent the manager's point of view, being instead the result of all members' construction, irrespective of position, the members having "equal voices" in the dialogue that reduces the asymmetry of power. These provocative propositions represent a shared, collective vision, rather than a result of acceptation. At this stage, the provocative propositions were the following: (1) We are an organization with enough resources to run innovative social programmes (relates to the need for security); (2) We are a strong team, capable of attracting funds, and with long-term stability (relates to the need for security and belonging); (3) We are a team with plans for the future, with our own resources in the long term, ensuring the development of the organization (relates to the need for security and belonging); (4) The boss not only knows the team's activity and results, he also knows in detail the activity and the successes of each team member (relates to the need for self-esteem); (5) We feel satisfied and we enjoy the work environment and working with the people we help in our activity (relates to the need for self-actualisation and belonging); (6) We work in collaboration with the public authorities and with the organizations in the area of social assistance (relates to the need for self-actualisation); (7) We understand the organization's mission and we make an effort to provide quality services to all our clients (relates to the need for self-actualisation and self-esteem); (8) We are known for our capacity to mobilize ourselves and to answer the demands coming from our clients and users (relates to the need for self-esteem); (9) We recognize each other's unique and special qualities, which represent each member's contribution to

the success of the organization (relates to the need for self-esteem and belonging); (10) We are a team constantly interested in the optimization of services through a flexible, dynamic and proactive attitude (relates to the need for self-actualisation and belonging).

After the future was projected and a complex picture, shared by all the members of the organization, was constructed, a third focus-group (Design) was organized in order to draft the plans necessary for making the provocative propositions a reality. The key elements of the plan identified by the members were: (1) Mobilize the team in order to identify potential donors, assess community needs and write funding proposals; (2) Supervision activity – individual sessions for case supervision and for group supervision; (3) Flexibility in assessing the clients' needs – constantly adapting needs assessment instruments and involving the clients in designing the intervention; (4) Organize regular meetings with governmental and non-governmental organizations, in order to strengthen the developed partnerships and to establish new ones; (5) Maintain the organization assets in working order and at the standards required in the field; (6) Permanent communication of successes within the team; (7) Using the staff's abilities and competences in the organization's activities; (8) Maintaining the type of employment contract for all employees; (9) Participation in training programs both as trainers and as trainees.

7. Results and discussions

This appreciative-type intervention carried out according to the principles of the appreciative inquiry meant a change in the way the subjects perceive motivation and the satisfaction of needs; even though other independent variables were not operated, a modification is generated by the mere personal reinterpretations presented and negotiated within the group. During the experimental situations, no independent variables were introduced, such as changes in equipment, salary, bonuses etc. The appreciative approach of personal experiences within the organization resulted in changes concerning motivation, viewed from the angle of the theory of needs. Motivation deals with the ideas, beliefs, intentions, interests, knowledge and habits that determine human behaviour and direct this behaviour towards a certain goal, and with how this behavior is supported, including from the perspective of the perception of need satisfaction. As Table 1 and Table 2 show, each member of the organization recorded a drop in the scores relating to the need for security. The lower the score, the more people perceive the need as better satisfied. The maximum score that can be given to any type of need is 12. Through the change in perception, reality itself is changed; therefore, in order to change the organizational environment, we must change the way people perceive motivation and implicitly the satisfaction of needs.

Table 1: Scale for measuring the perception of need satisfaction
(at start of intervention)

Subjects	Self-actualisation	Esteem	Security	Belonging	Basic needs
Subject 1	4	7	10	8	4
Subject 2	6	2	11	9	5
Subject 3	6	5	8	6	6
Subject 4	5	6	9	8	4
Subject 5	7	8	9	9	3
Subject 6	4	7	7	6	4
Subject 7	6	9	9	7	2
Total	38	44	63	53	28

Table 2: Scale for measuring the perception of need satisfaction
(at end of intervention)

Subjects	Self-actualisation	Esteem	Security	Belonging	Basic needs
Subject 1	3	6	6	6	4
Subject 2	4	4	6	8	4
Subject 3	2	5	5	8	5
Subject 4	3	5	5	5	4
Subject 5	4	7	6	6	3
Subject 6	4	5	4	6	4
Subject 7	5	6	7	5	2
Total	25	38	43	44	26

At organizational level, the scores obtained before the intervention show that basic needs were perceived by the subjects as the most satisfied (lowest score, 28), whereas the need perceived as the least satisfied is the need for security (score 63). At the end of the appreciative intervention it can be noticed that the most satisfied need is that of self-actualisation (score 25), whereas the need to belong is last, despite recording a significant drop in score (from 53 to 44).

Table 3: Evolution of perception of need satisfaction within the organization
(before and after intervention)

Moment of measurement	Self-actualisation	Esteem	Security	Belonging	Basic needs
at start of intervention	38	44	63	53	28
at end of intervention	25	38	43	44	26

The most dramatic evolution in perception was recorded in the case of the need for security, which was perceived as the least satisfied at the beginning of the appreciative intervention (the score dropped from 63 to 43 after the intervention). During the intervention we focused on this need through specific questions. The changed the

order of needs in terms of degree of satisfaction after the intervention shows that the needs were interpreted as more satisfied after the intervention; their score dropped (see Table 4), and the need for security, which we focused on primarily, was perceived as more satisfied due to the fact that the organization's members took part in the development of a plan in which each of them had a precise responsibility in identifying donors, assessing community needs and writing funding proposals. Even though no other changes were operated in variables that may cause needs to be perceived as better satisfied (salary raises, securing funding for a new project, purchase of new equipment, organization of socialisation meetings or of team-building outings), a positive evolution can be noticed in the way people interpreted the satisfaction of these needs. This proves the fact that organizational reality is first and foremost a social construction of the members that compose it.

Table 4: Evolution of the hierarchy of needs in relation
to the perception of their satisfaction

RANK	Hierarchy of needs in relation to the perception of their satisfaction at start of intervention	Hierarchy of needs in relation to the perception of their satisfaction at end of intervention
1	Basic needs	Self-actualisation
2	Self-actualisation	Basic needs
3	Esteem	Esteem
4	Belonging	Security
5	Security	Belonging

We notice here that the system of values and beliefs of an organization depends on its members. The system of values and beliefs in the organization we studied and in which we intervened through the appreciative inquiry evolved into a new architecture due to the interactions between its members. The figures show that the need for self-actualisation was considered as the most satisfied, whereas the need for security was perceived as more satisfied. The appreciative interpretations and reinterpretations about various events taking place in the organizational environment have a noticeable influence in increasing staff motivation, due to the latter's involvement in building a shared vision, in making a plan in which every person is a voice in the organization, and in developing attachment and ownership in relation to the developed plans.

8. Conclusions

The appreciative inquiry is a form of intervention based on the principles of social constructionism; it is a technique that uses the appreciative approach, which can be used in order to effect change in the organizational environment. Any organization may be interpreted as a text, and the appreciative inquiry helps us carry out a collective, shared reinterpretation of the organization, which is built during the process of negotiating the individual interpretations of its members. In order to bring about change in an organization that is seen as a constant construction and reconstruction generated by its members' ideas, beliefs and intentions, we must support the organization members

in the process of changing these ideas, beliefs and intentions. The appreciative inquiry proposes an innovative model of change, because it leaves behind the "deficiency paradigm" (Cooperrider *et al.*, 2000) used by action research, because it assigns new values to the positive experiences of an organization's members and amplifies them in order to reach its goals. The appreciative inquiry is not an approach that omits the problems an organization faces; however, it leaves them behind in favour of positive experiences, in order to obtain a change in the desired direction (Bellinger and Elliott, 2011). The changes produced in an organization through the use of appreciative inquiry can be felt in a relatively short time, and they have an impact on the entire organization. The appreciative inquiry can be used in organizational development for the introduction of social innovations built through dialogue and consensus. The appreciative inquiry does not seek solutions to problems, instead it rebuilds the organizational architecture by stressing participation and deliberative democracy. Staff motivation depends on the way people interpret various situations and events that have occurred in their interactions within the organizational environment. It can therefore be changed through an appreciative approach of events, through their reinterpretation.

References:

1. Aldred, R., 'From Community Participation to Organizational Therapy? World Café and Appreciative Inquiry as Research Methods', 2011, *Community Development Journal*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 57-71.
2. Andrus, C., 'Using Appreciative Inquiry to Build Organizational Capacity to Learn, Risk and Grow', 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 30, pp. 63-76.
3. Asif, Z. and Klein, H.K., 'Open and Free Deliberation: A Prerequisite for Positive Design', 2009, *Information and Organization*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 186-197.
4. Bellinger, A. and Elliott, T., 'What Are You Looking At? The Potential of Appreciative Inquiry as a Research Approach for Social Work', 2011, *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 708-725.
5. Boerema, A.J., 'Challenging and Supporting New Leader Development', 2011, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 554-567.
6. Burke, W.W., 'A Perspective on the Field of Organization Development and Change: The Zeigarnik Effect', 2011, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 143-167.
7. Bushe, G.R., 'Advances in Appreciative Inquiry as an Organization Development Intervention', 1995, *Organization Development Journal*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 14-22, [Online] available at http://www.gervasebushe.com/aiodj.htm, accessed on January 15, 2012.
8. Bushe, G.R., 'A Comparative Case Study of Appreciative Inquiries in one Organization: Implications for Practice', 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 29, pp. 7-24.
9. Chapagain, C.P. and Ojha, G.P., 'Appreciative Inquiry for Enhancing Individual and Organization Capacity', 2008, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 20, pp. 7-18.
10. Cojocaru, D., 'Ancheta Apreciativă – formă a cercetării-acţiune în schimbarea socială', 2003, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 2, pp. 203-208.

11. Cojocaru, S., *Metode apreciative în asistenţa socială. Ancheta, supervizarea şi managementul de caz*, Iaşi: Polirom, 2005.

12. Cojocaru, S., 'Appreciative Evaluation – A Form of Formative Evaluation', *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, 2008, vol. 20, pp. 42-48.

13. Cojocaru, S., 'Appreciative Supervision in Social Work. New Opportunities for Changing the Social Work Practice', 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 29, pp. 72-91.

14. Cooperrider, D.L., Sorensen, P.F., Whitney, D. and Yaeger T.F. (eds.), *Apreciative Inquiry: Rethinking Human Organization toward a Positive Theory of Change*, Champaign, IL: Stripes, 2000.

15. Cooperrider, D.L. and Srivastva, S., 'Appreciative Inquiry: an Alternative to Problem Solving', in French, W.L., Bell, C.H. and Zawacki, R.A. (eds.), *Organization Development and Transformation: Managing Effective Change*, 4th edition, Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1994, pp. 207-208.

16. Cooperrider, D.L., Barett, F. and Srivastva, S., 'Social Construction and Appreciative Inquiry: A Journey in Organizational Theory', in Hosking, D.M., Dachler, H.P. and Gergen, K.J. (eds.), *Management and Organization: Relational Alternatives to Individualism*, Aldershot: Avebury, 1995, pp. 157-200.

17. Cooperrider, D.L, 'Positive Image, Positive Action: The Affirmative Basis of Organizing', in Cooperrider, D.L., Sorensen, P.F., Yaeger, T.F. and Whitney, D. (eds.), *Appreciative Inquiry: An Emerging Direction for Organization Development*, Champaign, IL: Stipes, 2001.

18. Cooperrider, D.L. and Whitney, D., *Collaborating for Change: Appreciative Inquiry*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1999.

19. Cooperrider, D.L. and Srivastva, S., 'Appreciative Inquiry in Organizational Life', in Woodman, R.W. and Pasmore, W.A. (eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, vol. 1, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1987, pp. 129-170.

20. Cowling, W.R. III and Repede, E., 'Unitary Appreciative Inquiry: Evolution and Refinement', 2010, *Advances in Nursing Science*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 64-77.

21. Cuyvers, G., 'Appreciative Inquiry as a Foundation for Quality Development', 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 30, pp. 39-52.

22. Dick, B., 'Action Research Literature 2008-2010: Themes and Trends', 2011, *Action Research*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 122-143.

23. Donaldson, S.I. and Ko, I., 'Positive Organizational Psychology, Behavior, and Scholarship: A Review of the Emerging Literature and Evidence Base', 2010, *Journal of Positive Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 177-191.

24. Elliott, C., *Locating the Energy for Change: An Introduction to Appreciative Inquiry*, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), 1999.

25. Felluga, D., 'Matrix: paradigma postmodernă sau impostură intelectuală?', in Zeffeth, G., *Matrix. Ştiinţă, Filozofie şi Religie*, Bucharest: Amaltea, 2003.

26. Fitzgerald, S.P., Oliver, C. and Hoxsey, J.C., 'Appreciative Inquiry as a Shadow Process', 2010, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 220-233.

27. Gałązka, A., 'Drama as a Tool of Appreciative Inquiry in Creative Learning', 2011, *New Educational Review*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 45-56.

28. Gergen, K.J., 'The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology', 1985, *American Psychologist*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 266-275.

29. Gergen, K.J., *Realities and Relationships: Soundings in Social Construction*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

30. Gergen, K.J., *An Invitation to Social Construction*, London: Sage Publications, 1999.

31. Gonzales, C.K. and Leroy, G., 'Eliciting User Requirements Using Appreciative Inquiry', 2011, *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 733-772.

32. Gordon, J.R., *A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behavior*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1991.

33. Hirunwat, P., 'Appreciative Inquiry Based Organization Development Intervention Process on Satisfaction and Engagement of Senior Patients and Sustainability of Sukavet Institution: A Case Study of Nursing Home', 2011, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 33, pp. 56-71.

34. Johnson, G. and Leavitt, W., 'Building on Success: Transforming Organizations through an Appreciative Inquiry', 2001, *Public Personnel Management*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 129-136.

35. Kanaskie, M.L., 'Incorporating Café Design Principles Into End-of-Life Discussions: An Innovative Method for Continuing Education, 2011, *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 166-171.

36. Kavanagh, T., Stevens, B., Seers, K., Sidani, S. and Watt-Watson, J., 'Process Evaluation of Appreciative Inquiry to Translate Pain Management Evidence into Pediatric Nursing Practice', 2010, *Implementation Science*, vol. 5, no. 90, [Online] available at http://www.implementationscience.com/content/5/1/90, accessed on January 15, 2012.

37. Kelly, T., 'A Positive Approach to Change: The Role of Appreciative Inquiry in Library and Information Organizations', 2010, *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 163-177.

38. Kluger, A.N. and Nir, D., 'The Feedforward Interview', 2010, *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 235-246.

39. Kumar, L.R. and Chacko, T.V., 'Using Appreciative Inquiry on Learning Styles to Facilitate Student Learning', 2010, *Medical Education*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 1121-1122.

40. Lustig, P. and Ringland, G., 'The Role of Appreciative Inquiry in Meeting the Challenges of the Next Decade', 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 30, pp. 77-85.

41. Marshak, R.J. and Grant, D., 'Organizational Discourse and New Organization Development Practices', 2008, *British Journal of Management*, vol. 19, Issue Supplement s1, pp. S7-S19.

42. Messerschmidt, D., 'Evaluating Appreciative Inquiry as an Organizational Transformation Tool: An Assessment from Nepal', 2008, *Human Organization*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 454-468.

43. Miftode V., *Tratat de metodologie sociologică*, Iaşi: Lumen, 2003.

44. More, C., 'The Effect of Appreciative Inquiry as Organizational Development Intervention on Organizational Planning and Service Quality Improvement in St. Francis School (ICSE)', 2011, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 33, pp. 27-43.

45. Murrel, K.L., 'Book Review of Appreciative Inquiry: Change at the Speed of Imagination', 2001, *Organization Development Journal*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 92-93.

46. Ojha, G.P., 'Appreciative Inquiry Approach to Evaluation Practices in South Asia, 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 30, pp. 7-18.

47. Powley, E.H., Fry, R.E., Barrett, F.J. and Bright, D.S., 'Dialogic Democracy Meets Command and Control: Transformation through the Appreciative Inquiry Summit', 2004, *Academy of Management Executive*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 67-80.

48. Rattanaphan, P., 'Impact of Organization of Organization Development Interventions on Human Capital: A Case Study of Thailand Appreciative Inquiry Network', 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 29, pp. 25-43.

49. Repede, E., 'Participatory Dreaming A Unitary Appreciative Inquiry Into Healing with Women Abused as Children', 2011, *Advances in Nursing Science*, vol. 34, no, 3, pp. 174-197.

50. Repede, E.J., 'Participatory Dreaming. A Conceptual Exploration from a Unitary Appreciative Inquiry Perspective', 2009, *Nursing Science Quarterly*, vol. 22, no, 4, pp. 360-368.

51. Rubin, R., Kerrell, R. and Roberts, G., 'Appreciative Inquiry in Occupational Therapy Education', 2011, *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 233-240.

52. Sandu, A., 'Appreciative Philosophy. Towards a Constructionist Approach of Philosophical and Theological Discourse', 2011, *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, vol. 10. no. 28, pp. 129-153.

53. Sandu, A. and Ciuchi, O.M., 'Affirmative Dimensions of Applied Ethics. Appreciative Therapies', 2010, *Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială*, vol. 30, pp. 53-62.

54. Somerville, M.M. and Howard, Z., 'Information in Context': Co-designing Workplace Structures and Systems for Organizational Learning', 2010, *Information Research*, vol. 15, no. 4, paper 446, [Online] available at http://InformationR.net/ir/15-4/paper446.html, accessed on January 15, 2012.

55. Van der Haar, D.M., *A Positive Change. A Social Constructionist Inquiry into the Possibilities to Evaluate Appreciative Inquiry*, Tilburg: Tilburg University, 2002.

56. Wendt, S., Tuckey, M.R. and Prosser, B., 'Thriving, Not Just Surviving, in Emotionally Demanding Fields of Practice', 2011, *Health & Social Care in the Community*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 317-325.

57. Withney, D., 'Let's Change the Subject and Change our Organization: An Appreciative Inquiry Approach to Organization Change', 1998, *Career Development International*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 314-319.

58. Yoon, M.N., Lowe, M., Budgell, M. and Steele, C.M., 'An Exploratory Investigation Using Appreciative Inquiry to Promote Nursing Oral Care', 2011, *Geriatric Nursing*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 326-340.