Impact of Organizational Development Interventions on Human Capital:
A Case Study of Thailand Appreciative Inquiry Network

Pinyo Rattanaphan[1]

Abstract

Thailand Appreciative Inquiry Network (AI Thailand) has been established since 2007. AI Thailand aims to spread Appreciative Inquiry throughout Thailand. At the beginning, AI Thailand had 32 founding members. These 32 founding members were participants. They were from diverse background, education and ages. One of the most challenging problems AI Thailand faced at that time was: AI Thailand members lacked of Human Capital in Appreciative Inquiry. If this problem was not properly addressed in a timely manner, AI Thailand would vanish. To address this challenge, the Researcher employed Action Research for eight cycles in eight months to develop AI Thailand members' Human Capital. Organization Development Interventions implemented included Appreciative Inquiry, Appreciative Coaching and Knowledge Management. For impacts of Organization Development, Participants' Human Capital was developed. Human Capital consisted of 17 AI Champions, 12 AI Masters and 3 Apprentices. Participants were able to create impacts upon their organizations at diverse degree. Based on statistical findings, ANCOVA was used to measure changes of Experiment Group compared to Control Group. It was found that participants' Entrepreneurial Drive and Proactive Disposition increased but not Preference of Innovation, Nonconformity, Self-efficacy and Achievement Motivation. Impacts did not only occur with individual participants, but also on AI Thailand' performance related to Human Capital as measured by Key Performance Indicators before and after Organization Development.

Key word: Action Research, Organization Developments, Appreciative Inquiry, Human Capital

Background

This Case Study employed Action Research to develop Human Capital or skill knowledge and experience in Appreciative Inquiry (AI) of 32 founding members of Thailand Appreciative Inquiry Network (AI Thailand). AI Thailand has been established since October 16, 2007 by the Researcher. AI Thailand aims to develop AI Practitioners and spread ideas of Appreciative Inquiry in Thailand. At first AI Thailand recruited 32 founding members. These 32 founding members of AI Thailand were interested in Appreciative Inquiry. Participants aimed to apply AI in their organizations. But none had learned about AI before. The Researcher at that time had only limited experience in Appreciative Inquiry. Most of

participants were poor in Thai but at that time there were no case examples in Thai. In attempting to spreading Appreciative Inquiry in Thailand, the Researcher must start from developing participants' Human Capital in Appreciative Inquiry. If the Researcher was able to develop AI Thailand members' Human Capital, it was possible to have AI Practitioners. These AI Practitioners would be drivers for AI Thailand's' mission now and in the future.

To date, AI Practitioners have formed network for knowledge sharing. Most of AI networks disclose information, slides and power points even video clips. The Researcher had gained knowledge from established AI networks like AI Common of Prof. David Coopperrider. The Researcher had used AI to coach three entrepreneurs in 2006 and found extraordinary results. Inspired by such communities, the Researcher then established Thailand

1.Pinyo Rattanaphan is a graduate of the Ph.D. OD Program at Assumption University and a lecturer at Khon Kaen University. He is also the founder/president of Thailand Appreciative Inquiry Network

Appreciative Inquiry Network aiming to spread AI throughout Thailand. As this Organization relied heavily on Human Capital, organization assessment was then related to Human Capital. Initial organization assessment revealed following SWOT:

Strengths:
1. The Researcher's direct experience of Appreciative Inquiry
2. Many AI Thailand's members were top-notched MBA students. They might be the agents of change in helping the rest.

Weaknesses:
1. Lack of human capital. Community members had no skills, knowledge or experience in Appreciative Inquiry.
2. Lack of structural capital such as documentation and best practices in Thai.
3. Lack of social capital. Social capital is the ability of groups to collaborate and work together. It is a function of trust. We were new to one another.

Opportunities:
1. Appreciative Inquiry was still uncharted territory in Thailand since it was new at that time.
2. Appreciative Inquiry was still new to management education and human development training in Thailand. It provided the Researcher and academics as well as professionals a new field to pursue
3. Many members were top-notch MBA students who were also entrepreneurs and top management in government or private organizations. If Appreciative Inquiry worked for them, Appreciative Inquiry would spread throughout Thailand.

Threats:
1. Although the Researcher had experience in Appreciative Inquiry, it was only three cases.
2. Many were busy people. They already had heavy work loads. If AI projects consumed too much of their time, they may choose not pursue their projects.

Statement of the Problem

The real challenge of AI Thailand at the beginning was; there were over 32 AI Thailand members who adopted the Researcher's ideas and were aimed at developing their Appreciative Inquiry's skill, knowledge and experience or "Human Capital." This was considered the real challenge because there was no one in this group with experience in applying AI in real context before. AI Thailand's members would be able to help spread the idea of Appreciative Inquiry if only they already had proved that AI really helped them make significant and meaningful change. This challenge may be addressed by Action Research and Organization Development Interventions.

Research Objectives

Based on Conceptual Framework (See Figure 1), the expected impacts the Researcher aimed to see was the increase of AI Thailand members' Human Capital. The Researcher also expected that AI Thailand members' Intrinsic Motivation measured by Entrepreneurial Drive would increase. If AI Thailand members' Human Capital and Entrepreneurial Drive increased, they should be able to create impacts to their organization. In addition, since, the Researcher developed AI Thailand's Strategy based on Balanced Scorecard, increased participants' Human Capital, Entrepreneurial Drive and participant's organizational performance would increase AI Thailand's performance. Research Objectives reflecting such chain of cause and effects are as follows:

1. To develop AI Thailand members' Human Capital
2. To increase AI Thailand members' Entrepreneurial Drive
3. To increase AI Thailand members' Preference for Innovation
4. To increase AI Thailand members' Nonconformity
5. To increase AI Thailand members' Proactive Disposition
6. To increase AI Thailand members' Self-efficacy

7. To increase AI Thailand members' Achievement Motivation before and after intervention

8. To create an impact toward AI Thailand members' organizations via Appreciative Inquiry

9. To create an impact toward AI Thailand's performance via Appreciative Inquiry

10. To assess AI Thailand's Performance before and after Organization Development Interventions.

Research Questions reflective above Research Objectives are as follows:

Research Questions

1. To what extent did AI Thailand members' Human Capital increased after Organization Development Interventions (ODIs)?

2. To what extent did ODIs impacted AI Thailand members' Entrepreneurial Drive?

3. To what extent ODIs impacted AI Thailand members' Preference for Innovation?

4. To what extent ODIs impacted AI Thailand members' Nonconformity?

5. To what extent ODIs impacted AI Thailand members' Proactive Disposition?

6. To what extent ODIs impacted AI Thailand members' Self-efficacy?

7. To what extent ODIs impacted AI Thailand members' Achievement Motivation?

8. To what extent Appreciative Inquiry impacted AI Thailand members' organizations?

9. To what extent Appreciative Inquiry impacted AI Thailand's performance?

10. To what extent did AI Thailand progress, per its vision, mission and strategy -before and after Organization Development Interventions?

Literature Review

Theories of Motivation

Festinger (1957) also stated that people will have a more comfortable state of affairs when their beliefs, attitudes and values support one another. Such inner system must also is supported by external evidence. Vroom (1964) argued that a person's behavior is based on three factors: expectancy, instrumentality and valence. Brehm (1966) indicated that people get an unpleasant if their freedom to choose an action is threatened. Intrinsic Deci (1971) suggested that people with Intrinsic Motivation tend to do something because it is fun or they believe that things are the right or good thing to do. Alderfer (1972) suggested that there are three needs including Existence, Relatedness and Growth. McClelland (1975) argued that there are three types of needs including Achievement, Affiliation and Power. Rusbult (1980) indicated that an individual's relationship is dependent on his/her satisfaction on balanced rewards and cost, comparison with alternative relationship. Locke and Latham (1990) stated that people direct themselves by setting themselves goals. Deci and Ryan (1991) stated that people when they look at tasks, they evaluate them as to how well they meet their needs to feel competent and in control. If people consider that they are capable of completing the tasks, they would intrinsically be motivated to complete that task. Florin, Karri and Rossiter (2007) defined that Entrepreneurial drive is an individual's perception of the desirability and feasibility to proactively pursue opportunities and creatively respond to challenges, tasks, needs, and obstacles in innovative ways. The authors designed a test to measure Entrepreneurial Drive based upon five constructs with are Preference for Innovation, Nonconformity, Proactive Disposition, Self-efficacy, and Achievement Motivation. Entrepreneurial Drive is the best explanation for most of Motivation Theories. It offers the linkage between motivation and behavior.

Theories of Learning

Learning (Lewin, 1951) means "doing something better than before." Lewin classified learning according to types of changes including: 1) change in knowledge; 2) change in motivation (; 3) Learning as a change in group belongingness; and (4) voluntary control of body muscular. Skinner (1953) argued that people are

motivated to perform or avoid certain behavior because of past outcomes that have resulted from those behaviors. Bruner (1962) stated that learning occurs during problem-solving situations. Argyris (1977) argued that learning starts when learners begin to question underlying assumption and policies. Schön (1983) argued that to engage in continuous learning, an individual's capacity in reflecting on his/her action is crucial. Bandura (1986) argued that people learn by observing other persons (models) they believe in. Knowles (1990) proposed that adults have the need to know why they are learning something. Adults bring more work-related experience into the learning situation. Review of Learning and Motivation theories confirmed that Norton and Kaplan (2004)'s notion that motivation is a predecessor for learning. Properly-developed participants' motivation would lead to learning and growth. Learning would lead to behavioral change. In addition, according to the theory of learning evaluation, Kirkpatrick (1959) proposed the model for evaluating effectiveness of training programme. It consists of four levels including Level 1 (Reaction), Level 2 (Learning), Level 3 (Behavior) and Level 4 (Results). McLean, Sullivan and Rothwell (1995) proposed an OD Evaluation Model developed from Kirk Patrick's Hierarchy of Training Outcome (1959). Hierarchy of levels of the training consists of reaction, learning, behavior and organizational impacts. Learning in OD's perspective means Double-loop learning.

Appreciative Inquiry

According to Cooperrider and Whitney (2005), "Appreciative Inquiry is the cooperative search for the best in people, their organizations, and the world around them. AI is a systematic discovery of what gives a system "life" when it is most effective and capable in economic, ecological, and human development. AI involves the art and practice of asking questions that driver for participants' motivation, learning,

behavioral change and better organization performance. Literature reviews of theories of Motivation, Entrepreneurial Drive, Learning, Behavioral and Appreciative Inquiry suggests a strengthen a system's capacity to heighten positive potential. It mobilizes inquiry through crafting an "unconditional positive question." Appreciative Inquiry gives way to imagination and innovation; instead of negation, criticism, and spiraling diagnosis there is discovery, dream, and design. AI assumes that every living system has untapped, rich, and inspiring accounts of positive potential. Link this "positive change core" directly to any change agenda, and changes never thought of are possible suddenly and democratically mobilized. Appreciative Inquiry is the process of 4-D cycles including Discovery, Dream, Design and Destiny. The AI cycle can be applied as rapid and informal conversation with a friend, or college or a formal organization-wide process."

Yballe and O'Connor (2004) proposed the idea of a Pedagogy of Education. The authors proposed that Appreciative Pedagogy combine a mindset oriented toward appreciating and valuing the best in human experience. Bloom and Archer (2002) applied AI as the students' advising strategy. Ricketts (2002) stated when Appreciative Inquiry is integrated into Experiential Learning, AI accelerates learning, relationship building, builds empathy, deepens trust and heightens mutual understanding. Calabrese (2006) used Action Research as a core research methodology and Appreciative Inquiry to enhance social capital among universities and district schools. Newman and Fitzgerald (2001) had implemented Appreciative Inquiry as an intervention framed by Action Research. This was a large-scale change effort targeting 120 participants at a non-profit metropolitan healthcare facility. It was found that there was improvement in all areas by the end of year three. Chapagain (2005) reported that Appreciative Inquiry had been used for

leadership training organized by Plan International Nepal. Participants reported positive impacts such as improved leadership development and networking skills. Literature review suggested that Appreciative Inquiry is a casual relationship. To develop participants' Human Capital, the Researcher needs to develop participants' Motivation to learn Appreciative Inquiry. Once participants' Motivation is well developed, they would start learning. Right Organization Development Intervention would initiate participants' Double-loop learning. Participants' Double-loop learning would lead to behavioral change. Participants' new behavioral change and more Entrepreneurial Drive would lead them to explore and experiment more challenging ideas. This would lead to better organizational performance. This chain of cause and effect derived from literature review lead to our Action Research's Framework and the basis for designing Conceptual Framework.

Methodology

Participants are 32 AI Thailand's founding members. Ten of them are males while twenty-two are females. Participants are from diverse background including Business Administration, Engineering and Nursing. Their professions ranged from Government Employees, Business Owners, Top Management in Government Agencies or Private Companies. Most of their motivation at the beginning was to try a new thing. They were recruited after they bought off the Researcher's ideas during November 2007-January 2008. Participants committed to develop AI projects in their own organizations.

Action Research was adopted as a core Research methodology to develop participants' Human Capital. Action Research's model is based on the work of Stringer (1996). It consists of Look, Think and Act. Look consists of Gathering relevant data and describing situation. Think consists of exploring/analysis of problems and then interpreting/explaining situation. Act consists of planning, implementing and evaluating actions. Organization Development

Interventions implemented included: Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider and Whitney; 2005), Appreciative Coaching (Orem, Binkert, and Clancy, 2007); and Knowledge Management (Takeuchi and Nonaka, 1995). All events were recorded in Log. Researcher's Dairy was kept for reflection of concrete events. Kolb's Model of Experiential Learning (Kolb, 1984) was employed as a model of Researcher's Dairy. There were eight cycles of Action Research. Each cycle lasted long for one month. At the end of each month, the Researcher had developed a monthly Action Research Report and submitted to Dissertation Advisor for review and feedback. The Researcher had input his Dissertation's feedback to the new cycle. To measure to what extent participants' Human Capital increased, through Action Research, the Researcher developed an Individual Progress Evaluation. . In this Evaluation, participants' progresses were measured from documents. Their progresses can be classified from lowest to highest. The New Wave, the Enthusiast, the Apprentice, the Master and the Champion. From lowest, the New Wave. To measure whether participants' Entrepreneurial Drive, Preference for Innovation, Nonconformity, Proactive Disposition, Self-efficacy, Achievement Motivation before and after Organization Developments, compared to that of the Control Group increased, Quasi-Experiment was used. Statistics employed was ANCOVA (Repeated Measure). In this design, experimental Group A and the control group B are selected without random assignment. Both groups take a pretest and post test. Only the experimental group receives the treatment (Creswell, 2003). Group A is the experiment Group. They are AI Thailand members. Group B is the control group. The associated Instrument used in the Quasi-Experiment was Entrepreneurial Drive Survey (Florin, Karri and Rossiter, 2007). This instrument was translated into Thai, Pilot-tested and analyzed for reliability and validity. To identify whether Appreciative Inquiry improve participants' organization performance improved

116

after Organization Development Interventions, unstructured interview was employed. The step in conducting an Unstructured Interview according to that of Robin, Keegan and Ward (2003) was adopted. The design of the Interview is based on the work of Preskill and Catsambas (2006). Content analysis was used to identify themes concerning level of impacts emerged. Levels of Impacts emerged ranged from "Very High," to "High," "Medium," "Low," and "Very Low" respectively. To identify whether Appreciative Inquiry created impacts to AI Thailand's performance, Observation was adopted. Observation guideline would be based on the work of Reed (2007). The Researcher was to observe turning points of AI Thailand's performance and conceptualize them. To assess AI Thailand's Performance before and after ODIs, unobtrusive measure was adopted. AI Thailand's Strategy was reviewed per its 17 Key Performance Indicators to compare organizational performance before and after ODIs.

Findings

The Researcher's attempt to develop 32 participants' Human Capital in Appreciative Inquiry resulted in impacts at three levels: impacts upon individual participants, participants' organizations and the Researcher's Organization. At individual participants, Organization Development Interventions resulted in the increased participants' Human Capital at diverse degree. This was confirmed by the increases of Entrepreneurial Drive and its construct which was used as a proxy for measuring participant's Intrinsic Motivation. However, only Entrepreneurial Drive and Proactive Disposition increased. Participants were able to create impacts to their organizations at diverse degree. Another two impacts are: the finding of the Tipping Point through Appreciative Inquiry and impacts upon AI Thailand's performance related to Human Capital. Summary of ten impacts on human capital in details are as follows:

1. Participants' Human Capital increased at diverse degree: Individual progress at September 30, 2008 compared with that of February 1, 2008 suggested that participant's Human Capital increased from lowest level which is "the New Wave" to higher levels which are the Enthusiasts, the Apprentice, AI Master and AI Champion respectively. These measures were resulted from Subjective Evaluation on participants' written case studies and self-report.

The New Wave is the participant who confirmed that they will join us. He/she want to do AI projects. The Enthusiast is the participant who already knows which kind of AI project they want to pursue. He/she already spotted his/her "Tipping Point" clients. This Tipping Point may be external or internal people. The Apprentice is the participant who crafted AI interview questions and started AI interviews on 20-30 Key informants or over. AI Master is either (i) the participant who already have reflected their peak experience at Dream, Design and Destiny Process and written them down as a case study. Or (ii) He/she found interesting discovery and finished one AI experiment. AI Champion is the participant who adopted Appreciative Inquiry as his/her flagship change model in his/her own organization. This impact was evidenced by impacts participants had created to their organizations. This Evaluation criterion had been developed during Action Research Cycle 3 and redefined in Action Research Cycle 5. However, it is subject to test and validation in the future. Since this was subjective evaluation, the developed Human Capital was measured in other terms for validation. Such measure was impacts participants with increased Human Capital created upon their organizations.

2. *Participants with higher Human Capital were able to create impacts on their organizations at diverse degree:* Post Interview revealed themes. Such themes classified as highest to lowest impacts which participants created upon their organizations. This is the assessment developed

at the end of Action Research Cycle 8. It is subject to future retest and validation. In this Research, this impact was in line with increased Intrinsic Motivation as measured by its proxy which is Entrepreneurial Drive and one of its constructs or Proactive Disposition.

3.   Entrepreneurial   Drive   increased: Entrepreneurial drive (ED) refers to an individual's perception of the desirability and feasibility to proactively pursue opportunities and creatively respond to challenge, tasks, needs, and obstacles in innovative ways (Florin , Karri and Rossiter, 2007. By practicing Appreciative Inquiry, participants' ED increased. From data analysis, we saw that the experiment group's ED significantly increased while the control group's ED did not. For detail of data analysis, the result shows that ED at the end of the experiment was significantly higher for the experimental group than the ED at the beginning of the experiment, $(F\ 1,\ 55) = 5.414$, $p < 0.05$ $r = 0.3$. The main effect of the group on the ED scores was non significant, $(F\ 1,\ 55) = 0.359$, $p > 0.05$. This indicates that when the time at which ED was measured is ignored, the ED among the experiment group was not significantly different to the controls. The time x group interaction was not significant, $(F\ 1,\ 55) = 0.485$ $p > 0.05$, indicating that the change in ED in the experiment group was not significantly different to the change in the control group. For pair-sample tests, the result also show that ED, $t\ (29) = 2.779$, $p < 0.025$, $r = 0.45$, in the experiment group increased at significant levels. Using the benchmarks for the effect sizes, this represents a medium to large effect (it is between the thresholds of 0.3 and 0.5). Therefore this shows that ODIs resulted in stronger effects on ED. While there was non-significant increase of ED of the control group, $t\ (29) = 1.318$, $p > 0.025$, $r = 0.24$. The Covariate did not significantly predict the dependent variable as Levene's Test show that $p > 0.05$. This suggests that age, gender and educational background did not influence dependent variables.

4.   Participants'   Proactive   Disposition increased: Proactive Disposition (PD) refers to an individual's initiative to improve or to create entirely new circumstance (Florin , Karri and Rossiter, 2007). By practicing Appreciative Inquiry, participants' Proactive Disposition increased. Data showed that the experiment group's PD had significantly increased after ODI, while the control group's PD did not. For detail, the result shows that PD at the end of the experiment was significantly higher than the PD at the beginning of the experiment, $(F\ 1,\ 55) = 8.434$, $p < 0.05$ $r = 0.34$ Using the benchmarks for the effect sizes, this represents a medium to large effect (it is between the thresholds of 0.3 and 0.5). This is a substantive finding. The main effect on the group by the PD scores was significant, $(F\ 1,\ 55) = 11.102$, $p < 0.05$, $r = 1.23$. This indicated that when the time at which PD was measured is ignored, the PD among the experiment group was significantly different to the controls. The time x group interaction was significant, $(F\ 1,\ 55) = 11.712$, $p < 0.05$, $r = 0.44$, indicating that the change in PD in the experiment group was significantly different to the change in the control group. For pair-sample tests, the result also show that PD, $t\ (29) = 11.347$, $p < 0.001$, $r = 0.77$, in the experiment group increased at significant levels while there was not significant increase of PD of the control group, $t\ (29) = 1.662$, $p > 0.001$, $r = 0.9$. Using the benchmarks for the effect sizes, this represents to large effect (it is closed to 1). Therefore this shows that ODIs resulted in stronger effects on PD.

5. The Covariate did not significantly predict the dependent variable as Levene's Test show that $p > 0.05$. This suggests that age, gender and educational background did not influence dependent variables. However, increased participant's Human Capital did not in line with others' Entrepreneurial Drive Construct including Preference for Innovation, Non-conformity, Self-efficacy and Achievement Motivation.

5. Participants' Preference for Innovation did not increase: Preference for Innovation (PI) in business setting refers to a willingness and inclination toward experimentation and creativity when developing and introducing new products and services (Florin, Karri and Rossiter, 2007). By practicing Appreciative Inquiry, participants' PI should increase. However, data analysis suggested that the experiment group's Preference of Innovation and that of the control group did not significantly increase during this research. PI at the end of the experiment was not significantly higher than the PI at the beginning of the experiment, $(F 1, 55) = 2.392$, $p > 0.05$ r = 0.16. The main effect of the group on the PI scores was non significant, $(F 1, 55) = 0.006$ $p > 0.05$, r = 1.23. This indicated that when the time at which PI was measured is ignored, the PI among the experiment group was not significantly different to the Control. The time x group interaction was not significant, $(F 1, 55) = 1.244$, $p > 0.05$, r = 0.44 indicating that the change in PI in the experiment group was significantly different to the change in the control group. For pair-sample tests, the result also show that PI, $t (29) = 0.203$, $p > .025$, r = 0.235, in the experiment group increased at non-significant levels while there were also non-significant increases of PI of the control group, t $(29) = 0.284$, $p > 0.025$, r = 0.2 However, r in both groups was greater than 0.1. This suggests that PI in both groups increased but it was not detected because the sample was relatively small. The Covariate did not significantly predict the dependent variable as Levene's Test show that $p > 0.05$. This suggests that age, gender and educational background did not influence dependent variables.

6. Participants' Nonconformity did not increase: Nonconformity (NC) refers to two continuums in this sense which are innovation and adaptation (Florin , Karri and Rossiter, 2007). In business settings, people can channel their creativity toward adaptive innovations that follow accepted rules and procedures of the organization, or they can challenge the status quo and develop original innovation reflecting their degree of conformity or NC respectively. By practicing Appreciative Inquiry, participants' NC should be increased. However, data analysis showed that both the experiment group's and the control group's NC did not increase. For detail, the result showed that NC at the end of the experiment was not significantly higher than the NC at the beginning of the experiment, $(F 1, 55) = 0.304$, $p > 0.05$. The main effect of the group on the NC scores was not significant, $(F 1, 55) = 2.713$, $p > 0.05$, r = 0.17. This indicated that when the time at which NC was measured is ignored, the NC among the experiment group was not significantly different to the Control's. The time x group interaction was not significant, $(F 1, 55) = 3.064$, $p > 0.05$, r = 0.19 indicating that the change in NC in the experiment group was not significantly different to the change in the control group. For pair-sample tests, the result also show that NC, $t (29) = 1.229$, $p > .025$, r = 0.224, in the experiment group increased to non-significant levels while there was also non-significant increases of NC of the control group, $t (29) = -1.238$, $p > 0.025$, r = 0.223 However, r in both groups was greater than 0.1. This suggests that NC in both groups increased but it was not detected because the sample was relatively small. The Covariate did not significantly predict the dependent variable as Levene's Test show that $p > 0.05$. This suggests that age, gender and educational background did not influence dependent variables.

7. Participants' Self-efficacy did not increase: Self-efficacy (SE) refers to individual's perceptions to their ability to perform a task to improve the chance of converting attitude to behavior (Florin , Karri and Rossiter, 2007). By practicing Appreciative Inquiry, participants' SE should increase. However, data showed that the experiment group's Self-efficacy did not significantly increase. For detail of data analysis, the results showed that SE at the end of the experiment was not significantly higher than the

SE at the beginning of the experiment, $(F_{1, 55}) = 0.616$, $p > 0.05$. The main effect of the group on the SE scores was not significant, $(F_{1, 55}) = 0.948$, $p > 0.05$ This indicated that when the time at which SE was measured is ignored, the SE among the experiment group was not significantly different to the control's. The time x group interaction was not significant, $(F_{1, 55}) = 2.751$, $p > 0.05$, $r = 0.17$ indicating that the change in SE in the experiment group was not significantly different to the change in the control group. For pair-sample tests, the result also show that SE, $t_{(29)} = 0.318$, $p > 0.025$, $r = 0.01$, in the experiment group increased at a non-significant level while there was also a non-significant increase of SE of the control group, $t_{(29)} = -1.337$, $p > 0.025$, $r = 0.24$. The Covariate did not significantly predict the dependent variable as Levene's Test show that $p > 0.05$. This suggests that age, gender and educational background did not influence dependent variables.

8. Achievement Motivation did not increase: Achievement Motivation (AM) refers to behaviors oriented to achievement (Florin, Karri and Rossiter, 2007). By practicing Appreciative Inquiry, participants' AM should be increased. However, data analysis suggested that the experiment group's Achievement Motivation was not significantly increased. For detail of data analysis, the result showed that AM at the end of the experiment was not significantly higher than those at the beginning of the experiment, $(F_{1, 55}) = 1.412$, $p < 0.05$ $r = 0.107$. The main effect of the group on the AM scores was significant, $(F_{1, 55}) = 0.514$, $p < 0.05$. This indicated that when the time at which AM was measured is ignored, the AM among the experiment group was significantly different to the controls. The time x group interaction was not significant, $(F_{1, 55}) = 0.115$, $p > 0.05$, indicating that the change in AM in the experiment group was not significantly different to the change in the control group. For pair-sample tests, the result also show that AM, $t_{(29)} = -0.348$, $p > 0.025$, $r =$

0.06, in the experiment group increase at non-significant level while there was also non-significant increase of AM of the control group, $t_{(29)} = 3.70$, $p > 0.025$, $r = 0.07$. The Covariate did not significantly predict the dependent variable as Levene's Test show that $p > 0.05$. This suggests that age, gender and educational background did not influence dependent variables. Next, the impact the Researcher was able to create during Dissertation was the finding of the Tipping Point's concept and its application.

9. By practicing Appreciative Inquiry, the Researcher found the Tipping Point's Concept: It was the most important finding in this research as it radically impacts AI Thailand's strategy and was also the driver for the increase of AI Thailand members' Human Capital. The Tipping Point is an individual who possesses a unique personality. The Tipping Point consists of the Connector, the Maven and the Salesman (Gladwell, 2001). They are drivers for popularity of idea, fashion and behavior. The connectors are persons who are capable of connecting people. They know a lot of people. They know where to spread the idea and news. The Maven means the person who possesses in-depth knowledge. They love developing the idea. The third persona is the Salesman. Salesman is a person who is capable of selling the idea. The Researcher found that many AI Thailand members' behaviors resemble the Connector or the Maven or the salesman or a combination. The Researcher named people who have one of these three personalities or combined as the Tipping Point. The Tipping Point influenced their peers. They are change agents. This finding is supported by Lawler III and Worley (2008). The Tipping Point is also a key for networking as stated by Gloor (2006). This finding radically impacted AI Thailand's strategy and initiatives in two ways: Firstly, the Researcher initiated change and communicated ideas and knowledge to all AI Thailand members through the Tipping Point. Technically, the Tipping Point was the

catalyst for change. Secondly, for participants, their Tipping Points' clients also become the catalyst for change. Therefore coaching AI Thailand members to reflect their peak experience they have with the Tipping Point's client becomes AI Thailand's strategy.

10. AI Thailand's performance on Human Capital improved but not on other perspectives: As Human Capital is the heart of AI Thailand. All strategic objectives were built upon development of Human Capital aligned from Learning and Growth to Financial and Stakeholder's Perspectives. It was found that AI Thailand's performance related to Human Capital was improved. AI Thailand successfully developed dedicated AI practitioners, developed Capable Positive Change Consortium and sustained Influential stakeholders. Before ODs, we expected to have 4 of them at the end of September 2008. Actually, we were able to generate five Dedicated AI practitioners. Each was still actively working on their Communities of Practices without any intervention from the Researcher. For Capable Positive Change Consortium we were able to develop two Capable Positive Change Consortiums, as expected, capable of developing their "Human Capital" without direct intervention from the Researcher. We were also able to sustain Influential Stakeholders. Influential Stakeholders means those who were qualified as AI Champions and are Tipping Points. From the beginning we expected only 6 of them. At the end we were able to sustain 16 Tipping Points. Their works in the future on Appreciative Inquiry may have positive impacts over AI Thailand's reputation. We still have to keep in touch and still network them with new members. Another achievement was; we were able to acquire more new AI Thailand members. We expected to have total 60 AI Thailand members at the end of September 2008. However, we successfully acquired total 68 of them. Based on Balanced Scorecard designed before this Action Research, AI Thailand achieved all strategic objectives in Customer Perspectives and Process Innovation Perspectives, but failed in Financial Perspective and Learning and Growth Perspective.

Conclusion and Recommendations

AI Thailand had just established in 2007. The most challenge problems AI Thailand facing at the beginning of this Research was: 32 AI Thailand members lacked of Human Capital or knowledge, skill and experience in Appreciative Inquiry. To address this challenge, the Researcher employed Action Research for eight cycles in eight months to develop AI Thailand members' Human Capital. Organization Development Interventions implemented included Appreciative Inquiry, Appreciative Coaching and Knowledge Management. For the outcome, Participants' Human Capital was developed. Human Capital consisted of 17 AI Champions, 12 AI Masters and 3 Apprentices. Participants were able to create impacts upon their organizations at diverse degree. 6 participants were able to create "very high" impacts to their organizations. 5 participants were able to create "high" impacts to their organizations. 10 participants were able to create "medium" impacts to their organizations. 8 participants were able to create "low" impacts to their organizations. 3 participants were able to create "very low" impacts to their organizations. After Action Research, participant's intrinsic motivation measured by Entrepreneurial Drive was increased in some dimensions. Measured by ANCOVA and compared to those of the Control Group, participants' Entrepreneurial Drive and Proactive Disposition increased but not Preference of Innovation, Nonconformity, Self-efficacy and Achievement Motivation. During Dissertation, the Researcher has found and implemented the Tipping Point's concept. This concepts did not help participants boosted their AI projects' performance but also AI Thailand. Coaching on the Tipping Point's Concept was incorporated in Appreciative Inquiry's "Design" phase. This Coaching had become AI Thailand's

flagship intervention. For Impact at Organization level, Action Research and Organization Development Interventions resulted in better AI Thailand' performance related to Human Capital as measured by Key Performance Indicators. However, there were no impacts over other perspectives including Financial and Stakeholder Perspective and Learning and Growth Perspectives.

Recommendations for AI Thailand

1. There should be follow-up Evaluation to see whether such Human Capital developed is sustainable.

2. There was a customized Researcher's Evaluation Criteria for evaluating Human Capital developed during Action Research. They are needed for validation.

3. AI Thailand recruited more new members. However, this Research had been applied for small group of 32 people. Therefore there should be another Action Research to improve organizational performance targeting larger audiences like 100 or over.

Recommendation for Academicians

1. In this Dissertation, the Researcher had developed Evaluation Strategy for Human Capital. There should be an Action Research to refine such Evaluation Strategy.

2. The Tipping Point's concept contributes to transformational change in this Research. The Tipping Point may be helpful for Action Researcher/AI Practitioners working in Thai context even in Western Organizations. Therefore, there should be more Action Research/Appreciative Inquiry projects on the Tipping Point's concepts.

References

Alderfer, C. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, & growth*. New York: Free Press.

Argyris, C. (1977). Double loop learning in organizations? *Harvard Business Review*, 115-126.

Bandura A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thoughts and Actions*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Bloom, J. L. & Archer, N. (2002). Incorporating Appreciative Inquiry into academic advising. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal*. Retrieved October 26, 2007, from www.psu.edu/dus/memtor/020829jb.htm

Brehm, J. W. (1966) *A theory of psychological reactance*, New York: Academic Press.

Bruner, J.S. (1962). *On knowing: Essays for the left hand*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Chapagain C. P. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry for building human capacities: An innovative approach for the new millennium*. Retrieved November 22, 2008, from http://connection.cwru.edu/ai/uploads/AI%20Paper-Sept%2005%20-Chandi.pdf

Calabrese R.L. (2006). Building Social Capital through Appreciative Inquiry: theoretical perspective in a school and university partnership. *The International Journal of Educational Management,. 20*, (3), 173-183.

Cooperrider D.L.& Whitney D. (2005). A positive revolution in change: Appreciative inquiry. In Cooperrider D. L., Sorensen Jr, P.F., Yaeger T.F. & Whitney D. (Eds.*),* *Appreciative Inquiry: Foundations in Positive Organization Development* (pp. 9-34). Illinois: Stipes Publishing.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches*. California: Sage Publication.

Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1991). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. In Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W. (Eds.) *Motivation and Work Behavior (5th Ed)*. (pp. 44-58), New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Festinger, L. (1957) *A theory of cognitive dissonance*, California: Stanford Universiy Press

Florin, J., Karri, R. & Rossiter, N. (2007). Fostering entrepreneurial drive in business education: An attitude approach. *Journal of Management Education*, 2007, *21*, 17-42.

Gladwell M. (2001). *The tipping point*. Bangkok: DMG Book.

Gloor P.A. (2006). *Swarm creativity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Robin, L., Keegan, J. & Ward, K. (2003). In-depth Interview. In Ritchie J. and Lewis J. (Eds), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. San Francisco: Sage Publication.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1959) *Evaluating Training Programs*, (2nd Ed.), San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). A model of learning process. In Osland, J. S., Kolb, D. A. &

Knowles M. (1990). *The Adult Learner*: *a neglected species, 4th Edition*. Houston: Gulf Publishing

Lawler III E. & Worley C.G. (2008). *Built to change*. San Francisco: Wiley and Sons.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory and learning. In Cartwright D. (Ed.), *Field theory in social scienc*e, (pp. 65-66). New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington

Newman H.L. & Fitzgerald S.P. (2001). Appreciative inquiry with an executive team: moving along action research continuum. *Organizational Development Journal, 19* (3), 37-43.

Kaplan, R.S. & Norton, D. (1996). The balanced scorecard: Learning and growth perspective. In Morey, M., Maybuy, M. & Thuraisingham, B. (Eds). *Knowledge management: Classic and contemporary works* (pp.318-336). Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Orem, S. L., Binkert, J. & Clancy, A. L. (2007). *Appreciative coaching: A positive process for change*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Preskill, H. & Catsambas, T. T. (2006). *Reframing evaluation through appreciative inquiry*. San Francisco: Sage Publication.

Reed J. (2007). *Appreciative inquiry: Research for change*. London: Sage Publication.

Ricketts, M. (2002). *The glass is half full—appreciative inquiry, experiential learning and organizational change*. Retrieved November 1, 2007 from http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/uploads/AEE-%20EL%20+%20AI%20-%20Ricketts1.doc

Rusbult, C. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *16*, 172-186.

Skinner B.F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Knopf.

Stringer, E. T. (1996). Action research: a handbook for practitioners. California: Sage Publication.

Takeuchi, H. & Nonaka, I (1995). The theory of organization knowledge creation. In Morey, M., Maybuy, M. &Thuraisingham, B. (Eds). *Knowledge management: Classic and contemporary works* (pp.139-182). Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Vroom V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Whitney, D. & Troston-Bloom A. (2003*). The power of appreciative inquiry*. San Francisco: Berret-Koeler Publishers.