

Contents

[Call For Papers by Jerry Porras](#)

[Welcome to Interorganization Development by D. D. Warrick](#)

[Needless Mistakes in Consultation by Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton](#)

[Is Organization Development Culture Bound? by L. David Brown](#)

[How Does Your Garden Grow? Pretty Well By Anybody's Standards by Robert T. Golembiewski](#)

[OD and Labor Law: A Word of Caution by Thomas G. Cummings](#)

[The Interorganization Group by Herbert A. Shepard](#)

[Articles by Members](#)

[Books by Members](#)

[News About Members](#)

[Help Sought in Study of Ethics in OD Practice and Research](#)

[The OD Network](#)

[American Society for Training and Development](#)

CALL FOR PAPERS

by Jerry Porras

I would like to invite every member of the Organization Development Division of the Academy to seriously consider making a presentation at the 1983 meetings. The program lives or dies on your participation. It gets you more personally involved. It gets your friends and professional admirers more interested in attending the meetings. And finally, it makes my job as program chairperson a heck of a lot easier. So, let me encourage you to plan on participating in the program and to start thinking right now about what you could present. If you would like to discuss your ideas with me, feel free to call at (415) 497-2850.

What are we looking for this year? I can answer the question with one word-CREATIVITY. All creative ideas will be welcome and seriously considered. Symposia will be especially important in developing a lively interesting program. I would also like to see us get more excited about research on OD and encourage you to present work that is just getting started; work in process; or work that has been completed and is all polished up. Descriptions and/or

demonstrations of new change techniques would also be ideal.

In any symposium proposal, I encourage you to find ways to involve the audience in the presentation process. In any paper, I encourage you to feel free to write it in a lively "non-academic" style if you wish. We are looking for creativity, good ideas, and effective ways of engaging those who attend our sessions.

Finally, if you are interested in putting on a one-day workshop after the meetings end, I would like to receive a proposal on that also.

REMEMBER, I NEED YOUR SUPPORT. THE PROGRAM WILL BE DULL AND UNATTRACTIVE IF YOU DON'T GET INVOLVED! DEADLINE: JANUARY 11, 1983. No papers can be accepted after this date. Please send all proposals to me at the following address: Jerry Porras, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

WELCOME TO INTERORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

D. D. Warrick

I feel very fortunate to have been elected the Chairperson of the OD Division of the Academy of Management for 1982-1983. In addition to being honored by your confidence, I am looking forward to having the opportunity to serve our membership by directing my efforts to three important goals:

1. To have a challenging, innovative, and quality national program at our national convention in Dallas in August of 1983.
2. To increase the membership in the OD Division.
3. To promote the concept of Interorganization Development.

The Executive Committee of the OD Division will be meeting in December to plan the national meeting. We would welcome your suggestions in planning the program. Please send your comments to the Program Chair, Jerry Porras, or any of the Committee members including myself; Tom Cummings, the Past Division Chairperson;

Representatives David Nadler and David Brown, and the Editor of the Newsletter, Wayne Boss.

We are hoping to increase our membership (our present membership is about 1000) by encouraging present members to solicit new members from academia, students interested in OD, and interested leaders and practitioners from the private and public sectors. In addition, we would like to encourage members of other OD associations to join our Division and our members to join their OD Divisions.

I personally have very strong feelings about the third objective. We are sending complimentary copies of this newsletter to the membership of several OD associations (as many as we could afford) to promote Interorganization Development in-the field of OD.

Last August at our national meeting in New York City, several historic meetings took place that launched an effort to promote Interorganization Development, and more specifically, to promote collaboration among the major associations and programs in OD. These meetings were the results of the simultaneous efforts of several people such as Herb Shepard and Gordon Lippitt, and a number of OD associations such as the OD Divisions of ASTD and the Academy of Management, to organize a meeting of the leaders of the major OD associations and programs to explore possibilities for collaboration and promoting the field of OD. The first meeting was held by Herb Shepard on the morning of August 16, 1982 to explore the interest in collaboration. The second, sponsored by ASTD, was held that evening to develop specific plans. In true OD tradition, David Nadler was used as a facilitator to guide the meeting. Most of us were amazed at the accomplishments of the meeting, much to the credit of David Nadler.

Later in October, a follow-up meeting was held by Herb Shepard at the OD Network Conference. Plans are already being developed for a fourth meeting at the ASTD convention in June of 1983. You can read more about these most interesting meetings in the article in this newsletter by Herb Shepard. You can be assured of the active involvement of your division in these pioneering efforts to foster Interorganization Development.

I am looking forward to an exciting year for OD and for our division. Please let me or any of the members of our executive committee know if there is anything we can do to serve you better.

NEEDLESS MISTAKES IN CONSULTATION

by Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton

Some see consultation as a performing art, something that can neither be described in the specific instance nor characterized in systematic terms. A performing art is learned by trial-and-error except as one is tutored in it by a master. Others see consultation as a behavioral science discipline; that is, as an activity which can be described and characterized in systematic terms and applied in a deliberate way in specific instances.

Though an intervention entails delicate and subtle relationships characterized by a performing art quality, there is little question but that systematic insights can do much to strengthen the effectiveness of help-giving beyond that possible when consultation is regarded only as a performing art. Granted that effective consultation is based on a complex of factors, the goal of learning about consultation skills and theory is to increase the utilization of systematic insights, thereby creating a discipline to replace a performing art.

According to the discipline point of view, one decision point inherent in any intervention relates to "Who is the client?" Needless mistakes begin to appear at this point. The examples that follow are from published sources, but the issue here is not what went wrong, but rather what can be learned from knowing more about the mistakes involved.

Take for example an intervention that was calculated to strengthen a quality-of-work project in a hospital. All but one significant group in the hospital participated in the effort--nurses, administrators, nonprofessional employees, and so on, including interns and residents. The only non-represented group was the physicians, those most directly responsible for the work of the hospital itself, including teaching, research, and medical care. Without participation of the senior staff (in this case, the physicians) commitment to basic change was unlikely. Eventually, the interns and residents withdrew participation and the project stopped.

Take another example. Six work groups were involved in team building. All but one of the leaders failed to show up and so it was undertaken without the absentees. After six months the five leaderless teams either had regressed or else showed no change by comparison with the one intact team, which reported significant change. An incomplete team, particularly when the leader is excluded, is not a "valid" client. The leader's presence is an essential condition for any prospect of success.

Here's a third example. The goal of the intervention was to reduce the likelihood of a strike recurrence through research to diagnose the causes of a recently concluded strike. Senior corporate staff executives and the top leadership of an international union reached agreement, which affirmed the desirability of the suggested research program and provided a funding base. The "real" client whose collaboration was essential in order to put the effort into motion included the local union leadership where the strike had occurred, but these key persons were not contacted for several more months. Resenting their exclusion from the proposal phase, they took the proposal to the membership where it v rejected out of hand.

These three examples constitute failures related to an inappropriate definition of the client. Others are readily available that show mistakes related to interventions geared to solving the wrong problem and still others related to trying to solve the right problem but with an inappropriate intervention.

What constitutes a proper definition of the client? (1) The client is that individual, group, or organization which contains within itself control over its own destiny insofar as the focal issue is concerned. In the first example, the physicians deeply influenced the quality of work life by the manner in which they conducted themselves. Without their contribution the major influence on quality of work life is excluded and therefore the historical influence of the physicians on quality of work life can be expected to continue.

In the second example, the team leader exercises the key impact on the team. How can the team change if the impact of this key person remains the same by virtue of his absence form the change process?

The same line of reasoning applies to the third example. Leaving out the local union forms initial involvement provoked resentment, which resulted in resistance.

These three examples constitute demonstrations that consultation is far more than a performing art. It is a discipline that can only be conducted successfully when the consultant deals with the whole client.

References: (1) Further amplified in Blake, Robert R. & Mouton, Jane S., Consultation: Handbook of Individual and Organization Development, 2nd Ed. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, in press.

IS ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT CULTURE BOUND?

by *L. David Brown*

The rise of multinational corporations encourages interest in and claims to "transnational OD." Can OD theorists and practitioners leap the cultural gaps that separate the world? I think it likely that most eager leapers in will fall into the abyss. Consider two recent studies.

Hofstede (1980) collected data from thousands of employees from a single multinational corporation that employed staff from forty countries. He found the cultures in his sample could be differentiated on four dimensions: (1) power distance, levels of deference due to authorities, (2) individualism, loyalty to immediate family rather than larger groups, (3) uncertainty avoidance, willingness to accept ambiguity and risk, and (4) masculinity, concern with performance and toughness versus relationships. Cultures varied widely on these dimensions, and Hofstede reported that management theories which evolved in one country are not necessarily appropriate to others. "Participative management," for example, may be very effective in cultures with low to moderate uncertainty avoidance and power distance (e.g., U.S., Britain, Sweden, Denmark), but bizarre and ineffective in other cultural contexts.

Even more relevant is the recent review by Faucheux, Amado and Laurent (1982) of organizational change efforts outside North America. They found that transferring change strategies across cultures has been quite difficult. North American theory and practice has often led to irrelevant or failed interventions in other cultural contexts. Latin approaches to organizational change, for example, have been driven by cultural factors to pay much more attention to power distributions, external social structures, and the role of unconscious processes than North American theory and practice.

In truth, most OD theory and practice has emerged from a rather small and specialized North American subculture. I suspect that most participants in successful OD projects are white, male, fluent, educated, and managerial. If I am right, then OD projects with organizations rooted in other subcultures (women's organizations, unions, organizations of people of color, poor people's organizations) may encounter different and disconcerting cultural assumptions.

Should OD theorists and practitioners stick to their own bailiwicks, operating in situations where they understand the

cultural rules of the game? I am interested in the development of a general theory of planned change, so I think it would be tragic if we retreated from the challenge. (It would be equally tragic if we overinflated our claims of cross-cultural efficacy, and damaged our collective reputation sufficiently to end further opportunities to work across cultures). Building a truly "transnational OD" will demand that we learn as much or more than our clients, and accept the stresses of being culturally "one-down" while we learn -- a position for which Americans have little training and limited natural aptitude.

References

Faucheux, C., G. Amado, and A. Laurent., "Organizational Development and Change," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1982 , 343-370.

Hofstede, G., Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

HOW DOES YOUR GARDEN GROW? PRETTY WELL BY ANYBODY'S STANDARDS *by Robert T. Golembiewski*

This brief summary of two published pieces (Golembiewski, Proehl, and Sink, 1981 and 1982) tests three components of the common opinion about OD, and finds all of them lacking. Many observers propose that:

1. OD'S batting average is adequate, perhaps, but not high enough to imply a solid theoretical base;
2. Public-sector OD efforts are rare, the constraints there being more exotic and formidable than in the private sector;
3. Public-sector OD has lower success rates than does business OD, in addition to being less frequent.

OD's Overall Batting Average:

The general opinion about OD's efficacy is at least questionable, as two approaches imply. First, the several

available comparative studies of the efficacy of published OD interventions imply attractive success rates. To illustrate only:

- 8 percent of Morrison's 26 cases (1978) deal with "failures."
- In Dunn and Swierczek's 67 cases (1977), 65-70 percent were considered "effective."
- In Porras' 35 cases (1979) selected for high degrees of methodological rigor, variables changed in the predicted directions in about 50 percent of the cases.

- Margulies and his associates (1977), rated 73 percent of 30 applications as "positive," with 10 percent "mixed," 24 percent "no change," and 3 percent as "negative."

No unqualified interpretation of such comparative efforts seems appropriate, but they do not well serve the common wisdom. For example, one might argue in opposition to the definite tendency implied above that "successes" are more likely to be written up, which may have been true early in the game. But that bias probably should be discounted because the reporting of "failures" now has a growing legitimacy (cf. Mirvis and Berg, 1977). Moreover, research designs do vary substantially. But even Porras' rigorous criteria generate a 50 percent success rate; and Morrison's data imply similar effects in all the classes of study designs she distinguished.

Second, the summary studies above deal with only a few cases, but their success rates do not differ markedly from those observed in a batch of 574 OD applications (Golembiewski, Proehl, and Sink, 1982). The latter batch was the product of an extensive search covering a 35-year period, which tapped both published and unpublished sources. The search has its gaps (Golembiewski, Proehl and Sink, 1982, pp. 87-88), but it seems to provide a reasonable replica of all OD activity.

The success rate in the 574 cases was estimated in two ways -- one global, and the other based on multiple indicators.

As for the global evaluation, two independent readers assigned each intervention's effects to one of four categories whose content the observers had discussed and illustrated in detail.

- Highly positive and intended effects on the efficacy and effectiveness of some relatively discrete system, as in

improving the ability of team members to hear one another without distortion.

- Definite balance of positive and intended effects, defined in terms of mixed but generally favorable effects; e.g., where major positive effects occurred in one system, while some negative but not counter-balancing effects occurred in another system.
- No appreciable effect.
- Negative effects, where substantial reductions occurred in some subsystem or in some broader system of which it was a part.

What did this laborious rating and cross-checking reveal? Table 1 obviously provides little solace for the common wisdom about private-sector OD applications.

The second approach to estimating the efficacy of OD interventions rests on the comprehensive set of 308 indicators developed by Porras and Berg (1978). Basically, this procedure generates a "percentage of positive reported change" at four levels -- individual, leader, group, and large organization. Readers determined all variables relevant in each of the 574 applications and rated them as either having improved or not improved.

The basic percentage was calculated directly: the number of improved variables was divided by the total number of variables in which change was intended.

Again the common wisdom does not get strong support. In sum, these are the percentages of positive reported change:

Individual-level variables: 78.1%

Leader-level variables: 68.1%

Group-level variables: 77.9%

Organization-level variables 72.4%

Incidence of Public Sector OD

There seems little question that public-sector applications get adequate representation in the population of 574 cases. Indeed, the very number of such applications, 270, may itself constitute a major finding, since most sources emphasize the paucity of public-sector applications (e.g., Burke, 1980). Public sector cases constitute over 47 percent of the present batch of OD studies.

Success Rates in the Public Sector

The common wisdom goes zero-for-three, as Table 2 indicates. Illustrating with the global indicator of efficacy, only a small advantage can be attributed to private-sector applications. Multiple indicators support the same conclusion (Golembiewski, Proehl, and Sink, 1981).

Tomorrow's Challenge

These favorable success rates should not stifle aggressive efforts to attain greater specificity about what designs work, why, and under which conditions, but they might. Progress in the teeth of success, then, constitutes the major future challenge.

References

Robert T. Golembiewski, Carl W. Proehl, Jr., and David Sink, "Success of OD Applications in the Public Sector," Public Administration Review, Vol. 41 (November, 1981), pp. 679-682.

Robert T. Golembiewski, Carl W. Proehl, Jr., and David Sink, "Estimating the Success of OD Applications," Training and Development Journal, Vol.72 (April, 1982), pp. 86-95.

Due to space limitations (in the original newsletter), the additional references had to be deleted. Interested readers should contact the author for that information.

Table 1.

Global estimates of efficacy, private-sector cases only, N: 304

Estimated effects in percent*

Class of OD Design Highly positive Definite balance No Negative

and of positive appreciable effects

intended effects and intended effects effects

Process analysis activities 16.7% 50.0% 16.7% 16.7%

Skill-building activities 40.4% 52.6% 3.5% 3.5%

Diagnostic activities 33.3% 44.4% 5.6% 16.7%

Coaching/counseling

activities 40.0% 46.7% 6.7% 6.7%

Team-building activities 39.3% 51.8% 3.61% 5.4%

Intergroup activities 44.4% 39.0% 5.6% 11.1%

System-building or

system-renewal activities 45.7% 40.0% 5.7% 8.7%

Technostructural activities 40.5% 51.2% 36% 4.8%

Due to rounding, totals may accumulate to 100%.

Table 2.

Global estimate of the success of 574 OD applications in Two Sectors.

Rating categories Individual applications classified by degree of effects

Public sector Private sector

No. % No. %

Highly positive and intended effects 110 41 122 40

Definite balance of positive and

intended effects 116 43 148 49

No appreciable effect 18 7 14 5

Negative effects 26 9 20 6

N = 270 100 N = 304 100

OD AND LABOR LAW: A WORD OF CAUTION

by Thomas G. Cummings

In 1979, Charles Maxey and I presented a paper on OD and labor law at the Academy's annual meeting in Atlanta,

Georgia. Judging from the modest size of the audience, many Division members were unable to attend, and we would like to repeat here some legal cautions for those practicing OD in the private sector. Specifically, one part of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) has particular relevance to OD--Section 8(a)(2) which accords employee organizations, called "labor organizations," the right to be free of undue interference from or domination by employers. We feel that many OD practitioners can unintentionally abridge that Section of the NLRA causing an employer/client to be charged with an unfair labor practice. Moreover, such lawbreaking is most likely to occur in non-union settings where practitioners are least likely to consider labor law relevant.

When an employer is charged with an 8(a)(2) unfair labor practice, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) must decide two questions: Does a labor organization within the meaning of the NLRA exist, and if so, has the employer illegally dominated, interfered with, or assisted that organization?

In deciding whether a labor organization exists, the NLRB relies on Section 2(5) of the NLRA, which defines a labor organization as: "any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

This definition is not restricted to employee organizations, which call themselves unions, or to organizations started by employees. It is a broad, inclusive definition, which essentially says that any employee group, which exists, at least in part, to discuss with the employer essential conditions of the employment relationship is a labor organization and, as such, is entitled to the protections afforded under the law. The breadth of this definition suggests that some employee representation committees, participatory structures, and problem-solving groups common to interventions could be construed as labor organizations under Section 2(5) of the NLRA.

Legal scholars have identified at least three tests or criteria, which the NLRB uses to determine whether a bonafide labor organization exists:

1. Structure--this requirement is satisfied where there is any meaningful employee participation in the organization. Again, this is relatively broad and employee organizations which lack traditional structural features such as bylaws, officers, dues, and even continuity of existence can qualify as labor organizations.

2. Subject Matter--this requirement is satisfied if interchanges between the employer (including management) and employees concern any of the following: grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of work, and conditions of employment.

3. Function--this requirement is met if the employee organization exists, in whole or in part, for the purpose of dealing with the employer. Both the NLRB and the Supreme Court have construed "dealing with" as not being restricted to bargaining but to include informing, counseling, or advising management, making suggestions or recommendations, or merely asking questions.

Each of the three tests for determining whether a labor organization exists is easily met. The NLRB has interpreted Section 2(5) so broadly that many OD interventions can inadvertently create labor organizations as defined by the law.

Once the NLRB determines that a labor organization exists, it must then decide whether the employer has violated Section 8(a)(2) by illegally dominating, interfering with, or assisting that organization. The main intent of this Section of the law is to prevent employers from creating company unions or similar employer-controlled representational mechanisms as substitutes for established external unions. In protecting employee rights to create viable organizations which can vigorously represent them to employers, the NLRB and the courts have not developed clear tests of illegal employer practices but have rendered decisions on each case individually. Based on a selected sample of past 8(a)(2) cases, illegal domination/interference has been found where:

1. The employer initiated or implemented employee representation mechanisms;
2. Management participated in the development of statements of employee organization goals or agendas;
3. The employer controlled membership, or selected members, or participated in meetings of the employee organization;
4. the employer provided office space, supplies, or clerical help to employee organizations;
5. The employer provided refreshments or paid employees for time spent in organizational meetings.

While these legal interpretations paint a relatively bleak picture for OD practitioners committed to building more open and participative organizations, other cases have shown a more promising perspective. These cases rely less on a "strict hands off" approach to employer interference and more on the construct of cooperation; they pay greater attention to employer intent and to the reactions of employees than to actual behaviors. In one case, for example, the court held that the employer had not dominated an employee committee but had cooperated with it; in another, the court refused to disestablish a series of employee committees because they had the overwhelming approval of employees. Perhaps more promising, the NLRB dismissed an 8(a)(2) complaint brought against an employer for creating autonomous work groups; the court ruled that the groups existed primarily for work rather than to deal with the employer over working conditions, and thus the groups were not labor organizations as defined by Section 2(5). Although these cases show some flexibility in the law, at present they represent only isolated cases and have not changed the relatively strict doctrines on which the NLRB judges 8(a)(2) complaints. Indeed, the creation and functioning of autonomous work groups frequently involves representational participation, and there is nothing in the case just mentioned to suggest that the NLRB would be any more sympathetic to this than they have traditionally been.

Given the apparent likelihood that OD practitioners can unwittingly violate labor law, the following advice seems prudent. When considering interventions which are intended to bring employees and management together to discuss conditions of employment on an on-going basis (we are not talking about one-shot meetings), ask the following questions, especially if you are in a nonunion setting:

1. Will the employer be creating a labor organization as defined by Section 2(5)?

1. Will there be meaningful employee participation in the intervention?

B. Will there be interchange between employees and management concerning

conditions of employment?

C. Is the intervention intended, in whole or in part, for employees to deal with the management)?

employer (including

2. If it appears that the employer might be creating a labor organization, can it be construed that the employer is dominating, interfering with, or assisting that organization?

A. Is the employer initiating or implementing the intervention?

B. Is the employer participating in setting goals or agendas for the intervention, especially that part having to do with employees?

C. Is the employer selecting employees for the intervention and participating the intervention?

D. Is the employer providing space, supplies, refreshments, paid time off. etc., for the employee part of the intervention?

If you answer "yes" to many of these questions and if you are hired by the employer exclusively, you can be creating a labor organization and helping the employer to dominate it, hence violating the law. We strongly suggest that if you see the potential of this occurring, you should seek the advice and counsel of qualified labor attorney before proceeding with the intervention. For those wanting a more elaborate discussion of this topic, Charles Maxey and I will be glad to send you a copy of our Academy paper.

THE INTERORGANIZATION GROUP

by Herbert A. Shepard

During the, past year, there have been several initiatives to promote collaboration among the various organizations that comprise our profession. Never mind that the definitions and boundaries are somewhat fuzzy: that's characteristic of a developing profession. Approximate labels are Applied Behavioral Science, or Organization Development. But the spirit of these initiatives is not to determine boundaries; it is to start us on a path of building a professional community of which we can all be proud.

There have been three meetings of "The Interorganization Group," and over thirty people have been actively involved, representing the Academy of Management, OD Network, NTL Institute, Organization Development and International Divisions of ASTD, Organization Renewal Inc., International Consultants Foundation, The International OD Registry, Society for International Organization Development, Association for Creative Change, Gestalt Institute of Cleveland, Organization Behavior Teaching Society, and IAASS/Certified Consultants International. Special thanks are due to

Gordon and Ron Lippitt, and to Don Warrick, who took the original initiatives that brought the group together.

Most of the group's members belong to several of the above organizations, and officially represent one or two of them. A survey has been made inquiring into the areas where there can be mutual benefit from interorganizational collaboration, such as: local networks, sharing services to members, professional ethics, minimizing program overlaps, joint program sponsorship, shared administrative expenses, and providing a public voice for the profession. Bill Gellermann, representing the International OD Registry has been in correspondence with all of these organizations, and is developing an ethics statement that represents a professional consensus. The underlying philosophy of the Inter-organization Group is to maintain the integrity of each of the organizations and support the unique strengths of each, and to build an integrated professional community that shares high standards of competency and ethics, a common vision and a set of core values, and a commitment to professional development, so that we can collectively make a positive difference to the world.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Adler, Nancy J. & Kiggundu, Moses N., Awareness at the Crossroad: Designing Translator Based Training Programs. In D. Landis and R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of Intercultural Relations: Theory, Research and Practice. In press.

Boss, R. Wayne, Team Building and the Problem of Regression: The Personal Management Interview as an Intervention. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1983, 18 (1).

Cohen, Perry D., Community Health Planning from an Interorganizational Perspective. American Journal of Public Health, 1982, 72 (July), 717-721.

Cohen, Perry D. & Sedlacek, William E., Evaluation of Organization Development and Group Training Methods in a Hospice. The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 1982, 1(February), 48-55.

Golembiewski, Robert T., Do Flexible Workhour Effects Decay Over Time? Public Productivity Review, 1982, 6 (March), 33-46.

Golembiewski, Robert T., Estimating the Success of OD Applications. Training and Development Journal, 1982, 72 (April), 86-95.

Golembiewski, Robert T., Isolating Some Elements of Victory from Defeat Too Easily Acknowledged. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1982, 18(1), 143-148.

Golembiewski, Robert T., Organization Development Interventions. In W.S. Paine, (Ed), Job Stress and Burnout. Los Angeles, CA.: Sage Focus Editions, 1982, pp. 179-196.

Golembiewski, Robert T. "Phases of Progressive Burn-out and Their Worksite Covariants," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, In Press.

Golembiewski, Robert T., Toward Democracy Within and Through Administration. In J.A. Uveges, (Ed.), Public Administration. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1982, pp. 58-84.

Gricar, Barbara G. & Baratta, Anthony J., Bridging the Information Gap at TMI: Radiation Monitoring by Citizens. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, (In Press).

Hunsaker, Phil, Strategies for Organizational Change. In D.D. Warrick (Ed.), Organization Development: Current Developments and Applications. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Training and Development, 1982.

Hunsaker, Phil & Frayne, Colette A., Concentration: The Key to Staying on Track. Registered Representative, 1982, 6(2), 32-39.

Kilmann, Ralph H., Designing Collateral Organizations. Human Systems Management, 3. (In Press).

Lees-Haley, Paul R. & Lees-Haley, C.E. Attitude Survey Norms: A Dangerous Ally. Personnel Administrator. (InPress).

Liebowitz, S. Jay & DeMeuse, K.P., The Application of Team Building. Human Relations, 1982, 35 (1), 1-18.

Nicholas, John M., The Comparative Impact of Organization Development Interventions on Hard Criteria Measures. Academy of Management Review, 1982. (In Press).

Nicholas, John M. System Implementation, User Involvement and a Lesson from the, Japanese. Journal of Systems Management, 1982. (In Press).

Schein, Virginia E. Power and Political Behaviors in Organizations: A New Frontier for Research on Male/Female Differences. In A. Holberg (Ed.), Women and the World of Work. New York: Plenu; Press, 1982, pp. 77-84.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Bowditch, James L. and Buono, Anthony F., Quality of Work Life Assessment: Survey Based Approach. Boston: Auburn House, 1982.

Bradshaw, Peter., The Management of Self Esteem. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Brown, L. Dave., Managing Conflict at Organizational Interfaces. Reading, Mass. Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Chartier, Myron R., Preaching as Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective. Nashville: Abingdon, 1981.

Cooper, Cary L., High Pressure: The Working Lives of Women Managers. London: Fontana Books, 1982.

Dittrich, John E. & Zawacki, Robert A., People and Organization: Cases in Management and Organization Behavior.

Dallas: BPI, 1981.

French, Wendell; Bell, Cecil, and Zawacki, Robert A., Organization Development: Theory, Practice and Research. Second Edition. Plano, Texas: BPI, 1983.

French, Wendell; Dittrich, John E. and Zawacki, Robert A., The Personnel Management Process: Cases in Human

Resource Administration. Second Edition. Boston: Houghton & Mifflin, 1982.

Tichy, Noel, Managing Strategic Change: Technical, Political and Cultural Dynamics. New York: Wiley, 1982.

Weiss, Dimitri and Morin, Pierre., Pratique de la Fonction Personnel. Paris: Les Editions d'Organization, 1982.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Moses N. Kiggunu will be moving to Carleton University (Ottawa) as Associate Professor of Human Resource Management.

Phil Hunsaker, Professor of Management and Organization Development, has recently been appointed Director of Management Programs at the University of San Diego.

Craig Lundberg has joined the Graduate School of Business at the University of Southern California.

Carl L. Cooper has been appointed Special Advisor on Occupational Stress to the World Health Organization and spent the month of August in Geneva, Switzerland.

Paul Lees-Haley has resigned his position as International Director of Human Resources of Intergraph Corporation to return to full-time consulting.

Noel Tichy and colleagues John Fossum, Don Fossum, Mary Ann Deunna launched a new executive program, The Advanced Human Resource Management Program, at the University of Michigan for Vice Presidents of Human Resources. The focus is on their role as change agents in making human resources an integral part of the strategic management of the organization.

Allan Cohen will-be moving from the University of New Hampshire to teach full time at Babson College in Wellesley, Mass.

Mitchell Lee Marks has introduced a course on "Organization Change and Development" to the curriculum of the California State University at Fullerton. The course will be part of the Department of Management's new emphasis in Organizational Behavior.

HELP SOUGHT IN STUDY OF ETHICS IN OD PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

A project proposal to collect and assess "critical incidents" describing ethical dilemmas experienced by OD professionals is being prepared. It is being done by the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions (IIT) in cooperation with the leadership of several OD oriented professional organizations, including: Academy of Management, ASTD-OD Div., CCI, ICF, NTL, OD Institute, OD Network and SIDO. Its purposes include: preparing case studies and related materials for pre-professional and continuing education in OD; providing an empirical base for a Statement of Values and Ethics for OD Professionals; and initiating a process for making the ethics of OD practice explicit on a continuing basis.

If you would be willing to review a draft version of the proposal and comment, either in support or with-suggestions for improvement, write to: Mark Frankel, Director, Center for Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology, IIT Center, Chicago, IL 60616

THE OD NETWORK

The OD Network has scheduled the following conferences for 1983: Technology Conference, April 12-13 Boston; "Wellness in the Workplace," May 9-12 in Chicago (jointly sponsored with NTL Institute); "Ecology of Work," June 15-

17 in Cleveland (jointly sponsored with NTL Institute); and the National OD Network Conference, October 8-15 in Pasadena. Membership in the OD Network is \$45 per year. Benefits include four issues of The OD Practitioner, a membership roster and member rates at national meetings. For membership information, contact The OD Network, 1009 Park Avenue, Plainfield, NJ 07060.

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

The ASTD National Conference will be held in Washington, D.C. on June 19-24, 1983. Membership in ASTD is \$80 per year and includes a subscription to The Training and Development Journal, a copy of the membership directory, a bi-weekly newsletter (The National Report), member rates at the national conference and three issues of the OD Division Newsletter. For membership information, send requests to Membership Department, ASTD, Suite 305, Washington, D.C, 600 Maryland Avenue SW, 20024.