

WHITE PAPER

From Limiting Reactivity to Creative Adaptation in Organizations

An approach to sustainable development at the meso-level in organizations, and as a necessary condition for development at the macro-level — society as a whole.

Ramo de Boer

Gestalt therapist, trainer, educator and author | MindConsult

©2026 mindconsult

Core message

Organizations, teams and professional networks systematically display the same patterns as individuals under chronic stress: they react automatically from ingrained algorithms, repeat counterproductive strategies, and thereby precisely produce the results they were trying to prevent. Without structural attention to developing and maintaining the capacity for reflection, social systems drift toward disorder — not suddenly, but gradually and invisibly. This white paper introduces a working approach for recognizing, naming and interrupting collective reactive algorithms, and the structures that make Qualitative Attention sustainably possible as an organizational practice.

1. The problem: organizations¹ that get stuck within themselves

Organizations tend to slow down and become stuck, and what makes this phenomenon so persistent is that it is rarely the result of a lack of resources, talent or strategy, but almost always the result of ingrained patterns that have become so self-evident that nobody perceives them as patterns any longer. They are taken to be reality itself — “that’s just how it is; that’s how we do things here.”

Procedures once introduced as sensible responses to past situations or crises have remained procedures long after those circumstances vanished. Cultural patterns that once protected against disruptive internal and external influences now undermine the very internal cooperation

¹Organizations here means: all associations between people involving two or more, in any formal or informal form. In this white paper the focus is on larger configurations such as we find in profit and non-profit organizations: management boards, executive teams, civil servants in public administration, boards of directors and supervisors, works councils, municipal councils, provincial councils, scientific institutes, (sections of) political parties, trade unions and the like.

that is needed to function effectively. Leadership styles intended to provide control precisely generate the insecurity they try to manage. The protective reflex is active, but the constraining influence it protects against no longer exists. That, by definition, makes the reflex counterproductive.

This is not a failure of individuals but a structural phenomenon that affects every organization that does not actively invest in establishing and maintaining the Qualitative Attention a living, dynamic organization requires. The collective, like the individual, develops patterns: automated reaction patterns that were once productive but have since become counterproductive.

Recognizing this phenomenon begins with a simple but uncomfortable observation: the manager who has already spoken to the same employee several times without result; the meeting that ends, time and again, in the same pattern of indecisiveness; the team that automatically chooses avoidance when conflict arises and lets the tension build until it is too late. All these situations are expressions of the same mechanism: the organization is not responding to what is actually happening — to the observable here-and-now process — but to what it expects, on the basis of earlier experiences, to be happening.

2. Entropy and negentropy: the law behind decay

Every system that does not actively bring in and maintain a counterforce inevitably moves in the direction of increasing disorder. What happens in small teams and in large organizations alike when structural attention is absent is no accident and no exception — it is a lawful regularity. In thermodynamics this is called **entropy**; in social systems we recognize it as the slow disintegration of the quality of contact, meaning and direction.

An organization is an open system, comparable to a living organism: it can only function and flourish so long as it actively brings in and maintains **negentropy**. Negentropy is the counterforce to decay — the continuous investment in attention, reflection, shared meaning-making, and living contact with what is actually happening. The moment that investment stops, the system takes the path of least resistance: routines stiffen, procedures become ends rather than means, and the culture loses its capacity to respond adequately to a changing reality. Creative adaptation no longer takes place.

Nobel laureate Ilya Prigogine demonstrated that systems far from equilibrium do not, by definition, fall apart, but are also capable of generating new order out of apparent chaos. Organizational crisis, then, need not be the endpoint; it can also be the starting point of a more far-reaching reorganization at a higher level of functioning — provided that sufficient reflective capacity is present to recognize the crisis as a signal from a derailing system, and not as a threat that demands immediate protection.

This is precisely where things go wrong when collective reactivity takes the upper hand: the organization experiences frustration and powerlessness and activates protective reflexes that close it off from the very information it needs. Entropy and reactivity reinforce one another. The

counterforce — **Qualitative Attention as a structural practice** — is therefore not a desirable extra, but a necessary condition for the survival of a living, dynamic organization.

3. The approach: from reactivity to Qualitative Attention

Over 40 years of practice as a Gestalt therapist, trainer, educator and author, Ramo de Boer developed an approach that integrates four traditions: Gestalt psychology, Buddhism, phenomenological philosophy and non-dualism. The core of this approach is elaborated, in both theory and practice, in his most recent book — *De Waarheid Is Absoluut Relatief – Door aandachtig waarnemen naar overstijging van het zelf* (“Truth Is Absolutely Relative – Through attentive observation toward transcendence of the self,” MindConsult, 2026).

Key concepts

Emotional and mental algorithms	Ingrained reaction patterns that have formed within a person — or a collective — in response to earlier powerlessness, frustration and pain. These algorithms run outside conscious perception and control, and are easily — usually unconsciously — activated in the current situation.
Reactivity	The automatic reflex that tries to prevent the apparent repetition of earlier powerlessness, frustration and pain, but paradoxically produces precisely the result that was feared.
Initiation	The initiation that activates the reflex — not the cause of the problem, but the prompt for the reactive response.
Qualitative Attention	The capacity to be directly and alertly present in what is happening here and now, rather than reacting automatically from ingrained patterns. This is an active skill that requires structural training and that, once developed, forms a necessary condition for all other competencies.
Interrupting	Consciously and directly uncoupling the reactive response from the initiation — not letting go and not destroying, but recognizing, embracing and transcending.
Creative adaptation	The response that becomes possible when the reflex no longer steers automatically: direct contact with the here-and-now situation and a conscious, adequate choice that fits what is genuinely at play now. A response from an inner space of spontaneity, creativity and flexibility.

The four phases of transformation

The approach works through four phases applicable at every level — individual, collective and institutional — which together bring about a movement from automatic reaction to conscious, creative adaptation.

- **Observing** — being directly and alertly present in what is actually happening now, without filtering it through familiar patterns or expectations about how things will unfold.
- **Recognizing** — recognizing one's own reactivity: this is an emotionally charged response from the past, not necessary in the reality of this moment.
- **Interrupting** — by consciously breaking, repeatedly, the coupling between the initiation and the automatic response, the reflex is dismantled and gradually fades.
- **Adapting creatively** — generating a conscious response that fits the actual situation, rather than the apparent threat from which the algorithm originally arose.

4. From individual to collective: the meso-level application

What is at play at the individual level is equally at play in organizations, though on a scale and with a complexity that makes recognition more difficult. Collectives develop patterns in the form of procedures, hierarchical relationships, cultural patterns and communication styles that were once functional but have continued running long after the original occasion vanished.

The protective reflex of an organization produces — just as at the individual level — paradoxically precisely the result it is trying to prevent. A defensive organizational culture, fed by distrust and internal competition, creates exactly the insecurity it seeks to ward off. Control as the primary response to uncertainty undermines the responsibility and initiative that are needed to actually reduce that uncertainty. Avoiding conflict allows tension to build until it erupts in a crisis that is many times more severe than the original difference, which could simply have been voiced.

The organization is not responding to what is actually happening now, but to what it expects, on the basis of earlier experiences, to be happening. The initiation is here-and-now, the response stems from the past.

The field approach

Kurt Lewin, whose thinking is rooted in the same Gestalt tradition from which this approach emerges, described as early as the 1940s precisely what we see again and again:

behaviour is never the product of a person alone, but of the total field of forces in which that person finds themselves.

His formula $B = f(P,E)$ — behaviour is a function of person and environment — is simple and radical at the same time. It is not who falls short, but the field that steers the behaviour. Cultural

patterns, unspoken norms, hierarchical relationships and defensive routines are not the background to the problem — they are the problem itself, as restraining forces that hold every drive toward change in balance with the pressure trying to push that change through.

What Lewin called *quasi-stationary equilibria* describes exactly what we encounter in organizations: not a rigid pattern, but an active equilibrium — continuously sustained by forces driving toward change and forces guarding the existing situation. His most practical insight is that pressure for change typically calls forth an equally strong counter-pressure. Pushing harder does not work — but removing the forces that hold the pattern in place does. That is precisely what **Qualitative Attention** does: it makes those forces visible and discussable, so that the equilibrium can shift.

Qualitative Attention

Qualitative Attention is the capacity to remain concentrated and alertly present regardless of internal or external distractions. A skill which, unfortunately, is not structurally trained in any culture, including our own. We do find its seeds in phenomenological philosophy and existentialism, and naturally in the traditional meditative streams within Buddhism. The aim is for us to actually be able to use the limited freedom we have, as human beings, to consciously influence our own perception and action.

In work with leaders, groups and teams, an insight has been confirmed that sounds at first hearing surprisingly simple, but carries far-reaching consequences:

Qualitative Attention is the mother of all competencies

All competencies an organization needs — communication, cooperation, decision-making, conflict handling, leadership — run, to a greater or lesser degree, on the quality of attention that those involved manage to bring and sustain. Without sufficient quality of attention, competencies remain theoretical and are applied in practice inadequately or not at all, no matter how well the competency itself has been trained. This explains why organizations can have qualified people, well-considered procedures and substantial training budgets, and still get stuck in the same patterns. The missing link is not knowledge or skill, but the quality of presence *from which* that knowledge and skill are deployed.

Content and process: the invisible level

One of the most persistent blind spots in people, and therefore in organizations, is the absence of a distinction between content and process. The content of an interaction — the subject, the agenda, the decision to be made — is usually clear and stands at the centre of attention. The process — the action and reaction to each other's behaviour, the underlying needs and fears that colour the interaction, the patterns that repeat themselves in the cooperation — remains largely unnoticed. People are confronted with the result, but have no clear view of what it arises from.

Qualitative Attention makes the distinction between content and process visible and discussable. With it, the role of leaders, and equally of team members, shifts from a content-

oriented role to a process-oriented one: no longer focused solely on what needs to be done, but alertly present to how the collective functions in the back-and-forth of everyday work. This is the most direct and durable entry point for breaking through limiting collective patterns.

5. Collective reactivity: three recognizable forms

Collective reactivity manifests itself at the meso-level in three principal forms that mutually reinforce one another and that, together, can block an organization in its functioning and development.

Defensive culture	Distracting automatisms	Apparent confirmation
Distrust as unspoken undertone	Excessive meetings without decision-making	Drive for confirmation as collective pattern
Avoidance of honest feedback	Steering by numbers without reflection on the process	Selective information flow that confirms the picture
Internal competition over cooperation	Procedures as ends rather than means	Echo chambers within teams and departments
Blame and control as primary reflexes	Busyness as a substitute for real contact	Self-fulfilling expectations about the other

Group dynamics and absenteeism as a collective signal

A particularly telling symptom of collective reactivity is **absenteeism**. Where absenteeism is usually approached as an individual phenomenon — the sick employee as an isolated case — practice indicates that individual symptoms are often expressions of a collective process. The social climate of a team or department has a direct influence on the well-being of individual employees, and thereby on their functioning and presence.

When people in a group find insufficient connection, experience too little appreciation and safety, or are met by collective reactivity, not only their well-being but also their capacity to cooperate effectively and contribute to the shared result diminishes. Absenteeism, then, is not primarily a medical or personal problem but a signal that the organizational climate deserves attention. An approach focused exclusively on the individual therefore misses the heart of what is happening.

6. What works: interventions at the meso-level

On the basis of this approach and of practical experience with leaders, teams and professional networks, the following interventions have proved most effective for breaking through collective reactivity and for establishing and maintaining Qualitative Attention as an organizational practice.

Structurally embedding reflective practice

The most common mistake in organizational development trajectories is to treat reflection as a one-off intervention: a training, a team day, an external session. Effective negentropy, however, requires continuity. Supervision, InterVision and joint reflection sessions should not be set up as an add-on to the work but as an essential part of it, structurally anchored in the regular working practice. This is not lost time but the investment that prevents the system from falling back into its ingrained patterns the moment the external impulse falls away.

Working with current interaction as material

Preparation

For the whole to be more than the sum of its parts (Aristotle), it is a necessary condition that ideally all members of a group (team, department, company) — but at the very least a substantial majority — complete a basic training in Qualitative Attention. An additional condition is that, after the training, members continue to do the trained exercises individually on a regular basis for at least six months (preferably longer) in order to raise and maintain their qualitative attention.

Application

The most direct and effective way of working is one in which the regular work situation itself — the team meeting, the management meeting, the performance review — is used as practice material for training Qualitative Attention. The group investigates its own patterns in the actual interaction: what is really happening here now, who is reacting to what and from which pattern, and what effect this has on the collective result. This way of working eliminates the gap between the training context and the workplace and makes the learning yield directly applicable.

Psychological safety as a structural condition

A collective can only perceive what is genuinely happening when individuals within it dare to voice their perception without being punished through reactive behaviour from the group or the leader. Psychological safety is therefore not a goal in itself but the structural condition under which collective Attention becomes possible. It requires leadership willing to make its own algorithms visible, and so to model a culture in which self-inquiry and honesty are valued above performance and self-protection.

From content-oriented to process-oriented leadership

Training leaders and their teams in the distinction between content and process is one of the most direct entry points for raising the reflective capacity of an organization. A leader and/or

team member who is able to perceive the process of an interaction — who reacts how to whom, which patterns are repeating, which needs and fears are present unspoken — has access to information that content-oriented leading or participation simply does not generate. Reactivity diminishes when it is recognized as such and is not taken personally; and that recognition is a skill that can be trained.

STARR as an instrument for focused self-reflection

The STARR model — Situation, Task, Action, Result, Reflection — provides an effective framework for structured self-reflection at the meso-level, both individually and collectively. By regularly describing crucial moments of interaction along the STAR(R) dimensions and then reflecting on the discrepancy between intention and outcome, on the role of one's own attention and reactivity, and on the underlying needs and fears that drove the behaviour, an increasingly fine-grained self-insight develops into one's own contribution to the collective result.

The step of focused Reflection added later — the second R — is the most essential of all: it closes the circle by translating the observations made into conscious insight and concrete behavioural adjustment, and so prevents the model from being reduced to a description of what was, without prompting what could be done differently.

Train-the-trainer as leverage for lasting impact

The most durable meso-level impact does not arise from a prolonged external presence but from internal multipliers: professionals who fully command the approach and integrate it into their own daily practice as leaders, coaches, HR professionals, trainers — and certainly as team members. This requires a transferable, clear framework, a deepening programme in which participants learn to recognize and interrupt their own algorithms, and structural follow-through that ensures the learning is not dissolved in the press of daily business after a few weeks.

Anchoring within the organization

The forms of work described above thrive best in an organization in which the training and maintenance of Qualitative Attention continue to be offered structurally, through training and supervision. Through such provision, all employees can make this approach their own and learn to apply it. The more employees are familiar with and trained in Qualitative Attention, the stronger the field — the organization itself — that supports this approach.

7. Scientific grounding

The approach connects to several contemporary research traditions which each, from their own angle, describe why ingrained patterns are so persistent, how they manifest themselves in systems of every scale, and what is genuinely needed to break through them.

- **Kurt Lewin** — the man who built the bridge between Gestalt psychology — the tradition from which this approach emerges — and what we now call organizational science. He

was the first to describe scientifically that behaviour can never be properly understood from the person alone, but only from the entire field of forces in which that person finds themselves. His formula $B = f(P,E)$ — behaviour as a function of person and environment — is the foundation of everything described in this white paper. Every stuck pattern in an organization is, in Lewin's terms, a *quasi-stationary equilibrium*: actively held in place by driving and restraining forces. And his central insight — that reducing restraining forces is more effective than strengthening driving ones — describes precisely the movement that Qualitative Attention makes possible.

- **Antonio Damasio** — discovered that our body continuously sends signals that steer our behaviour — a kind of inner compass shaped by earlier experiences. When that compass has been distorted by old painful or threatening experiences, those bodily signals steer us toward responses that no longer fit what is actually happening now. The body responds to the past while the situation calls for something else.
- **Anil Seth** — shows that our brain continuously makes predictions about what is going to happen, on the basis of what has happened before. We therefore respond more to the pattern of expectation we have built up than to what is actually in front of us. An organization works the same way: it responds to its picture of the situation, not to the situation itself. The ingrained picture overwrites reality.
- **Sterling & McEwen** — prolonged pressure and stress wear the system into fixed reaction patterns that become ever more automatic. What was originally a meaningful adaptation to a demanding situation becomes an automatism that keeps running long after the situation is past. The system — human being or organization — still responds as though the old threat were present, while it has long since vanished.
- **Ilya Prigogine** — demonstrated that systems under intense pressure do not, by definition, collapse. Provided sufficient capacity is present to understand and steer the situation, they can grow into something new and substantially better. Crisis, therefore, is not an endpoint but can be the starting point of more far-reaching renewal — an insight with direct relevance for organizations that have become stuck in their own patterns.
- **Peter Turchin** — scientifically investigated how societies move through recognizable patterns of cooperation and mutual tension. He showed that social decline has measurable early signs that become visible in time to those who look for them. With this, he demonstrated that social destabilization is not a fate but a process that, if recognized in time, can be turned around.
- **Chris Argyris** — discovered that genuine and lasting change in organizations only takes place when people not only adjust their behaviour, but also examine the deeper assumptions and convictions that drive that behaviour. So long as only the behaviour is adjusted while the underlying assumption remains intact, the problem will eventually return in another form.

Integration of the scientific insights

When these seven researchers are placed side by side, something striking comes into view: however different their backgrounds, they are describing the same thing. **Lewin** lays the foundation: he is the scientist who first described that the field — the configuration of forces in the social environment — steers behaviour, and that changing that field yields different and more durable results than pressuring the individual. The fact that he developed his thinking out of Gestalt psychology makes him not only the historical but also the intellectual forefather of the approach described in this white paper.

Damasio, Seth and Sterling & McEwen each explain, in their own way, why ingrained patterns are so persistent: our body, our brain and our nervous system have been so shaped by earlier experiences that they react automatically to what they expect to see, rather than to what is actually in front of them. That is not a weakness but an originally meaningful property of every living system — the problem arises when these automatic responses remain stuck in a reality that no longer exists.

Prigogine and **Turchin** add an essential dimension: this mechanism plays out not only within an individual system (the human being) but in every system, from a team to a society, and it has recognizable, observable patterns that become visible in time to those who have developed an eye for them. Crisis and destabilization, then, are not an unavoidable fate but signals of a system that has lost its own capacity for renewal — and that, given sufficient reflective capacity, can also genuinely renew itself.

Argyris, finally, makes clear what that reflective capacity means in practice: not adjusting behaviour as a symptom, but examining the deeper assumptions that drive the behaviour. That is precisely what **Qualitative Attention** makes possible — and precisely why the insights of all these researchers, however different their backgrounds, converge on the same practical conclusion: being consciously and alertly present in what is actually happening now is not a desirable addition to good functioning, but the condition under which good functioning is possible at all.

8. Intent and invitation

My intent is to contribute, in substance and structurally, to a society in which Qualitative Attention has become a fundamental part of upbringing, education and support — at home, at school, in clubs, at work, in organizations and institutions — as a primary working condition and as first aid for all manner of setbacks, tensions and conflicts.

This white paper is therefore an invitation to enter into this contribution together with colleagues, organizations, training institutes, professional associations and policymakers who recognize the question that lies beneath each of the situations described here: how do we break through the patterns that prevent us from doing what is genuinely adequate for the whole field, and how do we build the structures that make this living, dynamic organization sustainably possible?

You are warmly welcome with questions, ideas and concrete plans for collaboration.

Possibilities for collaboration

Introduction to Qualitative Attention — pilot trajectory for teams or leadership groups — train-the-trainer programme for professionals — integration of the approach into existing trainings and curricula — keynote or in-depth session for your organization or network — research partnership for academic anchoring of the approach. And any other idea that carries enough realization potential to merit serious time and Attention.

Get in touch via:

info@mindconsult.nu | +31 6 24905665 | www.mindconsult.nu

Ramo de Boer (1957) is a Gestalt therapist, trainer and author with 40 years of experience in guiding individuals, leaders and teams. He has published four books on attention, the development of consciousness, reactivity and transcendence of the self. The most recent —

De Waarheid Is Absoluut Relatief – Door aandachtig waarnemen naar overstijging van het zelf

(Truth Is Absolutely Relative – Through attentive observation toward transcendence of the self,” MindConsult, February 2026)

— contains the theoretical and practical elaboration of this approach. He is the founder of MindConsult (1985).

For more information see: www.mindconsult.nu, LinkedIn, and Substack — Ramo's Inzichten.

N.B. This white paper was produced with the use of Claude AI (Sonnet 4.6 Medium).

APPENDIX

Sources used

From Limiting Reactivity to Creative Adaptation in Organizations

Ramo de Boer | MindConsult | June 2026

For each scholar, two sources are listed: the primary source and an independent or supplementary source. Where more recent works by the same author are available, the most recent has been chosen. Detailed commentary on each source is available on request.

Kurt Lewin

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*. D. Cartwright (Ed.). Harper & Row, New York.

The authoritative work that brings together Lewin's field theory, his analysis of quasi-stationary equilibria in social systems and his force-field analysis. Compiled posthumously from his articles and lectures. Contains the formula $B = f(P,E)$ and the foundation for modern organizational science. Lewin died in 1947; no more recent works by him exist.

Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), 977–1002.

A thorough independent scholarly review that recalibrates Lewin's contribution to organizational science and demonstrates that his field theory and force-field analysis go fundamentally beyond the simplified models that were later derived from them. Confirms the vital role of quasi-stationary equilibria and restraining forces in understanding persistent organizational patterns.

Antonio Damasio

Damasio, A. R. (2021). *Feeling and Knowing: Making Minds Conscious*. Pantheon Books, New York.

*Damasio's most recent work, in which he fully elaborates his theory of the role of bodily signals in consciousness and behaviour. More accessible than his earlier *Descartes' Error* (1994), on which it builds.*

Dunn, B. D., Dalgleish, T., & Lawrence, A. D. (2006). The somatic marker hypothesis: A critical evaluation. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioural Reviews*, 30(2), 239–271.

An independent peer-reviewed evaluation that empirically tests and confirms the core of Damasio's theory, with reservations regarding specific measurement methods.

Anil Seth

Seth, A. K. (2021). *Being You: A New Science of Consciousness*. Dutton / Penguin Press, New York.

Widely received work in which Seth elaborates the theory of the predictive brain: consciousness and perception are a "controlled hallucination," a continuously updated best guess based on earlier experiences.

Clark, A. (2016). *Surfing Uncertainty: Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford University Press.

The authoritative scientific work on predictive processing on which Seth builds, by philosopher and cognitive scientist Andy Clark. Designated by Seth himself as a key source.

Peter Sterling

Sterling, P. (2020). *What Is Health? Allostasis and the Evolution of Human Design*. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Sterling's own recent elaboration of allostasis — the mechanism he co-introduced in 1988. Explains how chronic load leads to fixed reaction patterns that become decoupled from the current context, and why recovery requires intervention at the system level.

McEwen, B. S. (1998). Stress, Adaptation, and Disease: Allostasis and Allostatic Load. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 840, 33–44.

The influential article by neurobiologist Bruce McEwen (Rockefeller University) on allostatic load — the wear and tear that arises through prolonged overload of the system. Cited more than 10,000 times.

Ilya Prigogine

Prigogine, I. & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. Bantam Books, New York.

The foundational work of Nobel laureate Prigogine (Chemistry, 1977) on dissipative structures: systems far from equilibrium can generate new order out of disorder. Prigogine died in 2003; no more recent works by him exist.

Nicolis, G. & Prigogine, I. (1989). *Exploring Complexity: An Introduction*. W. H. Freeman, New York.

A technically more accessible work that develops the scientific underpinning and broadens the application to biological and social systems.

Peter Turchin

Turchin, P. (2023). *End Times: Elites, Counter-Elites, and the Path of Political Disintegration*. Penguin Press, New York.

Turchin's most recent and most direct application of his cliodynamics method to contemporary Western society. Shows how measurable indicators forecast social instability.

Turchin, P. (2016). *Ages of Discord: A Structural-Demographic Analysis of American History*. Beresta Books.

The empirically substantiated work in which Turchin demonstrates that social decline has recognizable and measurable patterns visible in advance.

Chris Argyris

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Addison-Wesley, Reading MA.

The foundational work in which the distinction between single-loop and double-loop learning is introduced. Argyris died in 2013; no more recent works by him exist.

Akrivou, K. & Bradbury-Huang, H. (2023). Revitalizing double-loop learning in organizational contexts: A systematic review and research agenda. *European Management Review*, 20(4), 567–586.

Recent peer-reviewed systematic review (2023) that evaluates five decades of research into double-loop learning and confirms that the distinction between adjusting behaviour and examining assumptions is empirically robust.

Note: For Lewin, Prigogine and Argyris, the foundational works are the primary source because all three authors have died (Lewin 1947, Prigogine 2003, Argyris 2013) and have not published more recent work. The remaining sources have been chosen to be as recent as possible.