Contents

CALL FOR PAPERS
by Marshall Sashkin

Its time to think, again, about papers and symposia for next year's annual meeting. Full details of the formal call for papers are given on page 9 of the October Academy Newsletter (which you should have received by now). Please remember that we must have four (4) copies of everything, neatly typed (double-spaced). Be sure to give names, full addresses, and phone numbers of all authors, on the title page, along with the division(s) to which you are submitting the paper or symposium. Note: submit materials to both division program chairpersons, if you are proposing a jointly sponsored symposium session.

You don't have to submit full copies of all of the papers or planned presentations for a symposium, but you do have to send four copies of a 3 to 5 page statement from each symposium participant, describing the paper that person will actually present. For symposium proposals, there must also be a 5 to 7 page overview statement (again four copies.) To prevent the Program Chairperson from suffering a hernia, and the reviewers from going bonkers, remember that there is an absolute 20-page limit, and that includes exhibits, figures, tables, footnotes, and references. Finally, remember to include a brief (50word) abstract. All of the above instructions are presented in more detail in the October Academy Newsletter.

The deadline for submissions is January 10,1985. This is the date by which the Program Chairperson must, have

actually received, in his hot, little hand, your physical submission materials--postmark dates don't count., Papers, and symposium proposals received earlier will probably get read sooner, and we encourage you to get them in as quickly as possible.

The acceptance rate this past year for symposia, by the 18 divisions/interest groups, ranged from a low of 11% to a high of 100%, with the average being 54%. The rate for our division was .60%. Corresponding figures for papers are 15% (low), 79% (high), and 40% (average), with OD's acceptance rate at 30%. We received the second-largest number of symposia, of all divisions--only OMT topped us, with 22 to our 20. And, we actually ran more symposia than my other division or interest group—12!

As you may observe, we have intentionally encouraged symposia over papers. We will continue this policy for the coming meeting. We are also interested in submissions that propose workshops and other innovative sessions. How about, for example, a session in which an OD intervention is modeled followed by research reports on its use and effectiveness in organizations? We are especially interested in presentations that connect research with practice in organization development.

Of course, we also would love to see papers and symposia that dig into the current "hot" topics: Organizational cultures, excellence (and how to achieve it through OD), the role of "transformational" leaders in OD, and so on.

Send your papers and symposium to Marshall Sashkin, Mail Stop 24, National Institute of Education, Washington, DC. 20208.

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT AND STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT
by Dale E. Zand

During the past twenty-five years the two fields of organization development (OD) and strategic management (SM) have been growing side by side. Both have active theorists, researchers, and practitioners. Both fields have made significant contributions to improving organizational effectiveness. As each field has penetrated organizations and managerial practice they have occasionally blended, but more often they have gone their separate ways.

My training and consulting spans both fields, and my experience ranges from working with chief executive officers to unionized employees. There is a growing need, in my opinion, for theorists and practitioners in each field to better understand the other field. There is need to understand how each field relates to the other and how each may contribute to the other.

There is a need to explore how the two fields working together can create a synergistic effect in an organization which is greater than the effect of OD and SM working separately in the same organization. In my, work with organizations, I personally have experienced both the phenomena, the synergy of OD and SM, and the disjointed pulling and tugging of OD and SM. In the worst case OD and SM have approached each other as antagonists, each seeking to evade or bypass the other. I believe the initiative for this rapprochement must come from OD, for several compelling reasons. First, the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)--the organization, which evaluates and accredits graduate and undergraduate programs in business, requires that all students take7a course in strategy and policy or its equivalent.

This means there are now tens of thousands of business schoo1 graduates in middle and upper management who are familiar with SM. These same managers have little familiarity, if any, with OD. Although, the AACSB requires that students also take organizational behavior (OB), this is quite different from and at best minimally related to OD.

Second, in the past ten years, there has been a spate of one-week, three-week, six-week, and longer residential programs for executives with SM as the central theme. Again, these propagate a SM orientation while minimally increasing familiarity with OD.

Third, SM has become a substantive body of knowledge with defined, measurable variables and reliable relationships among the variables. Michael Porter's book, Competitive Strategy, which has sold more than 100,000 copies, has codified and made readable to the average executive what academics have been teaching about SM for the past fifteen years. From management's point of view SM is becoming a necessary condition for organizational effectiveness.

There are more and more strategic planning departments, strategic planning specialists, and strategic business units in organizations. Increasingly, general managers and functional managers consider SM to be the key area,

which will enable them to make A contribution to their organization.

Finally, the concept of SM as (a) formulating strategy and (b) implementing strategy has encouraged managers and SM specialists to consider OD irrelevant, or at most usable in a very specific, limited way to facilitate some aspects of implementation. There is, to the 'best of my knowledge, nothing in the SM literature which relates "formulating strategy" and OD. The SM literature goes .on to discuss "implementing strategy" in terms of leadership, designing organization structure, reward systems, and supporting functional policies.

OD specialists will immediately see substantial overlap between the traditional domain of OD and the SM approach to implementing strategy. The rub is that SM writers and managers rarely, if ever, refer to or see a connection between implementing strategy and OD. As a result there is trend, in my opinion, for SM specialists and managers increasingly to implement strategy without constructive integration of OD because they are primarily familiar with the SM literature and orientation.

In short, SM seems to be superseding OD even in OD's traditional area of implementing strategy. When SM fails or founders in implementing strategy, then occasionally management might reach for OD as a possible remedy.

Some readers may protest that I overstate the gap between SM and OD. Some may say that OD has substantially facilitated SM. In my view, OD's contributions to have primarily, been in theory, and in intent but, unfortunately, less I frequently in accomplishment.

The old context of OD consists of (I) participation as a benefit in itself (2) the development of effective groups as a key to improved organizational performance, and, (3) recognition of individual needs and growth. This old context has been accepted and understood by management. It is a sufficient basis for driving the development and use of OD.

Strategic management has become the new organizational context within which OD must position itself. There is increasingly a need to clarify for managers how the various OD methods may contribute to the major phases of SM formulating strategy and implementing strategy.

Collateral organization is one of the more interesting and potentially useful contributions-to the formulating strategy

phase of SM (Zand, 1974, 1981). The collateral organization introduces a process and structure specifically designed to deal with the ill-structured characteristics of the task of formulating strategy. The collateral organization supplements the linear inquiry process (LIP) of the conventional hierarchical organization with a creative analytic process (CAP) which is better matched to the formulation of strategy. The specific norms of a collateral organization, which lead to a creative analytic process, are open questioning of assumptions, concepts, and criteria. The OD specialist's contribution to formulating strategy lies in-inducing and monitoring these norms and blending them with SM paradigms for formulating strategy. Zand (1974, 1981) describes the use of a collateral organization for formulating strategy for the international division of a major bank.

Late in 1974, using the principles and methods described by Zand (1974), the Central Foundry Division of General Motors designed and introduced its own version of a collateral organization, which it calls "parallel organization"

(Wiltse & Carlson, 1982). To my knowledge, this GM collateral organization, which has been in existence for almost ten years and still exists today, is the most extensive, continuously operating collateral organization introduced in a major company. It has made many significant studies of different elements of strategy including the Foundry's position in the worldwide castings market and its position in controlling environmental pollution.

Although a collateral organization can be viewed as a device to encourage participation or to empower levels of an operating organization in my view these are secondary benefits which fade as the collateral organization moves away from its primary design purposes - the facilitation of strategic management.

There are of course other OD-type interventions which could apply to formulating strategy such as open systems planning (Jayaram, 1976). Also, several years ago, Professor William Guth and I designed a Strategic Management Workshop, which combined a paradigm for formulating strategy with OD principles.

In the "implementing strategy" phase of SM, there is a multitude of OD interventions. These include the various types of team building activities intergroup activities, and survey feedback design. OD's great strength, in my opinion, has been in implementing strategy—working with the existing organization and, people to improve performance in the here and now.

Historically, however, most OD interventions have been presented as behavioral science interventions. They have appeared as stand-alone interventions, remedying a specific, temporary difficulty in current operations. OD interventions have not been viewed as necessary instruments connected to the comprehensive, continuous task of implementing strategy. OD will be confined to piecemeal, stopgap applications so long as OD specialists themselves remain isolated from the theory and practice of SM.

There is a new context moving across organizations—it is strategic management. I have been interested in analyzing and researching the relationship between OD and SM for the past fifteen years. SM opens up a new frontier for OD, presenting both opportunities and threats. If OD specialists do not define and respond to these challenges, we can rest assured that the SM specialists (and micro-economists) will.

REFERENCES: Jayaram, G.K., "Open Systems Planning," in The Planning of Change, 3rd ed., eds, W.G.- Bennis, et al, N.Y.: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston, 1976, 275-283. Wiltse, T. & Carlson, H. General Motors Central Foundry Division, Interviews June 1982. Zand, D.E., "Collateral Organization: A New Change Strategy," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Jan. 1974, 63-89. Information, Organization, and Power. KY: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

MEMORIES OF ABE MASLOW: SOME ROOTS OF OD
by William G. Dyer

In his famous book Roots, Alex Haley indicated that until he understood his own heritage it was difficult for him to develop a complete picture of his own identity--to know who he was. In that same spirit, I offer this article to those who practice the profession of organization development. Perhaps if you knew more about Abe Maslow as a person you would understand at a deeper level the heritage of the profession and the values and ideals that directed those who helped found the field. This may then allow you to function more effectively, knowing more who you are as a professional person, and the stream of values our profession represents.

In the late 1960's I was in Bethel, Maine as a staff member at an NTL T-Group laboratory in human interaction. I was informed as I arrived that Abe Maslow was going to be a participant at the lab and I was to be his T-Group trainer. Since I had read most of Maslow's work, knew of his reputation and stature but had never met him, my anxiety jumped markedly. The evening before the program began I was eating dinner with two participants. We knew each

other only by name. One of the participants said, "I hear Abe Maslow is going through this lab as a participant. Wouldn't you hate to be his T-Group trainer!" The other agreed and I listened with interest as the two discussed what they thought it would be like to be in a T-Group with Abe Maslow.

Imagine everyone's surprise when the T-Group met the next morning to find that not only Abe was present but myself and, by some interesting stroke of chance, the two participants who had been my dinner companions. We all laughed at the coincidence, told the group of the incident, and then everyone talked about their feelings about being in a T-Group with one of the great pioneers of humanistic psychology. Abe handled all of the discussion with ease and understanding. He appeared rather tall to me-something over 6 feet--brown hair in a crew cut with streaks of gray and a rather full mustache. He indicated that he was invited to come to the lab as an observer but wanted to experience the T-Group process as a full participant. It was his hope that people would allow him to function as a full member without special status. He also said he knew he liked to talk and to "spin out ideas and theories", and he hoped people would check this tendency if it got in the way of the training. It was a seductive thing for all of us. When we would be discussing a significant happening in the group, someone would ask, "Abe, what do you think of all of this?" Abe would delight in giving a little lecturette --a personal experience or a little theory. Fortunately, in the group was a young sociologist from Vassar, Marty Oppenheimer, who would in a good humored way keep pulling Abe and all of us back to the "here and now."

But many of his personal incidents I remember clearly. The group was discussing openness and authenticity in communications. Was it possible or desirable to always be honest with others? Abe told about going through graduate school during the depression at the University of Wisconsin. Abe and Bertha Maslow had a friend, Harry, who needed some help to go to school, so the Maslow's agreed to feed Harry breakfast each morning for a few dollars a month. The first day Harry came to breakfast Bertha burned the toast. She apologize profusely and Harry politely countered with, "Don't worry about it Bertha, I like burned toast." The next morning Bertha remembered Harry's preference and burned the toast to please him. This went on for several days until Harry finally asked in desperation, "Bertha, what is it with this burned toast every day?" And Bertha responded, "Harry, you said you like burned toast and I was just trying to please you." Harry then confessed, "I really hate burned toast, I just said I liked it to be polite and make you feel good. Bertha's response was, "I feel worse now because I have served you something you didn't like for several days. I wish you had told me." This incident became a watchword between Abe and Bertha all the rest of their married life. Whenever one would sense in the other a reluctance to be open, the one

would say, "Remember Harry's toast." This would lead to a smile and a gentle sharing of information.

Another time the matter of feedback was the focus of attention. Do you give feedback to a person in a social situation? What if someone tells a story that is offensive, how do you handle this? The question was raised to Abe and all listened carefully to his answer. Abe said that when he was in a situation like that and someone said, or did something he found personally unacceptable, he would say in a direct but mild way, "That's a mean story " or "That's a mean action." He would not make an issue of it or say more but all would know where he stood. Abe told of being on a crowded street observing a man roughly abusing his little boy. Abe said, "I looked the man square in the eye and said, "That's a mean!" He then passed on.

There came up the issue of trust. How much do you trust others and do you trust everyone? Abe's opinion was solicited. He said, "I have found that there are some people in this world who are first-class S.O.B.'s. When I discover this kind of person I do not trust them at all. However, I would assume that people are innocent (of being a first class S.O.B.) until proven otherwise."

Abe was an avid supporter of the position that people should understand who they are, what they believe in, and not be swayed by popular or influential others. He told of his father who loved lettuce. Abe grew up being told by his father to eat your lettuce." He was far into his adulthood when he finally discovered that he didn't really like lettuce and couldn't stop eating it just because his father liked it. Re felt the same about art, dance, and music. "Take in the art form," Abe would say, "and then decide if you like it. Don't let someone else tell you what you ought to like or appreciate."

Abe had a deep feeling that many people if not most, early in their lives had a private feeling of mission or destiny-- that they were, born to do something important with their lives. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, people would run away from their own best selves, their own sense of mission. This is what he called the "Jonah Complex," the tendency for people to be like Jonah and to run away from their personal call or mission. Jonah was fortunate in that the whale swallowed him and returned him to his homeland to complete his destiny. But most of us, do not have the w hale to intervene; we need to follow our, own sense of mission. Abe he would ask his students " Which of you will be the next Albert Switzer, the next President of the United States, the next writer of a great book in psychology?" Students would hang their heads and look embarrassed, and Abe would say, "If not you, who?" "Why not you?"

"Decide what your mission in life is and achieve it."

Abe was convinced that there were conditions in groups and organizations that stifled or released individual initiative and creativity. He had visited and observed some companies that were trying to manage by greater involvement of people in controlling their own work lives. The T-Group was a fascinating experience for him. He was like a child in his wonder at discovering all of the personal and interpersonal dynamics that were going on and would get uncovered. He was so impressed with the T-Group experience that the next summer he came back to Bethel and had Bertha go through the experience in the group that I conducted that summer. So for two summers I spent an intensive amount of time getting to know the Maslow's in and outside the T-Group. Bertha Maslow was an absolute delight. She was short, gray-haired, and looked like a typical grandmother. But she, was alive and insightful and a compliment to Abe's disposition. She had met Abe when she first migrated to the United States. In the Jewish section of the community on the East Coast, he was also a teenager. He taught her the first English she heard--a translation of obscene graffiti on fences and walls.

My experiences with Abe Maslow were learningful and satisfying. He was an open, honest, authentic person. There was no posturing, arrogance, or false-modesty. To know him made all of his writings more personal and alive. He believed in the potential of individuals. He could not accept the doctrine of complete environmental influence a'la Skinner, for he felt every person was born with capabilities and attributes that needed to be unfolded, fostered, encouraged. He felt organizations could facilitate this process; to help people actualize themselves, to become the very best person they could become. That legacy has been important to me, and I pass it on to others whom may wonder about the value base of their own profession.

THE WALLENDA FACTOR
by Warren Bennis

One of the most impressive and memorable qualities of 'the leaders I studied was the way they responded to failure. Like Karl Wallenda, the great tight-rope aerialist, who once said, "The only time I feel truly alive is when I walk the tight-rope." These leaders put a all their energies into their task. They simply don't think about failure, don't even use the word, relying on such synonyms as mistake or glitch or bungle or countless others such as false start, mess, hash bollix or error. Never failure. One of them said during the course of an interview that, "A mistake is just another way of

doing things." Another said, "I try to make as many mistakes as quickly as I can in order to learn."

Shortly after Wallenda fell to his death in 1978 (traversing a 75-foot-high tightrope in downtown San Juan, Puerto Rico), his wife, also an aerialist discussed that fateful San Juan walk, perhaps his most dangerous. " She recalled, "All Karl thought about for three straight months prior to it was falling. It was the first time he'd ever thought about that, and it seemed to me that he put all his energy into not falling, not into walking the tightrope.

Mrs. Wallenda went on to say that her husband even went so far as to personally supervise the installation of the tightrope, making certain that the guy-wires were secure, "something he had never even thought of before."

From what I learned from my interviews with successful leaders, I can say that when Karl Wallenda poured his energies into not falling rather than walking the tightrope, he was virtually destined to fail. Indeed, I call that peculiar combination of vision, persistence, consistency, and self-confidence necessary for successful tightrope walking--the combination I found in so many leaders--the Wallenda Factor. -

An example of the Wallenda Factor comes in an interview with Fletcher Byrom, who retired recently from the presidency of the Koppers Company, a diversified engineering, construction, and chemicals company. When asked about the "hardest decision he ever had to make," he said, "I don't know what a hard decision is. I may be a strange animal, but I don't worry. Whenever I make a decision, I start out recognizing there's a strong likelihood I'm going to be wrong. All I can do is the best I can. To worry puts obstacles I the way of clear thinking."

Or consider Ray Meyer perhaps the winningest coach in college basketball, who led DePaul University to 140 straight years of winning seasons. When his team dropped its first home game after 29 straight home-court victories, I asked him how he felt-about it, his response was vintage, Wallenda: "Great, now we can start concentrating on winning, not on not losing." And then there is Harold Prince the Broadway producer, He regularly calls a press conference the morning after one of his Broadway plays opens, before reading any reviews, in order to announce plans for his next play.

Effective leaders overlook error and constantly embrace positive goals. They pour their energies into the task, not into looking behind and dredging up excuses for past events. For a lot of people, the word "failure" carries with it

finality, the absence of movement characteristic of a dead thing, to which the automatic human reaction is helpless discouragement. But, for the successful leader, failure is a beginning, the springboard of hope.

One CEO I interviewed, James Rouse, the famed city planner and developer, said that when he was dissatisfied with the looks of some housing in his Columbia Maryland, project, he tried to influence the next design by nagging and correcting his team of architects. He got nowhere. Then he decided to stop correcting them and tried to influence them by demonstrating what he wanted, what he was for. Inspired by Rouse's vision, the architects went on to create some of the most eye-catching and functional housing in the country. What this illustrates is that the self-confidence of leaders is contagious. Two more examples: In the early days of Polaroid, Edwin Land continually inspired his team to "achieve the impossible." Land's compelling self-confidence convinced his managers and researchers that they couldn't fail. When William Hewitt took over Deere and Company in the mid-1950's, he turned a sleepy, old-line farm implements firm into leader among modern multinational corporations. His secret? Commitment. Confidence. Vision. And always asking, "Can't we do this a little better?" And the employees rose to the occasion. As one long-time Deere employee put it: "Hewitt made us learn how good we were." Because they know where they are going, great leaders inspire the people who work for them so that they, too, can walk the tightrope. That is one of the reasons why organizations run by great leaders often appear so productive.

Although leading is a "job" for which leaders are handsomely paid, where their rewards come from--and what they truly value--is a sense of adventure and play In my interviews, they describe work in ways that scientists and other creative types use: "exploring a new space," "solving a problem, " "designing or discovering something new." Like explorers, scientists and artists, they seem to focus their attention on a limited field--their task--forget personal problems, lose their sense of time, feel competent and in control. When these elements are present, leaders truly enjoy what they're doing and stop worrying about whether the activity will be productive or not, whether their activities will be rewarded or not, whether what they are doing will work or not. They are walking the tightrope.

I've wondered, from time to time, if this fusion of work and play, where quoting from a Robert Frost poem, "love and need are one," is a positive addiction. My guess is that it is a healthy addition, not only for individual leaders but for society. Great leaders are like the Zen archer who develops his skills to the point where the desire to hit the target becomes extinguished, and man, arrow, and target become indivisible components of the same process. That's good for the leaders. And when this style of influence works to attract and empower people to join them on the

tightrope that's good for organizations and for society. Hail the Wallenda Factor!

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Burke, W. Warner; Clark, Lawrence P. & Koopman, Cheryl, "Improving Your OD Project's Chances For Success." <u>Training and Development Journal</u>, Sept. 1984, 62-68.

Murrell, Kenneth, L., "OD in the Third World. Lessons and Reasons Why." <u>The Organization Development Journal</u>, Summer 1984, 16-21.

Rubinstein, D. & Woodman, R.W., "Spiderman and the Burma Raiders: Collateral Organization Theory in Action." <u>Journal of Applied Behavioral Science</u>, 1984, 20, 1-21.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Adams, John, D., <u>Transforming Work—A Collection of Organizational Transformation Readings</u>. Resources for Human Systems Development, 2914 27th Street North, Arlington, VA 22207, 1983.

Neilsen, Eric H., <u>Becoming an OD Practitioner</u>. Prentice Hall, Englewood C1iffs N.J.: January 1984.

Bowditch, James L. & Buono, Anthony F., <u>A Primer On Organizational Behavior</u>, New York; John Wiley & Sons, 1985

Cummings, Larry L. & Frost, Peter J. Publishing in the Organizational Sciences. Richard D. Irwin, Inc. Scheduled for publication in March, 1985.

WHAT'S THE FOCAL ISSUE?
by Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton

"They wear safety glasses according to the regulations for awhile, right after they are employed. But then something happens after a bit. The trouble is, as soon as I leave the work area, the glasses come off. I see this when, returning because I catch people slipping them back on. Newcomers quickly come to do what is customary and join in violating.,, the regulations too. How can I get this thing back under control?" asked the client.

"Well," said the consultant, "It's related to your managerial approach. With appropriate supervision the subordinate will respond. I suggest a program that you can implement with newcomers so they'll want to comply, with regulations rather than joining the others in disregard of them. It's a matter of praise and reprimand."

"Do this with the very next person you hire. When he (or she) hits the floor, set objectives for wearing safety glasses and then give praise for compliance. The first time you catch him doing it according to regulations, say, 'I appreciate your wearing your safety glasses. They provide safety for you and I feel real good that you want to comply with these rules. Thanks a lot.' If you do this repeatedly, attention will be drawn to the importance of safety glasses again and again.

"It's probably also useful to have a reprimand in mind. The first time that you see the new workers slipping, you might say, 'You're better than that. I'm genuinely disappointed to see that you're not living up to the best that's within you.' Having said that in a good, firm way, then quickly add a positive note and say, 'I know you want to conform with the regulations and I really want to thank you for doing so in the future.' Then when you catch him doing it right, say, 'Attaboy.'

"Once you have the new person responding to you and living by the regulations, others will catch on and begin to revise their behavior in the same direction, too.

The approach that centers on boosting boss authority and control over subordinates was described in a general session in a recent OB Conference, but the consultant did not track its long-term impact on the problem. It is probable that it had little or no impact over the longer term. The new hire undoubtedly joined the troops and did what the boss wanted and the regulations required. However, the praise and reprimand approach my have put the new hire under more tension than he otherwise would have experienced because when he felt the pressure to do what the boss wanted, he probably also felt increased counter pressures from those with whom he worked: "Come on sissy.

Be a regular guy."

Had the consultant drawn the supervisor's attention to the wrong focal issue?

An alternative intervention can be applied in the same situation, that has been found to promote different and better results (Blake and Mouton, 1981). It is based on answering the question, "What is the real focal issue?" The answer here is, "Norms among those who work together, led to them not wearing the goggles because they are inconvenient. Therefore they slip them off when the boss is out. However, to avoid trouble, they slip them back on so he can't gripe when he's there." Now the focal issue as seen by the consultant, is related to a norm, which is shared by all members of this work group. The consultant might work with the supervisor to answer, "How can a supervisor help a group change a group norm?"

The consultant might suggest to the supervisor that he get the group together and lead a discussion of the members, to be introduced in the following way. "I know we've got a cat-and-mouse game going on, but it worries me that the goggles come off when I leave. We really have to think it through. Is the goggles regulation sound? If it is, what's behind ignoring it? Can we solve the problem?"

It turns out that group members recognize and agree in a basic way with the safety glasses regulation. They spot the real issue as one of safety versus comfort. They know in the short term that they have come to let comfort prevail over safety. In the long term, however, they have some tragic examples of the consequences of letting "least effort convenience" take precedence.

One member finally says, "I'm willing to go along with the regulations, but only if you guys are. I'm not going to be the odd man out." Another speaks up, "Me, too. I think we've become pretty slipshod on this thing. Sometimes I want to put my goggles on but I don't want to do it because I figure I'll get ribbing from you characters." One member after another can be heard to say, "Me, too," "Me too." Finally, someone comes up with, " You know, we can solve this thing if we're willing to be your brother's keeper. It's my job to nudge you if I see you disregarding the regulation and it's your job to finger me in the same way. If we do this, all of us can keep each other alert to the dilemma of serving convenience when we should be serving safety. Anyway, the glasses are not all that inconvenient."

The safety problem that related to wearing goggles disappeared with interesting additional results. A noticeable boost of morale became apparent and the safety norm began to spread to other issues of safe practice.Here are two fundamentally different conceptions of the focal issue that the consultant should seek to solve. The focal issue of an intervention is the problem-to-be-resolved (Blake and Mouton, 1982). Skill in identifying the focal issues is one of the important competencies of effective consultation. Interventions are not useful if they fail to deal with the focal issue that is the barrier to effectiveness; they may even worsen the situation.

In this kind of an example, the "felt" focal issue frequently is that safety is an authority problem and that people fail to comply with the boss's instructions. By this definition, the solution is for the boss to boost up the exercise of authority. One particular version of how to do it is to increase the praise-reprimand basis for inducing compliance.

The "real" focal issue is that people often protect their memberships by doing what colleagues expect of them even though this means departure from regulations and occasionally from good sense. According to the definition of the real focal issues it is not an authority problem, Rather it is one of membership and the normative issues that come into play, when each member wishes to preserve his status with the others. Only by aiding the group to grapple more constructively with what norm should apply under given conditions is it possible to rectify the risky behavior.

An OD consultant usually has some sense of what the focal issue is as the basis for deciding how to assist the client in solving it. The trouble is that the focal issue as reported by the client may not be the focal issue, as it should be diagnosed by the consultant. Many consultants fail to deliver the outcomes or results possible because they rely on the conventional, felt-needs definition of the focal issue and try to solve it at face value.

The same approach to diagnosing the real focal issue often produces an alternative definition of many organization problems. Included are issues such as quality, waste, early quitting, extended coffee breaks, late arrival, tool control, stealing, and so on. When defined as issues of group membership, with organization members' behavior held in place by conformance to informal norms that are adverse to organization results, a radically different solution to the problem comes into focus. Rather than working with the supervisor as client to strengthen supervision on a one-to-one basis, the work team itself becomes the client with the target of intervention being the shift of norms of work group members.

REFERENCES: Blake, Robert R., & Mouton, Jane S., Productivity: The Human Side. New York: AMACOM, 1981.

Blake, Robert R., & Mouton, Jane S., New Consultation (2nd Ed.) Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1983, 12-14.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

With reference to Jerry Porras's excellent article in the summer, 1984, O.D. Newsletter, I'd like-to make a small contribution. To the difficulty of designing research into the effects of an O.D. intervention, let me add the problem of

"orthogonality," or statistical independence. The inherent danger in "adding" and in "subtracting" measurable variables over a period of time during periodic project evaluation is that the research design can become compromised in the process. This is especially true where control groups are involved. Where variables are changed, the focus of the research changes, as can the instruments themselves. Given the difficulty of empirical work in human resources field, generally, I would rather see research into OD intervention err on the side of statistical caution, unless the researcher is greatly experienced, or the particular set of original variables under scrutiny becomes hopelessly irrelevant, endangering the life of the project itself. –Richard Zalman