CALL FOR PAPERS: ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT NATIONAL CONFERENCE DENVER, COLORADO, AUGUST 9-14, 2002

Christopher G. Worley
Program Chairperson

This call outlines some of the requirements for successfully submitting papers and symposia for review. The deadline for submissions is January 4, 2002.

The theme for this year's meeting is, "Building Effective Networks." It is a timely and relevant theme from a global and national perspective, and it is an important and central part of the research and practice that concerns organization development and change division members. This theme invites all of us to contemplate, question, theorize, and imagine how networks can be understood and developed. I encourage you to visit the Academy web page to learn more about this year's theme. The website address is:

http://www.aom.pace.edu/meetings/2002/index_flash4.html.

Submission Process

I cannot over-emphasize the importance of reading and following the submission guidelines in the All-Academy Newsletter or AoM Website, as well as the requirements specific to the Organization Development and Change (OD&C) division.

There are two primary stages in the submission process. First, as in prior years, your abstract, title page, and affiliation information must be submitted to the AoM website before submitting your papers and symposia to the OD&C Division. This is because you need to receive an "electronic submission number" from the AoM website (see URL above). This number should appear on all of your submissions and correspondence.

Be sure to print out the electronic submission confirmation sheet. It contains important information that must accompany your formal submission, including:

· The electronic submission identification number
· Formal name, postal and e-mail addresses, and

THE FOURTH TURNING: A CALL FOR REASSESSING OD's PURPOSE

Ronald E. Purser
Past Division Chair

Sudden loss and tragedy strike a blow to our business as usual attitude, making us question what really matters. After the loss of almost everyone who worked for him in the World Trade Center, including his own brother, I will never forget the tears and agony of the CEO of a bond firm interviewed on CNN. On that day, the importance of work, money and high performance seemed meaningless to this successful CEO who chided his surviving employees who wanted to immediately return to work: "Go to work! Are you crazy!"

Now that the initial shock of the events of Sept. 11, 2001 have subsided somewhat (at least temporarily until the inevitable next wave), perhaps it is worth pausing to reconsider "what matters" for our own professional and personal lives?

I would like to reflect on the talk by Dale Zand at the Washington meeting last August. I was struck by Dale's historical recollection of the personal anxiety that drove many of the OD pioneers in conjunction with the aftermath of World War II. While the major crises of that twenty-year period, starting with the Great

Table of Contents

(From Worley, page 1)

telephone and FAX numbers of all authors or presenters
· Title of paper or session
· An abstract of less than 250 words describing your paper, art/poetry, or symposium submission
· The single division or interest group receiving the paper submission. Papers can only be submitted to one division/ interest group. In the case of a symposium, identify all the divisions or interest groups receiving the submission. Please use the same name and affiliation on all submissions, and proof carefully.

Second, submit your paper or symposium proposal before January 4, 2002. We **strongly encourage** you to submit your paper or symposium proposal electronically to save time, money, and the environment. Please attach two versions of your submission to an e-mail message: one **with** a title page containing author(s)' identifying contact information and one **without** the author(s)' identifying title page. These two files should be named **"author"** and **"no-author,"** respectively. Both files must contain the **submission number** acquired from the Academy's web site.

Important: Include in your message a statement that you and any co-authors have read and are not violating the "Rule of 3" or the "Rule of 1" as described in the Academy's Paper Submission Checklist. All submissions must be made in a MS Word compatible format. Your submission will be acknowledged electronically upon receipt. Send your submissions as an attachment by e-mail to: odc@pepperdine.edu.

Authors without Internet/e-mail access should follow the hardcopy and diskette submission procedures specified by the Academy (see **Diskette Submission Procedures** in the Academy newsletter). Send your submission with a copy of the web-based electronic printout sheet to Dr. Christopher G. Worley, MSOD Program, Pepperdine University, 400 Corporate Pointe, Culver City, CA 90230.

There are more requirements for preparing your submissions, so I strongly encourage you to consult the national newsletter or the Academy web site for the details. The deadline for receiving all submissions is January 4, 2002.

We look forward to receiving your submission and seeing you in Denver, Colorado.

Depression and ending with the bombs being dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, were over, the anxiety among social scientists did not abate. With the exception of the Cold War and Korea, America was relieved and heading towards renewal, a carefree season—a new high period. The men were returning home, women were resuming their child-rearing roles and domestic duties, and organizations were growing and humming efficiently along. Yet, despite this optimism and happy-go-lucky times, OD pioneers were still worried and anxious. What mattered to them was the reform of bureaucratic institutions that inhibited adult development, preventing people at work from actualizing their full human potential and capacities to ensure the health and functioning of a democratic society. The early OD pioneers had a shared value-base, were motivated by common humanistic concerns, which could be characterized as idealistic, radical and reformist.

What sort of context has shaped the second and third generation of OD consultants/researchers? Moving into the '80s and '90s, economic survival in a globally competitive world demanded an emphasis on performance improvement, that is, a bottom-line results orientation. High performance was now the name of the game. If one was to indulge in soft skills, one better have good empirical data to show the link to performance and return on investment. This new generation of OD consultants/researchers, primarily baby-boomers, were raised in a time of rising consumption and societal affluence. Their role increasingly focused on making good on OD's promise for high performance. In light of the harsh and practical realities of the last two decades, those still enamored by OD's founding values and ideals were seen as nostalgic, out-of-touch (after all most had reached retirement age by now), and starry-eyed clinicians.

Today, many people are beginning to reassess what really matters to them. In recent years, we have seen a burgeoning interest, for example, in spirituality and religion at the workplace. Both *Business Week* and *Fortune* have published special issues on the topic. Baby-boomers are now entering a major transition from mid-life to elderhood. And let's not forget that many baby-boomers, before taking on respectable positions in corporate America, were once avid radicals during the Vietnam War and Civil Rights Movement. During this transition from mid-life to elderhood, many baby-boomers are beginning to question whether their

true destiny has really been fulfilled. From hippies to yuppies, many are asking "now what"? Questions such as:

· What value is worldly and financial success if I am unable to really enjoy my personal life and be of service to my community?

· What values and ideals do I really want to stand for? What sort of legacy do I want to leave for the next generation and for generations to come?

Such questioning comes in the wake of recent events. Indeed, let us consider that the Sept. 11 tragedy represents a cataclysmic event, a collective turn in the American psyche. The rhythm and mood of society has dramatically changed, literally overnight. We have suddenly moved from a time in history that was characterized by an unraveling of our culture, a period of fragmentation and cynicism. Before Sept. 11 America was known for its culture wars, the Simpson trial, Monica Lewinski, pragmatism, laissez-faire government and gridlock. Social historians Strauss and Howe (1997) have discovered that there are distinct seasonal rhythms in history, that unfold in four major cycles or "turnings" that make up a "saeculum," or roughly a century. For example, the period coming out of World War II, from 1946-1964 in America was the "First Turning," a "High" mood. From 1964-1984, we experienced the "Second Turning," known as the cycle of Awakening. We have been in the throes of "The Third Turning" cycle, known as the Unraveling, defined by culture wars.

Strauss and Howe's book is eerily prophetic. I was awestruck on Sept. 11 as I had read their book years earlier and recounted their scenarios for the cataclysmic events that would catapult America into the "Fourth Turning." After the World Trade Towers were destroyed that day, I pulled their book off my shelf and re-examined the paragraphs that I had highlighted. Some of the key excerpts from their prophetic chapter appear below:

"Sometime around the year 2005, perhaps a few years before or after, America will enter the Fourth Turning." (p. 272)

"A spark will ignite a new mood. Today, that same spark would flame briefly but then extinguish, its last flicker merely confirming and deepening the Unraveling-era mind-set. This time, though, it will catalyze a Crisis. (p. 272)

"…the following scenarios might seem plausible… A global terrorist group blows up an aircraft and announces it possesses nuclear weapons. …The terrorists threaten to retaliate against an American city. Congress declares war and authorizes unlimited house-to-house searches." (p. 273)

"The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention announce the spread of a new communicable virus. The disease reaches densely populated areas, killing some. Congress enacts mandatory quarantine measures." (p. 273)

"It's highly unlikely that any one of these scenarios will actually happen. What *is* likely, however, is that the catalyst will unfold according to a basic Crisis dynamic that underlies all of these scenarios: An initial spark will trigger a chain reaction of unyielding responses and further emergencies. The core elements of these scenarios (debt, civic decay, and global disorder) will matter more than the details, which the catalyst will juxtapose and connect in some unknowable way. If foreign societies are entering the Fourth Turning, this could accelerate the chain reaction." (p. 273)

"At home and abroad, these events will reflect the tearing of the civic fabric at points of extreme vulnerability—problem areas where, during the Unraveling, America will have neglected, denied, or delayed needed action. Anger at mistakes we made will translate into calls for action, regardless of the heightened public risk." (p. 274)

"…individuals will feel that their survival requires them to distrust more things. This behavior could cascade into a *sudden downward spiral, an implosion of societal trust. (my italics)*" If so, this implosion will strike financial markets—and, with that, the economy. …But as the Crisis mood congeals, people will come to the jarring realization that they have grown helplessly dependent on a teetering edifice of anonymous transactions and paper guarantees. Many Americans won't know where their savings are, who their employer is, what their pension is, or how their government works." (p. 274)

"Institutions will become increasingly bossy, limiting personal freedoms, chastising bad manners, and cleansing the culture. (p. 276)."

"Eventually, all of America's lesser problems will combine into one giant problem" (p. 277).

"The first glimpses of a new golden age will appear beyond: *if only this one big problem can be fixed* (italics in original, p. 278).

"Decisive events will occur—events so vast, powerful, and unique that they lie beyond today's wildest hypotheses. These events will inspire great documents and speeches, visions of a new political order being framed. People will discover a *new hitherto unimagined capacity to fight and die, and to let their children fight and die, for a communal cause. The Spirit of America will return, because there will be no other choice"* (my italics, p. 278).

"If there is confrontation, it is likely to lead to war. This could be any kind of war—class war, sectional war, *war against global anarchists or terrorists,* or superpower war. *If there is war, it is likely to culminate in total war, fought until the losing side has been rendered nil—its will broken, territory taken, and leaders captured. And if there is total war, it is likely that the most destructive weapons available will be deployed"* (my italics, p. 278).

If you agree with Strauss and Howe's prophetic scenario analysis—that America has indeed made a collective turn into a period of Crisis—which typically lasts for 20-25 years—we must pause and reconsider the value of our knowledge, and where and how it should be applied. We saw that during World War II many social scientists, both in Britain and the US, lending their expertise to the war effort. It is difficult to say whether the "new war" will lead us in this direction. With increased funding for the CIA, will social scientists be lured by grants to conduct experiments or studies that now focus on how to combat terrorism? Certainly the concern for satisfying quarterly demands for high performance will still be important, but more urgent matters of national security may overshadow the cries of the private sector. As we are likely to experience a long economic recession, or even depression, there will probably still be a market for a cadre of stalwart pragmatists who can squeeze more work out of the downsized survivors. And academics will still probably be able make a career out of proving the economic efficacy of such interventions.

But is that our calling as OD professionals? Our real destiny? Is that our vision for what we can offer to the world at large? In times of Crisis, we must reconsider our aims, our values, and our actions.

It is my belief that the field of OD also experienced its own form of Unraveling, in parallel with the larger American culture. There were the die-hard idealists, the softy clinicians who looked upon the hard-driving empirical types as traitors and sell-outs. Similarly, the hard-nosed researchers and in-the-trench consultants had an air of superiority and arrogance about them, chiding their clinician counterparts as hopelessly out-of-touch. The field of OD also now faces a crisis, and needs a rebirth. But the concept of rebirth requires that we shed our linear conception of time and history. What mattered and once worked during previous cycles of history, may be counterproductive if prolonged. Just as we attempt to prolong human life by technical means—even if it results in an actual decline in quality of life—perhaps OD consultants are doing society a disservice by attempting to prolong the life of terminally ill organizations through their technocratic interventions. And many of the idealistic OD clinicians who had their glory during the security and affluence of earlier times also need to let go and allow for new inspiration and vision to emerge.

Many baby-boomers will be moving into elderhood (63-83) over the next twenty-five years. Perhaps the real destiny of these baby-boomers is yet to be realized? The blind idealism and unrestrained behavior that characterized their youth during the cycle of Awakening must be relinquished. I doubt that war protests '60s style simply won't cut it, nor have much legitimacy during this time. However, I believe the seeds of wisdom were planted back then; they have not come to fruition. Clearly, younger generations will be looking to those of us to provide societal guidance in the years ahead. Self-indulgence in hard-times ahead is certainly not going to be very popular. Instead, as elders of society in crisis, baby-boomers will take on the archetypal role of the new Prophets. I have had visions of new wandering spiritual elder movement, characterized by a renunciation of materialist values, signaling a major shift away from our consumption-driven society. Perhaps new enclaves of a movement will reappear both in the bohemian enclaves of cities and in rural areas. Such a shift may be sparked by necessity of severe economic collapse that wipes out baby-boomer pension funds and the social security system goes bankrupt—just at the time of their retire-ment. Indeed, if the whole country experiences something equivalent to the Great Depression, it could make way for a serious period of re-enculturation. Values and ideals which seemed idealistic and counter-cultural in the '60s in such prior times of affluence, may now be reborn in new forms that provide communal meaning.

If baby-boomers do embark on this sort of cultural quest, subsequent generations—the 13th generation (X'ers or Nomads, 1961-1981), along with the Millennial Generation (1982-2000)—will look to them for guidance in terms of ideals and values. Surely these scenarios are all mere speculation. But I believe it is our task now to consider what shape and form the field of OD should take as we enter this new time in history.

References
Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1997). *The Fourth Turning: An American Prophecy.* New York, NY: Broadway Books.

<div style="color:red">

CALL FOR PAPERS
Dynamic Time and Creative Inquiry
in Organizational Change:
An Improvisational Conference
June 18-21, 2002, Boston, MA

</div>

The usual ways of coping with the reality of constant and ever accelerating change are based on notions of controlling time. Time is seen as either a scarce resource or a hostile force. But that view is coming under challenge. The 2000 AOM Conference in Toronto, along with a special issue of the Academy of Management Review, which take time as their central theme, reflects a new openness to alternative approaches. Building on this foundation, the Dynamic Time and Creative Inquiry Conference will bring together a small group of scholars for an engaging dialogue into our knowledge of time and its role in organizational life.

The Organization Development and Change (ODC) Division and the Center for Creative Inquiry (CCI) are co-sponsoring this conference. The conference will be held in the Boston area (details on location forthcoming on the ODC website: www.aom.pace.edu/odc).

What Is an Improvisational Conference?

Anyone familiar with conventional academic conferences knows that the most fruitful and lively parts of

any conference often happen spontaneously, "between times," in the hallways and the bars. This conference is meant to be an "all between times" conference. It will be designed to maximize creative interactions, keeping formal presentations to a minimum, offering participants the chance to probe topics in more depth. Authors will not formally "present" their papers, but will chair discussions on the themes, perspectives, or approaches they contain. The aim throughout will be to stimulate inquiry and interaction rather than simply a one-way transmission of information.

Types of Submissions and Contributions

Keeping in mind the improvisational structure of the conference, the types of submissions include (all submissions will be peer-reviewed):

· A full length paper, accompanied by a statement explaining how as an author you would design a highly interactive session that engages participants in a creative inquiry and dialogue related to the substance of your paper. You may submit a 500 word abstract of the paper, along with a statement that outlines your plans for making the session interactive before January 15, 2002. Authors will be notified of acceptance by March 1, 2002. Upon acceptance, final papers will be due by May 15, 2002.

· Proposals for experiential and interactive sessions/ workshops that explore the dynamic of time and allied questions. Potentially relevant approaches include phenomenology, action inquiry, embodied inquiry, contemplation, and experiential exercises or thought experiments that evoke new ways of experiencing and understanding time. (Submit a 2-3 page proposal describing your session by January 15, 2002).

· Discussion sessions by participants of their own work in progress (research, case studies, emerging theoretical ideas) that focus on time and temporal issues in organizational life. (Submit a 3 page proposal by January 15, 2002).

· Those wishing simply to attend without making a formal submission should send a statement of 500 words or less indicating the applicant's interests in the conference theme, and how one's interests and background will enrich the improvisational nature of the conference. (Submit statement by January 15, 2002).

Doctoral Student Scholarships

The ODC division of the Academy of Management is offering two $500 scholarships for eligible doctoral students. The registration fee will be waived for scholarship recipients. To apply, please send a 2-3 page statement outlining your personal and professional interests, particularly your interest in the study of time in organizational life.

Conference Organizing Committee

The organizing committee for this include the following: Barbara Adam, Cardiff School of Social Science, Cardiff University; Allen Bluedorn, University of Missouri, Columbia; Mary Jo Hatch, University of Virginia; Christian Noss, Freie Universitat Berlin; Jack Petranker, Center for Creative Inquiry; Ronald Purser, San Francisco State University; William Torbert, Boston College

Submission Information

All applications, submissions, and inquiries should by sent by e-mail to: programs@creativeinquiry.org.

Further information and details on the conference will be available after December 1, 2001 on the website of the Center for Creative Inquiry: www.creativeinquiry.org and also on the ODC webpage.

For further information, you can also contact: Ronald Purser, Dept. of Management, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132, (office) 415/338-2380, (fax) 415/338-0501, (Email) rpurser@sfsu.edu or Jack Petranker, Center for Creative Inquiry, 2625 Alcatraz #605, Berkeley, CA 94705, 510-849-0971, petranker@worldnet.att.net

Registration and Lodging

The conference will begin on June 18th at noon and conclude on Friday noon, June 21, 2002. Registration fee is $325 before March 15, 2002, $375 thereafter. Full-time doctoral students are eligible for a reduced fee of $225/275. Lodging information will be forthcoming; please check the websites (www.creativeinquiry.org) or (www.aom.pace.edu/odc).

CALL FOR REVIEWERS
An On-Line Teaching Resource

Ron Purser
Past Division Chair

I would like to make everyone in our division aware of MERLOT — Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching (www.merlot.org). This is a **free** and **open** resource designed primarily for faculty and students in higher education. The links to the learning materials in MERLOT provide users with useful web sites and on-line resources for teaching.

MERLOT is a cooperative of individual members and institutions of higher education interested in improving teaching and learning. As an individual member, you can join this community and can be a contributor to MERLOT, or simply use the materials. Individual members can add teaching-learning materials, comments, and assignments to the MERLOT collection. A growing number of on-line modules are being peer reviewed by a Business Discipline Editorial Team. This effort is in alignment with the scholarship of teaching philosophy.

To become a member, only your last name and e-mail address are required. Minimal other information is optional, and is designed to give other members a sense of your role and your subject interests in the educational community. This information is posted on each member's profile and in that way is public. MERLOT does not share this information beyond this use. Joining MERLOT is easily done by filling in a short form. After joining MERLOT, you can simply login during future visits.

Call for External Reviewers

As a member of the Business Editorial Review team of MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching), I am inviting academics from the ODC division to become External Reviewers. The criteria for being an External Reviewer are that the individual be an instructor at an institute of higher learning and that he/she has demonstrated expertise in the discipline, is recognized for excellence in teaching, has experience using technology in teaching, and has participated in the activities of the Academy of Management.

External Reviewers are partnered with members of the Editorial Review Board to conduct Expert Peer Reviews on a learning module in their discipline. In addition to contributing to the discipline, serving as an External Reviewer enables the individual to become more familiar with the types of learning material available. After completion of the review, the External Reviewer is recognized for his/her contribution.

Interested individuals should contact: Cathy Owens Swift, Business Co-Editor, Georgia Southern University, PO Box 8140, Statesboro, GA 30460-8140, cswift@gasou.edu, 912-681-5217

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE: A REFLECTION ON WHERE WE CAME FROM

Dale E. Zand
New York University

This occasion, the 30th anniversary of the founding of ODC Division in the Academy of Management, gives us an opportunity to reflect on our past. By reflect I mean both to recall and to probe that past. I thought it would be useful to explore our roots—to consider where we came from by reviewing the 30-year period before the foundation of the ODC division.

It is my proposition that the theories of change and the creative practices of that earlier period profoundly influenced ODC today, more than half a century later. The basic elements of theory and practice were put in place then. Most of our present-day concepts and methods—for example: process analysis, team development, open systems analysis, parallel learning systems, survey-research, appreciative inquiry, and large systems change—consist of refinements, extensions, and recombinations of those basic elements. If we conceive of development as a spiral process, then the ODC field has traveled several loops up the spiral by adapting those basic elements with increasing insight and creativity.

To appreciate our roots I believe we also have to look at the environment of that earlier period. As social scientists we are in our culture and affected by it, like everyone else. But, we are also motivated to systematically observe and analyze our culture's underlying values, norms, and dysfunction. As ODC specialists we then seek to develop theory and practice that will improve the functioning and health of individuals and organizations.

In the environment of that early period, roughly 1945 to

1975, America went through three decades of increasing anxiety, mistrust, and alienation caused by fighting several wars, trying to avoid atomic annihilation, facing internal subversion, mourning the assassination of dissenters, and discovering that our government was untrustworthy. I believe that the environment of that early period determined in large measure the questions social scientists asked and where and how they looked for answers.

Anxiety and Mistrust

Wars. America fought three wars in that early period: World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. The 50 million deaths attributable to WWII left lasting psychological and social scars. With disbelief and revulsion we learned of the Nazi death camps. The Korean War from 1950 to 1953 almost pulled us into an all out war with China. From 1964 to 1973 we kept escalating the Vietnam War, the longest and most troublesome war in American history. The Arab-Israeli wars of 1956, 1967 and 1973 pulled us into confrontation with the Soviet Union. The ensuing Arab-OPEC oil embargo increased the price of crude oil more than 1,200%, triggered rampant inflation for more than a decade, and depressed living standards of developed and developing countries by siphoning billions of dollars to the OPEC countries.

Atomic Chicken. America and the Soviet Union played "atomic chicken" with our lives. With one false move they could blow each other off the face of the earth. In the Cuban Missile crisis of 1962 America and the Soviet Union almost did that.

Subversion. The McCarthy hearings alerted the nation to the specter of Communist infiltration of the government and the entertainment industry to subvert U.S. policy in the interest of the Soviet Union.

Assassinations. We were plagued by assassinations that killed dissenters and tore the fabric of our democracy. President John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X were assassinated. Three young civil rights workers, James Cheney, Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman, were murdered in Mississippi.

Untrustworthy Government. Finally, the Watergate cover up and the revelation of misused campaign funds brought us face to face with the ultimate test of our democracy: the impeachment of President Nixon. We were awakened to the sobering discovery that the government we trusted was not trustworthy.

The point of this recapitulation is that we had been living through three decades of relentless anxiety and endemic mistrust.

Alienation

During those three decades the prevailing organizational norms for managers were be hard-nosed, be authoritarian, be directive. The norms for subordinates were be compliant, maintain a pleasant façade, do not express dissenting views. These norms inhibited motivation to work, diminished commitment to the organization, and suppressed the openness needed for problem solving and creativity.

Organizations were generating the pathologies that interfered with their effectiveness. The prevailing norms were also diminishing individual satisfaction with work, organizational role, and personal growth. Organizations were shaping individuals into role automatons who would suppress their needs as human beings.

Study of Individuals and Groups

This systemic anxiety, mistrust, and alienation also afflicted behavioral scientists. It stimulated them to focus on what was happening within the individual and how individuals related to others. If governments and large organizations were suppressive, dysfunctional, and crazy, then behavioral scientists concluded that the best bet was to study individuals and groups to help them find themselves, to help them cope with their dysfunctional organizations, and hopefully to improve those organizations. For example, much of Kurt Lewin's work on autocratic leadership, change, and social conflict was stimulated by that environment.

The pioneers of that early period blazed a path for ODC as we know it today. Much of what follows may seem like old hat to you, but that's because what the pioneers did was so effective and is so widely accepted.

Individual Development a Good in Itself

A dramatic shift occurred in the perception of the individual's status. Individual development became a good in itself. Individuals were to be valued as unique human beings rather than tools of the organization or servants of the state. Karen Horney (1950), Eric

Fromm (1955), and Sigmund Freud (1949), proposed that the development and growth of the individual is a desired value, a good in itself, a criterion of health. Abe Maslow (1954) legitimized self-actualization and elevated it to the top of his hierarchy of human needs. Doug McGregor's (1960) Theory X, authoritarian management, versus Theory Y, humanistic management, made managers aware of how they were denigrating individuals and undermining the effectiveness of their organizations. Chris Argyris (1962, 1964) focused on alienation from self and work and passionately argued for authenticity as the key to finding oneself and forming effective relationships. Carl Rogers (1961) pioneered non-directive counseling and helped us see that we were on an endless journey of "becoming". Jourard (1964) systematically described the transparent self and called our attention to the close link between self-disclosure and individual well being.

Groups

Group dynamics took on new prominence and emerged as the key mechanism for individual growth and organization development. Years earlier the Hawthorne studies observed that members of a cohesive work group could restrict or increase production in conformity with the group's norms (Roethlisberger, 1939), but there was little knowledge of the internal dynamics of groups. Behavioral scientists began asking many questions about how groups operated. A prolific body of group literature emerged. Lewin (1947) and Asch (1952) showed that groups could have a substantial effect on individual judgments and attitudes. Bales (1951, 1958) developed a system for analyzing the interaction process in a group and described the emergence of a task leader, a social leader, and the roles of members. Cartwright and Zander (1953) surveyed theory and research on group dynamics. Hare (1962) gave us a handbook of small group research. Shepard (1956) formulated a theory of training by group methods built around the concept of "valid communication"— that is, congruence between the private self and the public, interpersonal self. Bennis (1956) described the phases and subphases of group development and analyzed how members work on the issues of power and affection and move toward productive interdependence. Schutz (1958) distilled the concepts of power and affection into the three dimensions of control, affection and inclusion and developed his fundamental interpersonal relations orientation (FIRO) questionnaire to assess how an individual was likely to relate to others in a group.

Laboratory Method

The earliest theory of organization development was that individual self-awareness, sensitivity to others, and skill in interpersonal relations would lead to improved organizational performance. Sensitivity training, using the small group as the vehicle for personal learning, emerged as the path to individual growth. The here and now focus of one-to-one psychotherapy was blended with Kurt Lewin's (1948, 1958) pioneering work on social change, Carl Rogers' (1961) non-directive counseling, and Robert Bales (1958) small group theory to spawn the laboratory method for sensitivity training.

The innovation of the laboratory method was that the individual could, with supportive norms and the assistance of others in his small group, effectively investigate his feelings and behavior. In a so-called T-group, with proper guidance by a trainer/facilitator, an individual could gradually expose his feelings, behavior, attitudes and concepts and could learn from the feedback and reactions of others.

The laboratory method required carefully building trust among the members of the group, developing one's ability to listen to oneself and to others, increasing one's awareness of one's own feelings, developing skill in giving and receiving feedback, and improving one's ability to observe and understand the group's process. It provided an opportunity to experiment, to try new behavior to improve one's interpersonal skills.

Sensitivity training swept the country. The National Training Laboratories (NTL) emerged as the leading organization in the field. Under Lee Bradford it called on university faculty and practicing psychologists to staff its programs and began publishing the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* to provide an outlet for articles in this new field.

The laboratory method was a revolution in applied behavioral science and the pioneers wrote about it. Lee Bradford, Jack Gibb and Ken Benne edited *T-Group Theory & Laboratory Method* (1964). Ed Schein and Warren Bennis gave us *Personal and Organizational Change through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach* (1965). Bob Golembiewski and Art Blumberg continued the theme with *Sensitivity Training and the Laboratory Approach* (1970). Argyris (1970) presented another formulation and methodology in *Intervention Theory and Method.*

OD Theory and Practice

In the late 1950s the prevailing theory of organization development was the "seed" theory. The idea was to seed the organization with a few sensitive, interpersonally skilled managers. They would model the openness, authenticity and interpersonal skills that would improve the organization's effectiveness. For a number of years organizations sent large numbers of managers to sensitivity training programs. This was a tonic for the individual manager's development but managers did not have the concepts or the skills to implement change within the authoritarian norms of their organization. Managers had great difficulty transferring to their hierarchical organizations the carefully built laboratory norms of trust, openness, authenticity, feedback, and constructive use of dissent. Modeling alone would not do it. Some managers also had the mistaken belief that organizations would become T-groups.

We concluded that rather than send one manager at a time to a sensitivity program it was better to send several managers together so they could support each other when they returned to their organization. You might call this the "batch" theory of OD. Gradually this evolved into the early "family group" theory of OD. It consisted of sending an entire team of a manager and his subordinates to a program, distributing its members to different T-groups and then bringing them together toward the end of the program to work on back-home problems.

Ultimately, in order to improve transfer of learning from individual sensitivity to organizational problem solving we designed and began to deliver within an organization programs that blended some sensitivity training with process analysis, team goal setting, and problem solving. This might be called the later "family group" theory of OD. It avoided sending managers to so-called stranger programs but the downside was a greatly diminished concern for individual development and growth. Also, a person's exposure to managers and norms of other organizations was eliminated. All of this was happening before the founding of the ODC division.

Gradually the field moved away from individual sensitivity training as the primary component of organization change. The focus shifted to the work group, the department, the interaction between groups and between departments, and ultimately the larger organization and its strategy for prospering in a competitive environment. Lewin's early concepts of change as a process of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing and of force field

analysis were refined with concepts such as felt need for change, client system, change agent, contracting, diagnosis, depth of intervention, intervention design, action research, and stabilizing change.

Bennis (1961, 1968, 1969) examined the planning of change and the dynamics of human interaction in several books that are milestones in the field which are worth revisiting to this day. Lippitt (1958) set forth a comprehensive approach to planned change and analyzed many of the concepts in the social approach to the process of change.

Other Approaches to OD

People were increasingly exploring approaches to organizational change that de-emphasized sensitivity training. Implicitly these approaches assumed that until proven otherwise there was enough trust, openness, and interpersonal skill in an organization for people to work reasonably well on finding and solving organizational problems.

Confrontation Meeting. Dick Beckhard's (1964) confrontation meeting described a method for bringing together several levels of an organization for one or two days to identify problems and propose solutions to top management.

Survey Feedback. Rensis Likert and his colleagues at the Institute for Social Research were using survey questionnaires to study work groups and organizations. Over time they blended the questionnaire results with laboratory method and team meetings to develop the survey-feedback process. Likert (1961, 1964) conceptualized and summarized this work in his System 1-System 4 framework which he called new patterns of management.

Managerial Grid. Bob Blake and Jane Mouton (1964) developed their managerial grid version of OD. This self-administered, integrated program used questionnaires, feedback and laboratory method to move through the individual, group, and organizational levels of analysis.

Process Consultation. Ed Schein (1969) built on much of the literature and work of the laboratory method to put forth a concise description of process consultation. He examined the processes of communication, group functioning, group problem-solving, group norms, group growth, leadership, and intergroup relations.

Organization Change Consulting. By the late 1960s organization change consulting had become a major activity. Harry Levinson (1972) wrote about assessing the history, structure, and processes of an organization as a basis for diagnosis and intervention. Blake (1976) disaggregated consultation into a matrix with three dimensions—focal issues (e.g. power, norms), type of intervention (e.g. acceptant, confrontation), and target level (e.g. individual, intergroup) and wrote about each of the cells in this comprehensive matrix.

The Early Division Chairpersons

Wendell French, (1969), to whom we are all indebted as the founding chairman of the ODC division, wrote about OD objectives, assumptions, and strategies. Wendell then wrote what may have been the first comprehensive textbook in OD (1973) and followed this with a second book of foundation articles in OD (1978).

Tony Raia, ever active as an OD consultant, examined values and goal setting (1965), and with Newt Margulies edited informative collections of readings on laboratory method and change (Margulies 1971, 1978).

Craig Lundberg became the Will Rogers of OD, gently prodding us with wry wit to develop better theory and to ground our concepts more rigorously in the behavioral sciences.

Dale Zand (1972) formulated a dynamic theory of trust, induced different levels of trust in groups and demonstrated the beneficial effects of trust and the deleterious effects of mistrust on high-stake managerial decisions under uncertainty. Zand (1974) introduced the concept of collateral/parallel organization, detailed its theory, and described its application as a change intervention in two organizations.

Bob Golembiewski was already writing prolifically by the early 1970s pushing the frontiers of OD theory, practice and research with his books on sensitivity training (1970) and renewing organizations (1972).

Frank Friedlander (1970) examined the importance of trust as a factor in group accomplishment and wrote a comprehensive review of the status of OD (1974).

Conclusion

To appreciate OD today I believe that we have to review our roots and reacquaint ourselves with the remarkable creativity and risk-taking behavior of the pioneers. They sallied forth like little David with some behavioral science theory as a slingshot and a handful of experimental practices as pebbles. They confronted organizations girded like Samson in the armor of authoritarian management. It is a tribute to the pioneers that many of those early OD concepts and practices are still here and are familiar to most change agents and managers.

This short paper cites only a few of the many references in the OD literature. It also has left out or made insufficient reference to many people such as Warren Bennis, Herb Shepard, Ronald and Gordon Lippitt, Stanley, Charlie, and Edie Seashore, Harry Levinson, Muzafer Sherif, Bill Schutz, Floyd Mann, Dave Bowers, Bob Kahn, Bob Chin, Goodwin Watson, Bob Tannenbaum, Fred Massarik, Mike Beer, Warner Burke, Dave Nadler, Roger Harrison, and host of others who blazed a path for OD. We owe much to all of them.

Practically all the citations and events described in this paper occurred outside of the Academy of Management before the OD division was formed. In conclusion, I wish to pay my respect to Wendell French for bringing the rich theory, practice and literature of the OD field into the house of the Academy of Management. I want to compliment Wendell and all the chairpersons who followed for carrying on the work of building this division and the field of ODC.

References

Argyris, C., (1962). *Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Argyris, C., (1964). T groups for organizational effectiveness. *Harvard Business Review* 42(2): 60-74.

Argyris, C., (1970). *Interpersonal theory and method.* Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Asch, S. E. (1952). Group forces in the modification and distortion of judgments. *Social Psychology*, 450-501. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bales, R. F. (1951). *Interaction Process Analysis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley

Bales, R. F. (1958). Task roles and social roles in problem solving groups. In *Readings in social psychology*, ed. Maccoby, E. E., Newcomb, T. M., & Hartley, E. L., 437-447. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Bennis, W. G. and Shepard, H. A. (1956). A theory of group development. *Human Relations* IX, 4: 415-37.

Bennis, W. G. (1966). *Changing organizations*. New York, NY.: McGraw-Hill.

Bennis, W. G., Schein, E. H., Steele, F. I. and Berlew, D. E. (1968). Interpersonal Dynamics (rev. ed.). Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey.

Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D. and Chin, R. *The planning of change*. (2nd ed.) New York, NY.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX.: Gulf.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1968). *Corporate excellence through grid organization development*. Houston, TX.: Gulf.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1976). *Consultation*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (1953*). Group dynamics: research and theory*. (eds.), Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson.

French, W. F., (1969). Organization development: objectives, assumption, and strategies. *California Management Review* 12: 23-34.

French, W. F. & Bell, C.H., Jr. (1973). *Organization development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Freud, S. (1949). *Group psychology and the analysis of ego*. New York, NY: Liveright.

Friedlander, F. (1970). The primacy of trust as a facilitator of further group accomplishment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 12(1): 7-21.

Friedlander, F., & Brown, L. D., (1974). Organization development. *Annual Review of Psychology* 25: 313-41.

Fromm, E. (1955). *The sane society*. New York, NY: Rinehart.

Golembiewski, R. T. & Blumberg, A. (1970). *Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach*. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock.

Golembiewski, R. T. (1972). *Renewing organizations: the laboratory approach to planned change*. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock.

Hare, A. P. (1962). *Handbook of small group research*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth*. New York, NY: Norton

Jourard, S. M. (1964). *The transparent self: self-disclosure and well-being*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Levinson, H. (1972). *Organizational diagnosis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press

Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York, NY: Harper.

Lewin, K. (1958). Group decision and social change. In *Readings in social psychology*, ed. Maccoby, E. E., Newcomb, T. M., & Hartley, E. L., 197-211. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Likert, R. (1964). *The human organization.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lippitt, R., Watson, J. and Westley, B. (1958). *The dynamics of planned change*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Margulies, N. and Raia, A. P. (1971). *Organizational development: Values, process, and technology.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Margulies, N. and Raia, A. P. (1978). *Conceptual foundations of organizational development.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.

Raia, A. (1972). Goal setting and self-control: An empirical study, *Journal of management studies* 2: 34-53.

Roethlisberger, F. H. and Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin.

Schein, E. H. (1969). *Process consultation: its role in organization development*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Schutz, W. (1958). FIRO: *A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior.* New York, NY.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Shepard, H. A. and Bennis, W. G. (1956). A theory of training by group methods. *Human Relations* IX, 4: 403-14.

Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2: 229-39.

Zand, D. E. (1974). Collateral organization: a new change strategy. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 10 (1): 63-89.

Biographical Note

Dale Zand chaired the OD Division in 1975. He attended his first T-group with Jack Gibb in 1955 and shortly after was trained as a facilitator by Lee Bradford, Doug McGregor, Warren Bennis, Chris Argyris, and Herb Shepard. He has worked on the staff of many laboratory, training of trainers, and OD programs. He served on the board of directors of NTL and was chairman of the Management/OB department at the Stern School, New York University. He has been a coach to many senior executives, a consultant to many organizations including the board of directors of the 2 million member National Education Association, and a member of the board of business organizations. His most recent work on trust and collateral/parallel organization appears in Zand, D. E. (1997) *The leadership triad: Knowledge, trust, and power.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

DIVISIONAL WEB PAGE ADDS TEACHING RESOURCES

Eric A. Goodman
Web Master

Recently, as one of the ways of expanding the value of the ODC Division to you we undertook an initiative to create an area on the website dedicated to teaching resources. Please visit it at: http://www.aom.pace.edu/odc/teach.html. We have started off this resource by posting syllabi that were contributed by our members that attended a PDW on Teaching in ODC held at the Academy meeting this past August. Thanks to everyone who participated and was willing to share their resources.

In order to establish this as an even more useful feature, we need your help! As we work towards creating an archive of teaching materials we ask that you share your relevant syllabi, exercises, and other materials by sending it to me as an attachment at egoodman@coloradotech.edu. We hope that you will check out the website in the near future to see this useful addition to our site.

It is only through your active help that we can shape a website that is a useful resource to us all. We look forward to you visiting the site and contributing your materials! We would also welcome other links or suggestions that you have for enhancing the website in general.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR ODC DIVISION OFFICERS

George Roth
Division Representative

In the next several weeks the board of the Organization Development and Change (ODC) Division will consider nominations for an Academy Council Rep and a new Division Representative to the ODC Executive Committee. These are important positions that affect the future of our division and the Academy of Management. The membership will be asked to vote for people from the list of proposed nominees.

You can nominate people that you think would represent you and your interests well and be good in these roles. Nominations can be made either by sending (email, mail or fax) the attached nomination form, or by doing so on the web site.

We invite nominations from the membership for these positions. Self-nominations are acceptable.

To nominate someone please visit:
http://www.aom.pace.edu/odc/nominate.html

Position Descriptions:
The Academy Council Representative attends the Academy of Management Council to represent the ODC Division and views of the membership at large. The Council has been established by the AoM Executive Board as a way for broad input and suggestions from our membership. The position requires attending the Academy Management Council meeting and August meeting of the ODC Board. There is an opportunity to help the Academy by further defining the role of the Academy Council. This is a two-year position.

The ODC Division Representative will serve for five years on the Executive Committee, including terms as PDW, Program and Division Chairs. For more information on the roles and responsibilities for the ODC Divisiong Representative see http://www.aom.pace.edu/odc/roles.html

Please complete the form and mail nominations to: Dr. George Roth, Sloan School of Management E60-176, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 30 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02139, or fax to 617-252-1425, or email to groth@mit.edu. You may nominate more than one person.

- -

NOMINATION FORM:

Name of nominee _____

Affiliation _____

Mailing address _____

Phone number (if known) _____

Email (if known) _____

I nominate the above named person for the following position:
☐ Academy Council Representative
☐ ODC Division Representative

FEEDBACK TO THE EDITOR

We welcome your feedback and would appreciate your comments below. Selected comments on articles in the OD Newsletter may be published in the next issue, so please indicate if you prefer your comments to be withheld. After completing your comments, please detach this page and return it to the editor. *(Please Print All Comments.)*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

1.   Do you have any comments that you would like to share with the Editor (comments on articles from the last issue, comments on this issue, suggestions, etc.?)

_____
_____
_____

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

2.   Is there any important information about you or a colleague that you would like to have appear in the next issue?

_____
_____
_____

PUBLICATIONS

3.   Please list below any recent or forthcoming publications by you or a colleague.(Indicate full citation.)

_____
_____
_____
_____