Contents

NATIONAL MEETINGS IN SAN DIEGO - AUGUST 10-14, 1985

by Marshall Sashkin

The best news for the OD Division's program is that we received everything we asked for from the National Program Chair. That is, we not only got our "guaranteed" 18 1/2 hours, we also got nine more hours of "free" joint division sponsored time and five more hours of "Gee, couldn't we please have this, too" time, for a grand total of almost 33 hours. Of the 48 papers and 17 symposia submitted, we were able to accept 25 papers (52% and 11 symposia (65%). The, Executive Council reviewed all symposia, while papers were reviewed by two or (usually) three OD Division members. The quality of the papers seemed rather high, and that is why a larger percentage was accepted as compared with the two previous years. In addition to all the papers and symposia, we will have Ed Lawler as our Distinguished Speaker, followed by a panel on connecting theory and practice in OD. Following our Division business meeting, we will have a Wine & Cheese Social. All this is on Monday afternoon.

Before the formal start of the meetings, we will sponsor two workshops, for which you will need to register in advance. This first is a half-day session on Saturday, August 10 (8:00-Noon), conducted by Cecil H. Bell, Jr. His subject will be "Team Building in the 1980's", and the cost of the workshop will be $35. The second workshop kicks off our theme this year and deals with building better linkages between theory and practice. Frank Friedlander and W. Warner Burke will conduct a 2-hour session on Monday, August 11 (8:00-10:00) dealing with "Academic Becoming Practitioners" and "Practitioners Becoming Academics." The cost of this session will be $15.00. Both workshops are limited in attendance register early. Make your check payable to "OD Division" and send it to: Ma Sashkin, 8706 Nightingale Seabrook, MD. 20706.

ORGANIZATION TRANSFORMATIONS; FAD OR FUTURE?

by Richard Beckhard

I chose the title, "Organization Transformation -- Fad or Future", because it represents for me a dilemma we always face in this business: How can we make a better world by 'converting' our clients to "good"--How can we transfer our knowledge and values--while at the same time meeting our organization clients needs for improvement both of the present state and for changing to a different state. How do we both improve effectiveness of what is--and help the client organization change into something else--and not lose our values, biases, identities?

First a definition of "transformation." The dictionary says transformation is change in the shape, structure, and nature of something. That's a satisfactory starting point. Changing the *shape*. I see an increasing need in society for organizations to actually *change* their *shape*--their *character*--not just their organizational structures and managerial styles. For me *shape* means *how* we work, what *beliefs* we have, what *values* we hold that we act on, what we *reward,* and *who owns what* in the organization.

The changing, demanding environment around organizations--new technologies, new ways of doing work; new interactions between machines and people; new ways of "tele" communicating; competition for minds and money from countries all over the world; ambiguity and uncertainty being the normal state of affairs; all require organization leaders to examine not only *who* they are but *how* they are ... and in some cases this means they must consider or effect a change in *shape--a transformation*.

This type of change requires *different planning, management*, and *commitment* than do changes whose objective is to increase effectiveness or efficiency within the present shape.

Returning to the dilemma which the title hopefully illustrates, it seems to me that we must consciously examine our diagnostic and intervention strategies by asking *dilemma oriented* questions such as:

1. Is this a change where shape is indicated?

2. To what degree do I want to or plan to be an advocate, a methodologist, a teacher, a 'value adder'?

3. What knowledge and methodologies are available for me to address the first two questions?

4. Is the primary objective of change effort to improve something in the present culture or state or to create a new state to become something else? Let me give some illustrations: Is Exxon--as seen by its leaders--an oil company, an energy company, a financial institution? Is it all three? Does it matter? What implications for organization of work, structure, rewards, information flow decision-making, are there?

Does company X want to continue being a US company doing business around the world or does it want, or is it required, to become a multinational company or inter-national company? What does that mean for management practices, personnel policies, recruiting, tele-communications and the rest?

Should the future organization be governed by *executive management*-centralized strategic decision; *strategic management*--units report to center only to set goals and review budgets--relatively autonomous a directed by unit head; *conglomerate management*--where the center buys managements and businesses within the prescribed area of technology or markets--some cross fertilization but highly independent except perhaps on some personnel policies; *holding company* in which the entitles are financial investments to be bought and sold like securities?

5. What is the current culture as it relates to the proposed change?

a. What are the artifacts, myths, traditions that must be looked at, possibly changed if a shape change is to occur?

b. What are the values that are now used? Which do they choose or are required to be contained? Which new ones are needed?

c. What are the beliefs (truths) that are held (truths aren't good or bad, they just are, i.e., there is a god); which ones must be let go or you can't get there from here?

Beliefs may be about the way we treat people, about the role of management, about classes of employees, (e.g., scientists are more valuable than financial people,) or about the role of the organization in society, (e.g., as a wealth producer, corporate citizen, defender of capitalism, or public servant)?

Practitioner’s Dilemma

Today there is a significant search for meaning, for usefulness, for personal fulfillment among practitioners in this field. Let's face it, most of us have strong values and beliefs. Many people in the field are actively concerned about the nuclear threat, the environmental threat, etc. and wish to make statements about these in whatever settings they work. Others of us--like many in this room—may hold similar values but are primarily concerned professionally, with the development and transfer of knowledge that will increase organizational effectiveness, adaptability and health. Many people in this room are likely to be more focused on organizations as systems, which include people, information technology, production technology, etc. Many of the practitioners I saw at the transformation conference in Durham, NH last year were more focused on people and personkind--and how we can improve it and void world disaster. Both types are working professionally in organizations-espousing our capacities to help with change.

Simultaneously organization leaders are struggling to integrate and adapt to new values, technologies, new ways of thinking, an awakened and demanding work force, managing both change and stability, facing new competitors around the world, recognizing that present organizational structures will not get the work done and unsure of what structures should replace them.

Once again our field is faced with the question of whose needs to meet and how much? How many of our "goods" must we-will we--should we "inject" into our clients?

Let me suggest some factors to consider where organization transformation is involved.

Conditions in the Organization/Institution

For transformation to occur there needs, to be:

1. In the organization's top leadership one or more committed champions of the change.

2. A vision of what the transformed organization would look like and why.

3. A set of external conditions that makes the choice of staying as we are unlikely or impossible.

4. High potential that a critical mass of key people will get on board.

5. A medium to long time perspective expectation that the change will take years, not months.

6. High awareness of resistance and need to honor it and work with it.

7. Awareness of need for education of numbers of people and groups.

8. Conviction that this must be tried-that resources will be put against it--that an experimental attitude will operate--that the organization will stay with the effort.

9. Willingness to use all kinds of resources--technical, consultative and expert.

10. Commitment to maintaining information flow between parts of the organization--among change leadership; between those who run the store and those who are trying to replace it with something else.

For Intervenors:

1. Clarity on who is the client or clients--it must be the system as well as the parts.

2. Definition of the critical mass needed for the change.

3. Definition of the appropriate system which must be involved in the change.

4. Clarity as to what change management structures are needed.

5. Clarification of who needs to know what--when.

6. Agreement and joint commitment to long relationship—not project term mentality.

7. Realistically low expectations for short term dramatic results.

8. Absolute clarification on all sites that the change problem is the clients--not the intervenors.

For the Person in This Role She/He:

1. Must understand that there is a long feedback cycle--you won't get short-term brownie points. I believe there almost is an inverse correlation between the effectiveness of an intervention and who knows about it.

2. Must have a strong conceptual background to connect knowledge and problems.3. Must have high conflict management skills.

4. Must have a thick skin.

5. Must have good political skills--the road to heaven is paved with dead advocates

6. Must be pragmatic.

7. Must be a good methodologist—quick on the feet.

8. Must have in balance knowledge plus experience--the combination equals wisdom. A Spanish writer once said, "Knowledge without experience is like a load of books on the back of a jackass"...unfortunately, we can't Ret experience without having it--but the balance is important.

9. And finally, the practitioner must have worked his/her personal issues, how much one needs to advocate ideals, values and beliefs. We must be prepared to focus major energy on the client's world, putting in input, sharing values,

being clear about our own convictions, but not confusing that with the contract to help organization leaders with their change.

Finally, let me suggest that this is a wonderful, hopeful time to be in this business! There is a lot of new and potent energy among practitioners. There is increasing awareness among leaders of organizations of the need for help to pi and manage the significant organizational changes required and there is a high potential for useful partnerships--if we the practitioners get our act together.

We are in an era where the *meta good* will be organizations using emerging technology for both economic and social good--I'm convinced of that. New technology, available communications, financial interdependence, economic threats of survival of the race--these leave us no choice.

Our field offers one of the great hopes for creatively integrating technology and humanism: for changing and transforming people and organization life. We have among us the knowledge, some experience, the values and the will; *if* we can get *wisdom*, we've got it made!

MULTIPLE OUTCOMES OF BURN-OUT
by Robert T. Golembiewski

This note emphasizes four reinforcing interim conclusions about research with a phase model of burnout, involving a pilot study with some 300 (1) subjects and follow-on research with a population of about 1550. (2) Compelling results imply that burnout in large populations can be reliably, validly, and conveniently measured. Moreover, eight burnout phases map in regular and usually robust ways of broad range of personally and organizationally relevant variables. In addition, the phase approach has generated a range of findings having practical and theoretical significance. Finally, the phase model contradicts the common wisdom in important senses.

Measuring Burn-out Phases

This research utilizes the 25 items of Maslach's Burnout Inventory (3) to generate scores for individuals on three sub-scales. They are:

- Depersonalization, on which high scores indicate that a person tends to distance self from others and to consider persons as objects
- Personal Accomplishment (Reversed), on which low scores indicate a person is doing well on a task seen as worth doing.
- Emotional Exhaustion, on which high scores indicate the strains experienced by an individual approach or surpass normal coping limits.

The phase model proposes that the three sub-phases are sequentially prepotent in the order given. When High vs. Low scores are distinguished, this assumed prepotency generates eight phases:

Phases of Burn-Out

Depersonalization

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Lo Hi Lo Hi Lo Hi Lo Hi

Personal Accomplishment (Reversed)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Lo Lo Hi Hi Lo Lo Hi Hi

Emotional Exhaustion

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Lo Lo Lo Lo Hi Hi Hi Hi

The phases are seen as progressively virulent, but that does not mean that individuals will pass through each phase as burnout worsens. Indeed, that seems unlikely, both in conceptual and psychological senses.

Mapping Major Multiple Outcomes Burn-out in the popular literature is associated with a wide range of deficits and deficiencies, and hence this program of research tests relationships between five classes of variables in a "multiple outcomes" model:

The solid lines depict proposed main-line effects, while the broken lines indicate probable feedback or reinforcing linkages. Self-reports provide data on the phases, Worksite Descriptors, and Physical Symptoms. Performance and Productivity data come from organizational records. Over 50 variables are involved in the several tests of this model, but two summary points provide useful perspective. First, on definite balance, all 5 classes of variables are associated at statistically significant levels, as sketched. Second, the direction of effects has not been established, but inferential evidence supports the model above.

For example, Worksite Descriptors--participation in decisions, job involvement, and so on--are robustly and regularly associated with burnout phases. Not only are all Descriptors—16 in one case, 22 in the other-significantly associated with the phases; but the association is like a step-ladder, phase by phase; and about 16 per cent of the variance is shared, overall, which is a substantial amount. Relatedly, the phases share well over 15 per cent of the variance with 19 Physical Symptoms. In turn, Worksite Descriptors are significantly associated with Symptoms, but that association accounts for less than 3 per cent of the variance. Hence A is strongly associated with B, and B with C; but A and C are less robustly associated, although the linkage is statistically significant.

A similar pattern characterized performance appraisals and productivity. Statistically-significant associations still dominate, although the magnitudes of effects differ. This may be due to certain methodological issues, which probably generate conservative estimates of effects.

Casting the Net A Bit Further

The phase model also supports several outreaches that have theoretical and practical significance. Consider here incidence, persistence, and populations at special risk.

Only six substantial organizations have been surveyed thus far, but the - lowest incidence of advanced burn-out--defined as persons classified in Phases VI through VIII--has been over 20 per cent. The highest incidence is 56 per cent. Both extremes suggest much work to be done, especially since the lowest incidence comes from an organization, which approximates a model employer in its human resources practices and policies.

Exacerbating the challenge, extremes of burnout seem to persist. (4) Over a year's interval, one organization experienced about a 70 per cent carryover of individuals in the three-highest/lowest cases. For those initially in phases IV and V, in contrast, about 90 per cent were classified elsewhere a year later.

Finally, some observers see certain populations at special risk--those who care, "people-helpers," and so on. This may be the case, but available data suggest burnout is more basically an affirmative action disease. (5) A panel of 20 demographic variables disclosed statistically significant associations in about half the cases, but typically these each accounted for only a fraction of I per cent of the total variance. So women seem to report more advanced phases of burnout than men, to illustrate, and blacks more than whites. But those associations are not very robust.

Motivating Further Research

Future burnout initiatives also are motivated because the phase model contraindicates the common wisdom. Elementally and yet profoundly, burnout phases may be important determinants of designs-of-choice. A work team whose members-cluster in Phases VI-VIII, on the face of it, would seem better served by team-building design different from that appropriate for a group of those in Phases I-III. (6) The point is not trivial, for work group members overwhelmingly fall in either the most-advanced or least-advanced phases of burnout. (7) Relatedly, "stranger" workshops for stress or burnout may have awkward effects. Thus if the work team is a prime Burnout locus, as the affinity for extreme phases suggests, that urges designs focusing on intact teams. Ironically, from this perspective, a "stranger" experience may fail even as it succeeds in better equipping individual to cope with stress. That may only result in greater stress induction back-home for all, absent a change in worksite policies and procedures. The paradoxical result could be that all are worse off, on balance, and workshop attendees may have only broken even.

Finally, the burnout research suggests a wicked dilemma. Thus job enrichment is no doubt the prescription for a worksite with low participation, job involvement, satisfaction, and so on. But just those worksites seem to have high concentrations of advanced burn-out, and those in Phases VI-VIII at once seem to need job enrichment and yet have fewer of the resources required for making it work: some emotional and energy "slack" not consumed in normal coping, a sense efficacy that one can make a difference, and so on. At a minimum, the present program of research suggests that burnout differences can be powerful intervening variables in job redesign or other QWL efforts.

FOOTNOTES

1. R.T. Golembiewski, R. Munzenrider and D. Carter, "Phases of Progressive Burn-out and their Worksite Covariants," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 19 (No. 4, 1983), pp. 461-482.

2. R.T. Golembiewski and R. Munzenrider, "A Replication Using Norms from A Large Population," Journal of Health And Human Resources Administration (in press).

3. C. Maslach and S.E. Jackson, "The Measurement of Experienced Burnout," Journal Of Occupational Behaviour, Vol. 2 (No. 4, 1981), pp. 99-113.

4. R.T. Golembiewski, "The Persistence of Burn-out," pp- 300-304, 1984 Proceedings, Southwestern Academy of Management.

5. R.T. Golembiewski, with M. Scicchitano, "Some Demographics of Psychological Burnout," International Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 5 (No. 4, 1983), pp. 435-447.

6. R.T. Golembiewski, "Enriching the Theory and Practice of Team-Building," in D.D. Warrick, ed., Current Developments in Organization Development (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1984.)

7. R.T. Golembiewski, "The Distribution of Burnout Among Work Groups," pp.158-162, 1983 Proceedings,

Southwestern Academy of Management.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEFENSIVE ROUTINES
by Chris Argyris

During the past decade we have been studying examples of organizational changes that have either failed or produced less than expected results, yet top management, line and staff were enthusiastic about implementing them. The single most important cause of the disappointing results were defensive routines (be they organizational, group, or individual). (l) A defensive routine is any action or policy that prevents individuals or organizations from experiencing threat and simultaneously guarantees that they will not learn how to reduce or eliminate the causes of the threat. Defensive routines are overprotective and anti-learning. The puzzle of defensive routines.

In all our studies of large to small private and public organizations, we did not find one example of a formal policy on how to create and protect organizational defensive routines. For that matter, I do not know of an MBA program or any executive program that teaches individuals how to produce defensive routines.

Puzzle: Why are defensive routines so prevalent? How do defensive routines become so powerful?

It appears that the key processes by which defensive routines are created and maintained are the same in all the organizations studied, be they old or young, big or small, private or public, in financial health or in financial trouble. Also to our surprise, they seem to exist most powerfully among the best and the brightest: the very group that condemns them the most.

Mixed Messages:

One of the most frequent defensive routines that we have observed is mixed messages. In large decentralized organizations there is the tension between the control corporate deems necessary if it is to fulfill its stewardship and the autonomy the divisional heads believe should exist if decentralization is to be credible. Needless to say, both sides feel strongly about their positions because both want to act responsibly. For the most part, both sides have constructive intentions; their motives are clean. As a result they each strive to deal with the tensions constructively.

The top keeps communicating "We mean it: you are managing your show." The divisional heads concur that the message is credible except when the division or corporate gets into trouble or when a ver important issue is at stake. In the eye of the divisional heads, corporate begin to interfere precisely when they want to prove their own mantel. In the eyes of corporate they interfere precisely when they can be of most help; that is when the issue requires a corporate perspective.

Divisional heads described the mixed messages that they received as: "You are running the show, however… "You make the decisions, but clear with…" That's an interesting idea, but be careful . . ."

The logic embedded in the mixed messages

Mixed messages contain meanings that are simultaneously: ambiguous and clearly so imprecise and precisely so anyone who deals with mixed messages experiences the dilemmas that are embedded in them. The designers know that designing a message to be clearly ambiguous requires skill and knowledge about the receiver. They know that to be vague and to be clear is inconsistent. Furthermore to be clearly vague is not only inconsistent, but it is designed inconsistency. To design inconsistency makes them vulnerable unless the receiver does not question the inconsistency.

One way to increase the likelihood that the receiver will not focus on the inconsistency is for the sender to act as if there isn't any. This will work if the receiver is willing to sense the act and to respond as if it is not an act, namely he will not discuss the inconsistency. And this strategy will work if everyone involved not only knows that the mixedness of the messages is undiscussable but that the undiscussability is also undiscussable.

What leads human beings to act in these ways? To date, the answer is that mixed messages make it possible for individuals to evade threat. For example, corporate may wish to evade discussing the divisional heads sense of not being trusted. The message must be mixed because corporate does not wish to communicate that they are evading threat. If they said openly that they were evading threat, then they would have blown their cover. Moreover they would be engaging, not evading, threat.

There are, therefore, four rules about designing and implementing mixed messages. They are:

1. Design a message that is inconsistent.
2. Act as if the message is not inconsistent.
3. Make the inconsistency in both the message and the act undiscussable.
4. Make the undiscussablility of the undiscussable also undiscussable.

Reference:

Argyris, Chris "Strategy, Change, and Defensive Routines," Boston: Pitman, 1985.

SURVEY OF OD PROGRAMS

Last year we invited Division members share information about their OD prorams with our readers. The following represents the responses to that survey.

- American University and NTL Institute

American University and NTL Institute jointly sponsor an M.S. degree in H.R.D. designed for working adults. Most courses offered in Washington, D.C. on 3-day ends over a two year period to aspiring consultants, trainers and managers. Full-time Faculty: Elsie Cross, Wally Sikes, Charles Seashore, Edie Whitfield Seashore, Henry Malcolm, Maria Ramos, Unice Parisi-Carew, Richard Orange, Allan Drexler, Roger Ritvo, Daryl Funches, Radord Wilson, Denny Gallagher, Lucia Edmonds, Ted Tschudy, Leroy Wells, Morley Sega1, Kent Baker, Neil Kerwin, Bob Marshak, Kent Smith, Don Zauderer, Lisa Levy, Carolyn Lukensmeyer, John Carter, Steven Jenks, Jospeh Potts, Marilynn

Swenson. Part-time Faculty Contact: Patti Goodall, American University, College of Public and International Affairs, School of Government and Public Law, The American University, Washington, D.C., 20016.

- Antioch University of Los Angeles

A five quarter M.A. Administration program specialties in Business Management, Resource Development, and Information Resources Management, and the Opportunity to design an individualized curriculum. Emphasis on combining theory with work experience. Full-time Faculty: Donald Mankin, Susan Nero, Ken Smith, Al Erdynast.

Part-time Faculty: Variety of faculty drawn from the business and professional communities. Contact: Donald Mankin, Program Director, Administration Program, Antioch University, 300 Rose Avenue, Venice, California 90291.

- Boston University

Students in the Social Psychology (PhD) and the Organizational Behavior (DBA) doctoral programs work with faculty and students from both departments in a program that combines research and practice in various settings. Full-time Faculty: Bob Chin, Phil Kubzansky, Hilda Perlitsch, Dave Brown, Kathy Kram, Gerry Leader, Phil Mirvis. Contact: Bob Chin, Department of Psychology, College of Liberal Arts, Boston University, 100 Cummington Street, Boston, MA. 02215 or Dave Brown, Organizational Behavior Department, School of Management, Boston University, 621

Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215.

- Bowling Green State University

Masters in Organization Development: A fully accredited, part-time (weekend's) program involving the study of organization analysis, strategies for change and development of effective organization development skills. Full-Time Faculty:Glenn H. Varney, Kenneth M. Alvares, Donald J. Campbell, Orlando C. Behling, Robert G. Warehime. Part Time Faculty: John Adams, Donald Warrick, Joe Yaney, Paul Tolchinsky. Contact: Glen H. Varney, Director of M.O.D., School of Business Administration, 263 Business Building, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403, Telephone: (419) 371-2210.

- California School of Professional Psychology at Los Angeles

Doctoral Program training scientist/practitioners with strong conceptual and methodological backgrounds. All students take coursework in organizational diagnosis, psychological theory, methodology, interpersonal and consulting skills, and long-range business planning, and participate in two paid internships. Full-time Faculty: Kelin Gersick, Richard R. Kopp, Mitchell Lee Marks, Daniel S. Schag, Michael Storms. Part-time Faculty: Several local OD practitioners participate in the program. Contact: Dr. Mitchell Lee Marks, California School of Professional

Psychology, 2235 Beverly Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90057 Phone 213/483-7034.

- Case Western Reserve University

The MS Program in OD provides an intensive learning experience in the theory and techniques of organization development and analysis over a 17-month period. The Ph.D. Program in OB takes 4-5,years and equips students with skills in teaching, research and consultation. Full-time Faculty: Barbara J. Bird, David L. Cooperrider, Ronald E. Fry, David A. Kolb, Mitchell D. McCorcle, Michael R. Manning, Eric H. Neilsen, William A. Pasmore, Michelle I. Spain, Suresh Sprivastva, Donald M. Wolfe. No Part-time Faculty Contact: David A Kolb, Professor and Chairman, Department of Organizational Behavior, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106 phone 206-368-2055.

- Eastern Michigan University

The Masters in Organizational Behavior and Development program is designed to train individuals to (1) understand and utilize OB and OD in organizations they manage and/or (2) fill full-time professional consulting positions in the field. Full-time Faculty: Fraya Andrews, P. Nicholas Blanchard, Richaurd Camp, Pradeep Chowdhry, Gregory E. Huszczo, Jean McEnery, Mary Vielhaber. Contact: P. Nick Blanchard, Chairman, Masters in Organizational Behavior & Development program, Department of Management, 504 Pray-Harrold, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan -48197 Phone 313/487-0141 or 487-3240.

- The Fielding Institute

The Fielding Institute is a competency based external degree, interdisciplinary masters and doctoral program for mid-career professionals. A fully accredited program, it offers degrees in Organization Development, Human Development, and Organizational Systems Management. Faculty: Richard Appelbaum, Dorothy Blackmore, Don D. Bushnell, Anna DiStefano, Libby Douvan, Frank Friedlander, Leo Johnson, Richard Kalish, Elaine Kepner, Malcolm Knowles, Keith Melville, Barbara Mink, Will McWhinney, Jeremy Shapiro, Jody Veroff. Contact: Don D. Bushnell, The Fielding Institute, 2112 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93105.

- United States Air Force Academy

The USAF Academy offers a major in Organizational Behavior within the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership. In addition to their core requirement for the B.S., cadets take 11courses in the major including a full semester, double-period course in Organization Development (OD). Full-time Faculty: Major Robert A. Gregory, Major Thomas E. Ulrich, Major William H. Clover. Contact: Bob Gregory, USAFA/DFBL, USAF Academy, Colorado Springs, CO 80840 Phone 303/472-3860.

- University of Colorado

The Graduate School of Business Administration offers a five-course sequence in O.D. and Consultation skills a part of the Masters and Doctoral Program in Organization Behavior. Full-time Faculty: Richard W. Beatty, Wilmar F. Bernthal, R. Wayne Boss, Wayne Cascio, Leonard Chusmir, John E. Dittrich. Douglas Durrand, Donald M. Gardner, G. Dale Meyer, Edward J. Morrison, Joseph Rosse, Marilyn Sargent, Donald D. Warrick, Raymond F. Zammuto, Robert A. Zawacki. Part-Time Faculty: Tom Isgar. Contact: Dr. R. Wayne Boss, College of Business, Campus Box 419, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309.

- Universities of Massachusetts

We offer a multi-disciplinary program offering masters and doctorate degrees. The major areas of concentration are organizational development theory and practice, training and development, small group facilitation and human resource development. Full-time Faculty: Norma Jean Anderson, Don Carew, Bailey Jackson, Sheryl Reichmann-Hruska, Charlotte Rahaim, Horace Reed, Dwayne Wilson, Part-time Faculty: Ken Blanchard, Mason Bunker, Renee Carew, Michael Grennebaum. Contact: Dr. Don Carew, 356 Hills South, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01002 Phone 413/545-0918 or 413/545-3610.

- The University of West Florida

The University of West Florida offers a masters degree in Psychology with an emphasis in Organizational Development. This option is offered jointly by the Departments of Psychology and Management. Faculty: Terry R. Armstrong, Rosemary Hays Lowe, Harvey Thompson Martin, Kenneth L. Murrell, Judith F. Vogt. Contact: Terry R. Armstrong, Dept. of Management, Bldg. 17, Rm. 130, The University of West Florida, Pensacola, FL 32514.

- Villanova University

As part of the masters program in Human Organization Science (MHOS), Villanova University offers a concentration in Human Resource Development. Ten courses are required, including six in OB/OD and two in statistics/research methods. Full-time Faculty: David F. Bush, Theresa Nance, Louis Gershman. Part-time Faculty: Richard S. Andrulis, Samuel T. Barnett, John Kelley. Contact: David F. Bush, Ph.D., Coordinator, Graduate Program in Human Resource Development, Human Organization Science, Villanova University, Villanova, PA 19085.

CALL FOR CRITICAL INCIDENTS IN OD

With a grant from the Program on Ethics and Values in Science and Technology of e National Science Foundation, IIT's Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions and several Organization Development (OD) professional groups are conducting a collaborative research project to assess ethical issues in OD. The project is expected to produce: (1) a Casebook on Ethical Issues in OD, (2) an Annotated Bibliography in OD Ethics and (3) an OD Clearinghouse on Professional Ethics to promote continuing assessment of ethical issues beyond the life of the project. An important goal of the project is to contribute to the development of ethical guidelines for OD researchers and practitioners. The project is committed to widespread participation in its activities by OD professionals and their clients, social and behavioral scientists familiar with OD and philosophers working in applied and professional ethics.

The project is soliciting critical incidents and statements of concern describing ethical issues in OD. The incidents or statements may reflect actual experiences or observations or they may reflect serious ethical concerns as received by persons inside or outside the OD field. A sample of ethical issues likely to arise during OD research and practice might include confidentiality, responsibilities of change agents, researcher-practitioner role conflict, informed consent and accountability in terminating professional-client relationships. Contributors are encouraged to describe the ethical issue(s), the conditions that precipitate it and how, if at all, it was or could be resolved. Project staff, with the assistance of an Advisory Board, will use the materials submitted to prepare a series of case scenarios which will be suitably disguised to -ensure anonymity, while retaining sufficient information to assess the ethical concerns and alternative strategies for resolving them. The cases and their assessment will be presented at a series of panels at OD professional meetings convened over the next twenty months.

Submissions and inquiries should be dressed to Dr. Mark Frankel, Co-Project rector., CSEP, IIT Center, Chicago, Illinois 60616-3793; (312) 567-3017.

VALUES AND ETHICS STATEMENT

As many of you may know, the Human Systems Development Consortium, a group of O.D. related professional associations, including the OD Division of the Academy of Management, has been working together over the past two years in an effort to develop a statement of values and ethics for use by professionals in the fields of organization and human systems development.

To quote, in brief,

The statement seeks to: 1. Increase professional consciousness and responsibility among OD/HSD professionals by- stimulating a widespread discussion of values and ethics underlying OD/HSD practice. Highlighting and clarifying major differences in OD/HSD values and ethics and seeking to resolve them. Identifying those OD/HSD values and ethical guidelines, which are generally accepted. 2. Enable OD/HSD professionals to make more informed ethical choices about their practice by reference to a generally accepted set of guidelines. 3. Contribute to enabling the OD/HSD profession to achieve excellence in its own functioning.

The statement is intended to serve as an aspirational guide, a statement of ideals toward which OD/HSD professionals can strive.

The statement also is intended to continually evolve, change and grow as our profession matures. The ultimate goal is a widely shared learning and discovery process dedicated to the creation of professional excellence and lives that are fully worth living.

Given that ethical practice is a continuing developmental process OD/HSD professionals are encouraged to: Involve themselves actively in that process by consciously examining their own ethical dilemmas. Share the results of that process with other OD/HSD professionals and, when appropriate with their clients. Make input into the development of the statement.

If you are interested in participating in the development of the Values and Ethics Statement, please request the most recent draft from: Bill Gellermann, Management and Organization Development, 372 Central Park West, Suite 16C, New York, NY. 10025.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Ackerman, Linda S., Managing in the Flow State: A New View of Organizations and Leaderships. 1925 Rhode Island Ave., McLean, VA 22101, Private Publication, 1983.

Bowen, Donald D., Monitoring: Research Identifies Some Important Guidelines for Management. Training and Development Journal, February, 1985.

Brown, David S. & William A. Jump, Pioneer in Professional Public Administration. Federal Public Policy. Theodore W. Taylor, (Ed.), Mt. Airy, MD: Lomond Press, 1984.

Brown, David S., Management Development in the Public Sector. Management Development and Training Handbook, Bernard Taylor & Gordon Lippitt, (Eds.) London: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Warrick, Don D; Gardner, Don; Cougar, Dan; & Zawacki, Robert, Managing Stress in Data Processing. Datamation, April, 1985.

Weisbord, Marvin, Future Search: Innovative Business Conference. Planning Review, 12, (4) July, 1984.

Weisbord, Marvin, Team Effectiveness Theory. Training & Development Journal, 1985.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Ackerman, Linda S., The Managing Complex Change Guide. Private publication. Londa S. Ackerman, Inc., 1925

Rhode Island Ave., McLean, VA 22101, 1982-4.

Bradford, David L. & Cohen, Allan R., Managing for Excellence: The Guide to Developing High Performance in Contemporary Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1984.

Cooper, Cary L., Psychosocial Stress and Cancer. New York: John Wiley, 1984.

Cooper, Cary L., & Davidson, M., Working Women: An International Survey. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984.

Gilmour, P., & Lansbuty, R. D., Marginal Manager: The Changing Role of Supervisors in Australia. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1984.

Lansbury, R.D. & David E.M. (Eds.). Work, Technology and Industrial Relations. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire,1984.

Lippitt, Gordon; Mussop, Jack; & Langseth, Peter, Implementing Organization Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1985.

Miles, Robert H. & Randolph, W. Alan. The Organization Game: A Simulation. (2nd Ed.). Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1985.

Randolph, W. Alan, Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior: A Developmental Perspective. New York: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1985.

Ronen, Simcha, Alternative Work Schedules: Selecting, Implementing, and Evaluating. Homewood, Ill.: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1984.

Runkel, Philip J., & Runkel, Margaret, A Guide to Usage for Writers and Students in the Social Sciences. Totowa, NJ:Rowman and Allanheld, 1984.

Schmuck, Richard A. and Runkel, Philip J., Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. (3rd ed.). Palo Alto: Mayfield, January, 1985.

Taylor, Bernard and Lippitt, Gordon, Management Development and Training Handbook. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Warrick, D.D., Contemporary Organization Development. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1985.

Warrick, D.D. Managing Organization Change and Development. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1984.

Warrick, D.D. & Zawacki, Robert A. Supervisory Management: Understanding Behavior and Managing for Results. New York: Harper and Row, 1984.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Donald Bowen is the Chair-elect of The Careers Division of the Academy for the 1985-86 year.

Cary L. Cooper, Professor, was invited ls attend the Anglo-American Ditchley Conference in Oxford, to explore the political, social and occupational issues of Women in the Workplace.

Alan Randolph, on leave from the University of South Carolina to work with Blanchaard Training and Development, Inc., was elected Vice President Elect of the Southern Management Association for 1984-85.

John Malcolm Rigby, President of Pacific Management and Organization Development Consultants, presented a paper, "A Bridge Across Cultures: A Diagnostic and Predictive Model for Consulting Across Cultures" at the O.D. Network National Conference, October 1984.

Don Warrick of the University of Colorado was named the Outstanding Human Resources Development Practitioner of the year by the Rocky Mountain States Chapter of ASTD.

HUMAN SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM

by Herb Shepard and Jeanne Cherboneau, Co-Coordinators, HSDC

HSDC, a creation of the major professional organizations in the field of Organization Development and related applications of behavioral science, is still working quietly at its major task: finding ways in which these organizations can be of mutual benefit. (It was founded at the 1982 annual conference of the Academy of Management, as the Interorganization Group.)

It has, facilitated the widespread support now given by our profession to Bill Gellermann's aspirational statement of ethics for our field. It was also active in gaining support from the National Science Foundation for the Clearinghouse on Ethics and Values in OD. (Academy Members were asked to supply critical incidents in OD to this project in the Winter 1984 issue of this newsletter.)

Currently the HSDC Planning Committee is involving the consortium members in a study of mailing lists and their uses, which we hope will lead to more strategic employment of these resources.

The need for HSDC is not dramatic or short term. Its fundamental task: the development of an optimal professional community in a changing world is basic but not high profile. The existence of HSDC should raise for our members some questions worthy of investigation and discussion, and HSDC would welcome thought papers to build guidance for the future. For example, in what ways, if any, does it matter whether our professional theory and practice are congruent with our other actions? The taunt, "Physician, cure thyself", seems not to have interfered with the economic health of medical practitioners. Do organization shortcomings in our field reflect on its member’s competence or affect their earning power? Is product differentiation within our field a strength or weakness from the standpoint of various stakeholders? Are there "ethical dilemmas" or "critical issues" of value and ethics at the organizational/institutional level of analysis, which need somehow to be incorporated in the NSF study?