

Kiko Suarez

My familiarity with other sectors leads me to believe that there are lessons to be learned and approaches and perspectives to be considered from fields and sectors (Selsky & Parker, 2005) that are different from the one facing the need for change. I also believe that human systems are complex in nature (Buckley, 1968), due to the necessary interdependence and interrelation between individuals that are together at a given moment in time in their lives, but come from different places, experiences and levels of personal and professional growth and development. The organizational and system complexity that I have observed over the many years of practice does not seem to be “manageable”, appearing to be closer to the theory of complex adaptive systems. However it seems feasible to align (Bontis, Crossan, & Hulland, 2002) the pockets of energy inside an organization or human system by considering the different viewpoints and perspectives as if they were electrical potential differences between two places or positions that can provide the energy required for change.

My international background as someone who was born in Spain to a French mother and a Spanish father and has lived in various countries and continents becomes another area for bias, as I happen to believe that hybrid approaches constitute a richer petri dish for professional and personal success. Coming from a humble family, I am also biased toward social enterprise as a potential solution to tackle social problems with conscious market-friendly approaches (Yunus, 2007) that keep high ethical and humane standards.

This global profile has also influenced me to construct and use analogies in an attempt to help others understand innovation and change (Bingham & Kahl, 2013) like in the case of electrical potential mentioned above. It is my exposure to multiple languages and cultures that has led me to invoke the richness of different figures of speech (analogies, metaphors and similes) in my verbal and written expression. It is also my connection with education —both my

parents were K-12 teachers, and now I am deeply involved in post-secondary education issues—that led me to choose communications as a professional career, in an attempt to help those around me be more comfortable understanding the increasing complexity of the world and technological advances in our lives.

My technology background also leads me to believe that we can aspire to “simulate” human processes, and achieve a seamless integration of technological advances in our human existence without giving up our human condition. I spent my early years in the computer field both programming and managing systems, but also helping users and leading helpdesk/customer attention services. I believe there is a risk of technification and dehumanization (Montague & Matson, 1983) which concerns me greatly, particularly in social sectors. My idea of the world is that technology will serve humanity, and that its essence is about improving human lives. My exploration of wisdom is linked to my need to understand complex human processes and analyze them from a systemic perspective, while helping others understand the value of a humanistic approach. The appeal of wisdom is clear: at its core, it is a uniquely human process. I may say that I am attracted to the concept of studying the possibilities of “artificial wisdom,” but I am concerned about the possible misinterpretation that could be made if conceived as a way to dehumanize our existence. In fact, my quest is to understand human processes so organizations can be more human, which will in turn lead them to a wiser state, where humans flourish.

A last area of influence in my bias has to do with the future. In my line of work, as well as my personal time, I am in connection with professionals in the area of futures research and strategic foresight. I believe that prospective thinking (Seligman, 2011) allows individuals to flourish and work wisely together. It provides the necessary space to think and discuss without constraints of present differences. In my experience, individuals have less difficulty setting temporarily aside their differences when the dialog is designed about a future scenario that requires the group to picture themselves in it. This has clearly influenced my choice of methodology.