

Contents

[Final Program Set for Annual Meetings: Richard Beckhard to be Distinguished Speaker](#)

[Register Now for the Managerial Consulting OD Consultation Skills](#)

[Suppose We Took Culture Seriously by Edgar H. Schein](#)

[Emphasizing the Research Part of Action Research: Some Guidelines for the Researching Practitioner by Jerry Porras](#)

[OD Newsletter to be Sent to Mumerous OD Organizations](#)

[News about Members](#)

[Articles by Members](#)

[What's Happening in OD](#)

NATIONAL MEETINGS SET FOR BOSTON: AUGUST 12-15, 1984

FINAL PROGRAM SET FOR ANNUAL MEETINGS: RICHARD BECKHARD TO BE DISTINGUISHED SPEAKER

L. David Brown, the Program Chairperson for the OD Division, has announced the final program for the OD Division of the Academy of Management Meetings.

The program will begin with the Organization Development and Managerial Consultation Divisions jointly sponsoring the pre-conference workshop on "Launching a Career in Consultation and Organization Development." The content of this session will emphasize essential elements in building a successful consulting practice.

A highlight of the conference is expected to be the Invited Presentation by Richard Beckhard of the Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. As this years-distinguished speaker in Organization Development, Professor Beckhard will discuss "Organizational Transformation: Fad or Imperative?"

The general program will include a combination of symposia and high quality papers selected by competition from Division members. Program details can be found in the Academy of Management 1984 Program, which should be

arriving shortly. This year's program provides a rich mixture of presentations by both academicians and practitioners. Since copies of this Newsletter are being distributed to members of other OD organizations who will not be receiving the 1984 Program but may want to attend the Academy Meetings, the titles of and participants in each of the program sessions are listed below:

Organizational Change and Innovation: The Case of Quality Circles---Edward E. Lawler, Mitchell Lee Marks, Susan A. Mohrman, Gerald E. Ledford, Jr., Paul Wolff and Stanley E. Seashore.

The Opportunities for OD in the Employee Owned Firm --Joseph Blasi, Chris Meek and Warner Woodworth.

Political and Cultural Issues in OD--Max Elden, Anthony T. Cobb, Gervase R. Bushe, Michael L. Moore, Virginia E. Schein, Thomas Diamante and Gene Boccialetti.

Sense-Making in Organizational Settings: Consequences for Theory and Practice-Stanley G. Harris, Meryl Reis Louis, Robert F. Sutton, Michel Bougon, Barbara Gray Gricar, Anne Donnelon, Kimball Kehoe and Karl Weick.

Neglected Issues in Action Research: Dilemmas in Client-Consultant Relations--Roger M. Schwarz, Daniel R. Denison, Gerald E. Ledford, Jr., Daniel R. Denison, Philip H. Mirvis and Thomas G. Cummings.

Evaluating Interventions--Abraham Shani, Marsha Katz, John M Nicholas, Timo J. Santalainen, J.G. Hunt, Cecil H. Bell, Jr., John Seeger and R.J. Bullock.

Cultural Change Within a Large System--Gary E. Jusela, Paul A. Banas, Raymond H. Johnson, Karen L. Cornelius, Douglas Hincker, Jeffrey T. Walsh, Nancy Lloyd Badore and Craig Lundberg.

The Variety of Employee Ownership: Its Different Forms, Goals and Consequences-- Joseph Blasi, Arnold S. Fannenbaum, Harold Cook, Jack Lohmann, Katherine J. Klein, Robert N. Stern and Cherlyn Skromme Granrose.

Conversation Hour on Professional Support Groups for OD-- Kathy Kram, Lee Bolman, L. David Brown, Philip Mirvis and Barry Oshry.

Conceptual Perspectives on OD--Michael K. McCuddy, Michael R. McGrath, Carlton J. Whitehead, John D. Blair, Joseph A. Litterer, Stanley Young, Jean M. Bartunek, Frank J. Franzak and Anthony Buono.

WorkRlace Democracy: Implications for Organizational Research--William Pasmore, Ronald M. Mason Warner Woodworth, Eric H. Neilsen, John Simmons and Jeanne Neumann.

Empirical Research on the Change Typology -- Robert T. Golembiewski, Neal Schmitt, W. Alan Randolph, James R. Terborg, Archilles A. Armenakis, M. Ronald Buckley and Arthur G. Bedeian.

Current Perspectives on OD/Consultation in the Public Sector--Rupert F. Chisholm, R. Wayne Boss, Robert T. Golembiewski, Gregory H. Gaertner, Alan Glassman and Thomas G. Cummings.

Learning. from Each Other: Suggestions for the Cross-Fertilization of Ideas and Methods in Organizational Science - - Ricky W. Griffin, Jeffrey Pfeffer, Barry Staw, Chris Argyris, Carl R. Anderson, Richard L. Daft and Lyman W. Porter.

Organizational Life Cycles, Effectiveness and Culture: Toward a Dynamic Perspective--Caren Siehl, Michael R. McGrath, Robert E. Quinn, Joanne Martin, Sim Sitkin, Michael Boehm, Kim Cameron and John Kimberly.

The Family-Owned Firm: Theory and Intervention--Gibb Dyers, Ivan Landsberg, Peter Davis, Harry Levinson, Richard Beckhard and Edgar Schein.

REGISTER NOW FOR THE MANAGERIAL CONSULTING OD CONSULTATION SKILLS WORKSHOP

August 12, 1984, 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

On Sunday, August 12, from 9:00 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. the Organization Development and Managerial Consulting Divisions will joint sponsor a pre-conference workshop on "Launching a Career in Consultation and Organization Development." The workshop coordinators are Andre L. Delbecq of the University of Santa Clara and Craig Lundberg of the University of Southern California.

The first panel will discuss "A View of Organization Development and Managerial Consulting from a University

Base." The participants--made up of academics who consult from a variety of perspectives-include Charles Greene, Indiana University, Thomas Cummings, University of Southern California, Peter Vaill, George Washington University; and Richard Beckhard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The second part deals with a "case" of a major corporation, which focuses around strategic and change issues. The design calls for subgroups to discuss the case and to talk about consultancy styles and diagnosis for change and strategy. The facilitators include Larry Greiner of the University of Southern California and Howard Schwatz, Larry Benningson, and Ann Evans from the Management Analysis Center in Cambridge, Mass.

The third portion of the workshop will be a forum dealing with "Problems of Consultation" from A University Campus Setting" and will be moderated by Andre L. Delbecq.

The Executive Committee of the OD Division is very enthused about this workshop and would like to encourage members of the OD Division, OD practitioners and other interested parties to attend. In order to provide an opportunity for intensive dialogue between participants and resource faculty, attendance will be limited to 50 pre-registered participants. The cost of the workshop is \$35.00 for members of the Managerial Consulting and OD Divisions and \$45.00 for non-members. To register, send a check payable to L. David Brown, along with your Name Affiliation and Address: L. David Brown, School of Management, Boston University, 621 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-4159.

SUPPOSE WE TOOK CULTURE SERIOUSLY by *Edgar H. Schein*

I would like to borrow Hal Leavitt's phrase of a few years back--"suppose we took groups seriously"--in thinking through some of the issues that I face as an OD consultant when I take organizational culture seriously. I have for a long time believed that some aspects of organization development have an impact on organizational culture. I have used the phrase "OD is culture change." I have encountered directly the effects of culture when my interventions did not work. In fact, it is for these reasons that I articulated and described "process consultation" as a more appropriate model for intervening in human systems (Schein, 1969). But even then I don't think I took culture seriously.

We make six mistakes in thinking about culture. It does not matter so much if the layman or practitioner makes these

mistakes because culture is intrinsically a difficult concept to grasp, but it is professionally irresponsible for OD practitioners to make these mistakes. Our obligation is to understand what really goes on in organizations and to help clients to face reality. We have to have a clear understanding of what organizational culture is, how it works, and what impact it has on organizational life.

Mistake 1. SUPERFICIAL OR INCORRECT DEFINITIONS OF CULTURE. As one reads the OD literature, one finds a surprising range of definitions and concepts for "culture." For some it is the same as organizational climate, for others it is management style, and for still others it is how the human system of the organization works, as distinct from the task, the structure, and the technology. In some analyses culture refers to behavioral regularities, in others it focuses on values, in still others it refers to cognitive symbols, systems of meaning, and beliefs.

My own definition of culture focuses on the deeper layers of cognition in human systems. **CULTURE IS THE PATTERN OF BASIC ASSUMPTIONS THAT A GIVEN GROUP HAS INVENTED, DISCOVERED, OR DEVELOPED IN LEARNING TO COPE WITH ITS PROBLEMS OF EXTERNAL ADAPTATION AND INTERNAL INTEGRATION, THAT HAS WORKED WELL ENOUGH TO BE CONSIDERED VALID, AND, THEREFORE, TO BE TAUGHT TO NEW MEMBERS AS THE CORRECT WAY TO PERCEIVE, THINK, AND FEEL IN RELATION TO THOSE PROBLEMS (Schein,1983).**

Because such assumptions tend to drop out of awareness as they come to be taken for granted, they are difficult to surface and to decipher. If we take culture seriously we cannot rush in with questionnaires to measure it. Only a complex interactive process of joint inquiry between insiders and outsiders can surface the assumptions I am referring to.

Mistake 2. TOO LIMITED A VIEW OF WHAT CULTURE COVERS. Not all groups or organizations have cultures. Only if a fairly stable group has had a significant history which has permitted real social learning to take place can we even consider that an organizational culture might be present. However, if a group's history has been long enough and rich enough for a culture to form, then, by definition, that culture will cover ALL aspects of that organization's functioning, not just the "human system" as so many definitions imply.

If we take culture seriously we have to recognize it as the DETERMINER of task, structure, and strategy, not some

separate variable to be analyzed as a matter of choice. How a company defines its products, markets, and economic goals, how it prefers to make decisions and operate, how it chooses to organize, how it chooses to raise money and allocate it, all are a reflection of its culture. If we, as OD practitioners, promise some help in analyzing cultures, we must be prepared to help organizations to recognize how all of their functions reflect their culture.

Mistake 3. STEREOTYPIC AND OVERGENERAL CATEGORIES OF CULTURAL TYPES. Another mistake we make in analyzing cultures is to look for "types," such as System 4 or Theory Z. While it may be useful to reduce the mass of observable cultures to a few ideal or model types, such reduction should only be undertaken if we have good data on which to base the model. It seems to me that our research base for such typologies is very thin. We have not looked at very many organizations in the depth that would be required by the above definition to determine whether they actually fall into types. I would certainly question any classification that is based on survey data, on the assumption that we are only picking up information on employee ideologies, not on basic culture types.

Mistake 4. SIMPLISTIC VIEWS OF CULTURAL DYNAMICS AND CHANGEABILITY. If culture is social learning, and if that learning is based both on positive reinforcement and the avoidance of pain and anxiety, then our theories of change must take into account what we know about extinction and relearning. Culture not only solves the problems of adaptation and thus permits group survival, but it is the invented solution to the problems of living together in some kind of predictable harmony. Once we have a culture it reduces both cognitive and interpersonal uncertainty. Through language and conceptual categories we master our physical environment; through rules of social conduct we manage our aggressions and our needs for love and intimacy.

If an organization has developed a culture in this sense, we cannot simply change it without facing the fact that massive anxieties will be unleashed in even the PROPOSAL to change something. For example, when we redistribute power in an organization, the massive resistance to change that we encounter may have more to do with the transition period of uncertainty during which we do not know who has what power and on what assumptions is allocated, than with the loss of power that some people will experience. What we need to recognize is that culture change involves giving up for some unknown length of time the comfort of predictability, something which no human being is willing to do unless it is absolutely unavoidable.

Should OD consultants ever play the role of culture changers, or is this intrinsically a leadership role? Leaders do

have to change culture if their vision tells them that the group is in danger of extinction. In producing such change, leaders have to own the consequences both of the techniques they use and the ultimate outcomes they achieve. If consultants get into changing culture (versus clarifying or helping clients to articulate their culture), they may be moving into leadership roles unwittingly and inappropriately.

Mistake 5. OVERGENERAL ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE FUNCTIONS OF CULTURE; IGNORING ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE STAGES. Do organizations need "strong" cultures in order to be effective, as many have claimed? If we look at organizations in different stages of growth and development, we find that their cultures play different roles at different stages. For example, one might hypothesize that in the growth and development stage culture is an important glue that holds the organization together, and a strong culture at this stage might be necessary for survival. But in midlife or during a period of decline, the culture serves the function of rationalizing and justifying the past, which may make the culture a barrier to innovation and future adaptations.

Before we advocate culture change, we had better understand clearly what functions the culture is presently serving for the members of the organization, and ask ourselves how those functions would be met if our change program were successful.

Mistake 6. ETHNOCENTRISM IN THE OD CULTURE. Finally, what can we say about the culture of OD? What strikes me most about our own occupational assumptions is the degree to which they are a reflection of American culture, and how little we recognize that our assumptions may not be valid universally. Our approach seems to be based on "pro-active optimism," i.e. we assume that anything is possible and that things can always be bettered, and that all derive from individual effort, "egalitarian individualism," i.e. that the individual is the ultimately important unit of society, and that everyone has an equal opportunity to make a contribution (Schein, 1981). Team building would not be such a common intervention if we did not have to overcome the inherent individualism that we assume in most organizations.

In addition, many OD practitioners espouse optimistic "humanistic" values, i.e. that individual and organizational goals can be integrated, that if given a chance the individual will exercise self-control and will work for the organization, that the work place can and must be psychologically healthy as well as physically safe, that decision making works better under conditions of high trust and openness, and that organizations are more effective if power

is more equalized.

Perhaps the most subtle trap we fall into is the ethnocentric assumption – that effectiveness and efficiency are ultimately more important than the preservation of face, status, and the relational order. We are not prepared to consider how OD would help in a highly class-structured society, where power and status are more important than effectiveness, where religious values supercede economic ones, where openness and trust are considered signs of weakness, where power equalization is tantamount to destroying the social structure, where management and labor are assumed to be intrinsically in conflict with each other, and where society and group is considered far more important than individual achievement.

Can we take our own culture seriously before we offer to help clients with theirs?

Schein, E. H., Process Consultation. Addison-Wesley, 1969. Schein, E. H., "Does Japanese Management Style Have A Message for American Managers?" Sloan Management Review, 1981, 23, 55-68. Schein, E. H., " The Role of the Founder in Creating Organizational Culture." Organizational Dynamics, Summer, 1983, 13-28.

EMPHASIZING THE RESEARCH PART OF ACTION RESEARCH: SOME GUIDELINES FOR THE RESEARCHING PRACTITIONER *by Jerry Porras*

Any practitioner who has attempted to research an OD process knows what a difficult task it is. My purpose here is to explore with you some key reasons for researching your interventions and then to define several barriers to doing research and how you might overcome them. All this is offered in the hope that you might see the benefits in getting involved in research and be motivated to try it in your next change project.

Perhaps the most immediately important reason for studying your interventions relates to the impact it can have on the change process you're facilitating. We use the term action research to describe what we do in OD, but often the reality is that we emphasize the "action" much more than the "research." As a consequence, we have less than a clear sense of what is really going on, and we run the risk of working on the wrong long-term problems. A systematic research process could be very useful in staying focused on the important issues.

Clearly, in any well-run OD intervention data continuously are being collected through informal contact with system

members, through sensing or problem-solving meetings, or through a variety of other means. These ongoing activities tend to track the "micro-" or more everyday shifts in individual attitudes and behavior and organizational outcomes. They, however, do not highlight the macro-shifts that indicate the broader directions of system change. As a consequence, these longer-term trends may go unnoticed and therefore not consciously be influenced by the consultant and key person. A systematic change research process could be of major benefit in this area.

A second reason for engaging in a more formal process is more pragmatic. A growing number of organizations want to know if the resources spent on planned change have produced any desired outcomes. Most often, decisions are based on the subjective judgements of key organizational decision-makers. They "feel" good about what's happening. They "see" things as different and like what they see. Other organizational members tell them that things are better than before, and so on. I don't intend to downgrade these perfectly legitimate ways of continuing to justify any OD effort. My point, however, is that, increasingly, organizations are wanting more. In this era of scarce resources, managers are beginning to ask for harder evidence of change. Research can provide some of this evidence.

A third reason for doing OD research is that it can contribute significantly to your own development as an OD professional. Through a more formal research process you begin to acquire a clearer understanding of planned change. Since a research process forces you to think theoretically, your theory of how OD works will grow, and as you add to it the findings that come out of your research will expand even further. For me, the bottom line is that as your personal theory of change improves, so will your practices. This is the area in which research can have the most significant long-term personal impact.

More than likely, the greatest barrier to doing research in OD relates to just not knowing how to do it. What are the ways or methods of doing research? What do you have to think about? What skills or knowledge do you need? What should you look out for? Let's turn to some of these questions.

The process of doing research can be divided into several parts. First, you must decide what it is that you want to

Measure, i.e., what variables are of interest? Second, you must come up with ways of measuring the variables of interest; i.e., what instruments will you use? Third, you must develop a plan for collecting the data you need, i.e., what

will be your research design? Finally, you must figure out what to do with the data you've collected, i.e., what will be your approach to data analysis?

VARIABLES

Selection of the variable to measure is, in my mind, the most important part of the entire research process. The best instruments, research designs, and analyses can produce lots of sound information, but if it is about unimportant aspects of the change process then it is of little use to the practitioner. So the key questions to ask are "What are the specific targets of the intervention process? What do you intend to affect?"

The targets of any change intervention typically can be divided into two types. The first relates to specific attitudes, behaviors and organizational conditions targeted by the intervention. Examples of these process types of variables could be such things as increased satisfaction, more open communication with the boss, improved collaboration in problem solving, or a more attractive organizational climate. The second type of change target is the longer-term outcomes of a change intervention. Organizational performance, productivity, turnover, absenteeism, grievance rates, etc. are all examples of this second set of variables.

The key to beginning an OD research process is to determine a Priori, which variables are most likely to be affected by what you do and to make sure that you measure them. Now, it is clear that you won't be able to predict totally accurately all of the variables directly affected by the change intervention. Since OD interventions tend to be quite organic, it is impossible to totally define the set of target variables prior to the actual intervention. Yet it is possible to define a great many of them and you should do this as early as possible. The ones that surface later on can be included in subsequent measurements. (This will be described more fully in the discussion on research design.)

Behind this selection of variables is a model of change. Your model may be vague, incompletely formed, more intuitive than specified, in a state of flux, and so on. Yet, my belief is that it is there, somewhere. The research process helps you get it out and refine it.

MEASUREMENT

Measuring the variables identified is the second challenge of the research process. Although a variety of ways to

measure process variables exists the most common and economical is through the use of paper and pencil questionnaires. These contain questions that may be open-ended (i.e. they require a written response) or scaled (i.e. a scale of some sort is given from which the respondents pick the most accurate of their opinions). Since this latter form yields quantified data that can be statistically analyzed, it tends to be the most popular form.

Questionnaires also can be standardized or customized. To the degree you can, I would advise you to use standardized questionnaires. They have been systematically developed and tested and tend to be the most reliable form of gathering data. Standardized questionnaires are available from a variety of sources. Space precludes me from listing them here, but if you write to me I will send you a list of some of the more popular ones.

Customized questionnaires are more tailor-made for your needs, but require some expertise in creating them and some time in testing them. It can be a lot of fun and a really good developmental experience to put together your own questionnaire. Before you do, however, I would suggest that you talk to your local organization behavior academician.

An important action to take related to both the selection of variable stage and the selection of questionnaire stage, is to restrict the amount of data you collect. It is very easy to measure much more than you can absorb and use. After making your "wish-list" of variables, cut it down to only the most important. Too much data is almost as bad as no data. Both states help relatively little. It's quite easy to have so much data that you can't make any sense of what you have without highly sophisticated analytical techniques. So this is an area where you should really try to "keep it simple."

Data can also be collected through interviews, but this approach presents some important difficulties in the analysis stage. In order for information collected in this manner' to be truly useful, it is necessary to develop a coding scheme which will systematically pick out the key issues in the data. This is a rather difficult and time-consuming task. Both the development and application of coding schemes for interview data are quite demanding.

On the other hand, interviews can be useful for more exploratory purposes when you're trying to get a general "feel" for what is going on. As a diagnostic tool they are quite helpful and as a consequence are commonly used for that purpose. I don't advocate abandoning them completely. Rather, I suggest not using them for more rigorous research

purposes because of the resources they demand.

Company records are an important source of data, especially useful in assessing changes in organizational outcomes. Performance, costs, profits, turnover, absenteeism, tardiness, grievance rates, and so on are the typical outcome variables measured by most organizations. As such they are readily available and useful for determining longer-range effects of a change process.

DESIGN

The design of research is the definition of when and from whom measurements are taken. The simplest design is to measure before the intervention begins and sometime after it ends. This is called a before-after design and has some key weaknesses that make it a somewhat unattractive approach. If it were possible to have a comparison group to measure at the same time, many of the drawbacks to the before-after design would dissolve. However, comparison groups are hard to find, so usually this approach is unavailable.

A second type of design that has quite a bit more power in the OD situation is called the time series design. In this case, measurements are taken two or more times before the intervention begins. This gives a firmer, more stable baseline on the characteristics of the organization prior to any change activity. Pre-measures should be taken several months apart, thus giving the opportunity to thoroughly look at the system before beginning any concrete change activity. I know that this requirement may be difficult to achieve, because systems will tend to be less cooperative unless change activity is taking place.

Once the intervention begins, then measures could be taken periodically over the life of the intervention and thereafter, i.e., after the formal intervention activity has ended. The periodic measurement could either be every nine months to a year, or at the end of any major phase in the intervention process. One important benefit of this repeated measures procedure is that new variables can be added that were unanticipated change targets before the intervention began and therefore were not measured. Once measured, these added variables could continue to be looked at over the life of the research process.

At each measurement point new variables could be added. Some of the variables previously measured could be

dropped if they appear to have been irrelevant over the entire research period. One should be careful to make a basic set of variables that are measured across the entire life of the research project. Care also must be taken not to make the research instrument too long, while at the same time keeping it focused on the actual change targets that emerge.

DATA ANALYSIS

Analysis of the data can be as extensive as your statistical skills allow. In its simplest form an analysis would consist of calculating the average response for each variable measured at each point in time. A graph could be made for each variable, showing time across the horizontal axis and the particular variable scale along the vertical axis. The average response for each variable at each point in time could be plotted and a line drawn that connects all adjacent points. The resulting curve can be assessed as either tending to rise, fall, or stay horizontal. This interpretation will give a somewhat crude, but nevertheless useful, view of change on that particular variable.

Comparison of the actual mean scores across time for each variable gives a slightly more rigorous view of any changes shown in the data. Subtracting measure from one taken at a subsequent time period yields a gain (loss) score indicative of change over that time period. Typically, changes of about a half point or greater (on a seven-point variables scale) can be thought of as significant, although a lot of factors must be taken into account before that can be said with a high degree of certainty. The factors are part of what statistical testing is all about and if you do not have the knowledge to take them into account, then this "half-point rule" can be a useful heuristic.

If you do have some statistical background, then significance tests such as t-tests could be used to more rigorously analyze your data. With time series data, i.e., multiple measures across time, a variety of regression techniques also could be applied. I suspect, however, that for the majority of you, the half-point heuristic would be the most useful.

In all cases, displaying your data on graph gives both you and others a much better feel for what is going on than merely looking at the numbers.

CONCLUSION

I've tried to describe some of the rudiments of research on OD processes. It ally isn't very easy to do research of is

type and there are many barriers mitigating against you even trying. I think the biggest question for each of you is whether you're willing to take the risk of finding out that your data indicate no change. Certainly that is not a desirable outcome for anyone.

You might find that nobody in your organization really cares whether or not you research the process. So, why do it? It could be that the resources for doing research aren't readily available and you have to go out on a limb to get them. Why fight it?

There are plenty of reasons for not doing research, which is why so many practitioners (or anybody else for that matter) has done little. Yet I firmly believe that without research we will not progress in our basic knowledge of what goes on in OD, and without this increase in our knowledge we will not be able to improve our practice. So, I see this as a basic way of improving professionally, which does have a large personal payoff.

I also believe that the knowledge of OD gained from researching it is far more valuable to the practitioner than the intervention techniques one can learn from going to conferences and workshops. Research-based knowledge provides basic understanding of change processes, and from this basic understanding the practitioner can develop his/her own techniques of intervention and will have to rely on others much less for that support.

OD NEWSLETTER TO BE SENT TO NUMEROUS OD ORGANIZATIONS

During the past two years there has been an attempt to improve the collaboration among the various OD organizations. One way the OD Division of the Academy of Management is contributing to that collaboration is by sending members of each of those organizations a complimentary copy of the OD Newsletter. If you receive more than one copy of the Newsletter, it is because you belong to more than one of those organizations.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Dr. Rupert F. Chisholm of Penn State University convened a panel on "A Second Look At Productivity and Quality of Work Life in the Public Sector" at the National Conference of the American Society for Public Administration (Denver, Colorado, April 8-11, 1984).

Gary M. Richetto, Ph.D., Managing partner of Triad Associates, Inc., has been elected as Director of the Organization Development Division of A.S.T.D.

The work of Richard Beckhard and Ernesto J. Poza was featured in "Meeting of the Minds: A One-Day Formula to Strategy Setting." Industry Week, October 17, 1983. The article discusses their participative format for strategy making.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Bradford, David L. & Cohen, Allan R., "The Postheroicheader," Training and Development, Jan. 1984.

Bush, David F., "Passive-Aggressive Behavior in the Business Setting." In Richard D. Parsons and Robert J. Wicks (Eds.), Passive-Aggressiveness: Theory and Practice, New York: Brunner-Mazel, 1983.

Buono, Anthony F. & Kamm, Judith B., "Marginality and Organizational Socialization of Female Managers" Human Relations", 1983, 36(12), pp 1125-1140.

Chisholm Rupert F., "Quality of Working Life: Key Issue of the '80's," Public Productivity Review, 1983, 7(1), pp. 10-25.

Chisholm, Rupert F., Kasl, S.V. & Eskenazi, B. "The Nature and Predictors of Job-Related Tension in a Crisis Situation: Reactions of Nuclear Workers to the Three Mile Island Accident," Academy of Management Journal, 1983, 26(3)\$ pp. 385-405.

McCormick, Donald William, "Neurolinguistic Programming: A Resource Guide and Review of the Research," The 1984 Annual for Facilitators, Trainers, and Consultants, Pfeiffer & Goodstein (Eds.), San Diego: University Associates, 1984, pp. 267-281.

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN OD

Wellness in the Workplace, third annual conference on the leading edge of employee and corporate health, May 21-24, 1984, Hyatt Regency, Long Beach, CA. Cosponsored by ODN and NTL. Contacts: Same as Ecology of Work; see below.

The Ecology of Work, Seventh Conference on Improving Productivity and the Quality of Work Life, June 13-15, 1984, The Hamilton Hotel at O'Hare, Chicago. Cosponsored by ODN and NTL. Contacts for conference content: Tom Chase, RFD #1, Box 44A, Northwood, NH 03261, (603) 8622018; for preliminary registration, Judith Leibowitz or Glenda Hilton, NTL Institute, P.O. Box 9155, Rosslyn Sta., Arlington, VA 22209, (703) 527-1500.

National Conference for Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution Sept. 20-23, 1984, University of Missouri, St. Louis. Pre-conference workshops Sept. 18-19. A continuation of the 1983 conference held at the Univ. of Georgia. Contact: NCPCR Secretariat, Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Univ. of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602. Tel 404542-7905.

Managing Change in Health Care, second annual conference, Sept. 23-26, Hyatt Regency, Oakland, CA. Co-sponsored by ODN and ASHET. Details forthcoming.

ODN National Conference; Celebrations and Challenges: 1984 and Beyond. Oct. 31-Nov. 2, 1984, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, DC. Pre-conference workshops Oct. 28-9.

THE ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT JOURNAL: The Organization Development Institute is now publishing A new collaborative quarterly journal called THE ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT JOURNAL. A subscription for 1984 is \$18/year. Contact The OD Institute, 11234 Walnut Ridge Road, Chesterland, Ohio 44026 Tel. (216) 4614333.

The 4th Organization Development World Congress will be held July 17-21, 1984 in Southampton, England. The title of the Congress is "World Economic, Social and Political Crises: Are There Any Solutions?" The registration fee for members of participating organizations is \$245; for others it is \$295. For additional information, contact The OD Institute, 11234 Walnut Ridge Road, Chesterland, Ohio 11234.