

Contents

[O.D. Division Program 1987 Convention in New Orleans by Robert E. Kaplan](#)

[Making a Difference While Making a Living by Herb Shepard](#)

[Occidental-Oriental Intercultural Conflict Solving by Robert R. Blake & Jane S. Mouton](#)

[Taking Culture Seriously: A Normative Viewpoint by Marshall Sashkin](#)

[A Rejoinder to Sashkin and Further Clarification by Edgar H Schein](#)

[Articles by Members](#)

[Books by Members](#)

[News About Members](#)

[Letters to the Editor](#)

O.D. DIVISION PROGRAM 1987 CONVENTION IN NEW ORLEANS

by Robert E. Kaplan

This is a call for innovation in the O.D. Division sessions to be held at next year's conference. This will be a year for experimenting with new designs, new formats for the symposia, paper sessions, and other types of sessions. The 1985 conference, for example, experimented with a "general paper session" which consisted of small-group discussions attended by the paper's author, pre-assigned discussants, and individuals who had written and read their paper before the conference. The general paper session got rave reviews by authors and other participants alike. It gave all parties a chance to participate actively in engaging the issues.

What is wanted in next year's sessions is the chance for both presenters and attendees to participate in lively discussions. Let's escape the irony that the process of the O.D. division's sessions are generally no more interactive, energizing, or imaginative than other divisions' sessions. Let's build in dialogue as well as monologue. Let's meet the attendees' needs as well as the presenter's needs. Let's enliven our sessions without sacrificing scholarly quality by doing such things as:

1. Repeating the general paper session.
2. Allowing ample time for discussion-both between the audience and presenters and among members of the

audience. Ample time means about one-third of the scheduled time. This means fewer panel members (including chairperson and discussant) or shorter presentation.

3. Arranging debates among presenters who are on different sides of an issue.
4. Building a session around a new, influential book which participants are expected to read ahead of time. The session might begin with reviews by a couple of discussants, followed by discussion in smaller groups.
5. A variation of the general session constructed around a new handbook or collection of papers. Authors of chapters meet in small groups with pre-assigned discussants and people who have read the chapters. The session is divided into 2 or 3 segments so that participants can meet with more than one author.

To put teeth in this appeal for innovative session design, the division's executive's council will favor proposals that meet this criteria. As if innovation in session design weren't enough, next year's conference will also put a premium on attention to practice and practitioners. The division's mission is to encourage scholarly practice and practical scholarship. To keep from overweighing the academic side, the program next year might, for example, include a session on a notable experiment in organization development- e.g., General Motors' progressive Saturn Plant – which managers and/or consultants involved in the project would describe and which a scholar-expert on organizational design – would interpret theoretically.

Lastly, let me remind you that the O.D. Division has just introduced an Outstanding Paper Award to recognize a conference paper that exemplifies the Division's mission. If you would like to discuss your bright ideas for a session before submitting a proposal, feel free to contact me, Robert E. Kaplan at the Center for Creative Leadership. P.O. Box P-1, Greensboro, NC 27402.

MAKING A DIFFERENCE WHILE MAKING A LIVING

by Herb Shepard

Many people believe that we are on the verge of a massive social and cultural transformation – and that if we are not, then we are on the verge of world suicide. (1) The role of OD, or the applied social and behavioral sciences, in this period is implied in a statement of Arnold Toynbee's: " During the disintegration of a civilization, two separate plays with different plots are being performed simultaneously side by side. While an unchanging dominant minority is perpetually rehearsing its own defeat, fresh challenges are perpetually evoking fresh creative responses from newly

recruited minorities." (2)

Probably some of us will be helping the dominant minority to keep its act together, while some of us are helping the new minorities to get their act together; perhaps some of us will be trying to convene the two casts to develop a mutually satisfactory play.

If we deploy ourselves in this way we are likely to be working at cross purposes and adding to the fragmentation that is part of the world's predicament. To the extent that we get caught up in the mentality of the dominant minority, and to the extent that we get caught up in the adversarial spirit of some of the new minorities, we add to the tensions. And the higher the tensions are, the less likely are we to succeed in efforts at conflict resolution.

Yet, I think we do need to be involved in both plays and in a bridging between them. Capra (p.33) counsels us that we should do all we can to reduce the hardship, discord, disruption and pain that are inevitable in times of great social change. The world makes itself dangerous in such periods. To get our own act together, we need a common vision, a lot of clarity about what we're trying to do, and multiple, mutually supportive strategies for accomplishing it.

Some values and understandings about human systems are widely shared among us, and with them go some images of a transformed society and culture, however vague and incomplete. Each of us has had some successes in inducing the vision and positive energy required for a system to move in that direction. And each of us has been sobered by a drop-in-the-bucket feeling when contemplating the magnitude and momentum of the forces that are destroying the biosphere-supported by an unchanging dominant minority, a rehearsal of the simultaneous defeat of everyone.

One of our common values around which we have built some skills, is the facilitation of positive social change. We do what we know how to do mostly as individuals or small groups and mostly in relatively bounded systems. Intersystem synergy is hard to arrange. We often lack access and strategies for building on the secondary consequences of work within a system.

For example, the implication of new work cultures for community institutions-family, education, or government. And we haven't had a great deal of experience in trying to apply our knowledge collectively or synergically.

Yet, I think many of us have a strong desire to join with others in a comprehensive strategy for facilitating the needed social and cultural change. The mission statement of Certified Consultants International: An Association of Applied Behavioral and Social Scientists, is explicit on this matter. The Human Systems Development Consortium, comprised of thirteen professional associations, is seeking ways of building a professional community to achieve such superordinate goals. There are groups in other professions with the same aspirations. There are many Aquarian networks concerned with various aspects of transformation. And we all know people in our client systems and among our friends who have similar desires. We are unique only in having made a specialty of facilitating system change.

Despite these concerns, values, skills, talents and desires, the facts of our lives keep most of us occupied and preoccupied with taking care of business. We have little excess time and energy. If we are to be active in a larger strategy, which involves us in global networks, it must not drastically alter our current work-life styles.

And that would mean finding the levers of change that are both potent and energy-efficient. Presumably a global strategy would engage multiple systems at multiple levels, which sounds very complicated and difficult. But perhaps it can be approximated in a strategy that is community-based and that links communities. In other words, a local network of communication so that their efforts can be made synergistic. That, to me, is the strategic meaning of "think global-act local".

The alteration in life-work style that this suggests is for each of us to focus some energy in a locality, while being strongly linked to a larger network or set of networks. A locality can make for ease of access and communication; one can discover kindred spirits and create a local network or organizations to develop and implement projects. We could take the initiative in creating local structures to serve the larger purpose. And there would be new learning and professional development involved for all of us, as well as the development of entrepreneurial skills.

Providing local leadership and linkage to larger networks would entail the anxieties associated with personal growth as well as the learning of additional professional skills. Refocusing of energies probably would mean transcending some past identities. But to the extent that one's past identity was an expression of the culture whose transformation one now seeks to facilitate, the self-transcendence is an integral part of the transformation. And if the new culture is expected to be more fulfilling for the human spirit, the risk is worth taking.

Footnotes: (1) Fritjov Capra, The Turning Point, Bantam Books, 1983; John Naisbitt, Megatrends, Warner Books, 1982; Buckminster Fuller, Critical Path, St. Martin's Books, 1981; Marilyn Ferguson, The Aquarian Conspiracy, J.P.Tarcher, 1980. (2) Arnold Toynbee, A Study Of History, Oxford University Press, 1972, P.228.

Printed by permission of Herb Shepard prior to his death.

OCCIDENTAL-ORIENTAL INTERCULTURAL CONFLICT SOLVING

by Robert R. Blake & Jane S. Mouton

The emergence of a global economy supplemented and reinforced by satellite and TV communication as well as high-speed travel are bringing about what Marshall McLuhan referred to as "The Global Village." The development of the global village by no means, however, can be regarded as something that will transpire smoothly and effortlessly. Indeed, the closer that people of different backgrounds and cultures get, the greater the potential for conflicts arising among them. Such conflicts are not subject to resolution simply by increasing the frequency of contact or the intensity of communication; rather, both of these may only serve to escalate the tensions and frictions existing between people coming from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Using Grid development techniques (1) to bridge the cultural chasm, American industrialists on the one hand and industrial personnel from the People's Republic of China on the other were drawn together by virtue of an important joint venture concerning technology transfer between the McDonnell Douglas Corporation and the People's Republic. It is "natural" under these circumstances that organization development technology comes to be seen as a resource to bridge some of the conflicts that could be anticipated or that already have appeared.

International Technology Transfer Programs are difficult arrangements to begin with, let alone a Technology Transfer Program between a cooperative People's Republic of China organization and an American corporation molded around free enterprise values. This article describes how two such organizations used a particular conflict resolution model in order to improve results that could only succeed through joint effort on the part of both parties. The use of the Grid Interface Model resulted not only in determining what a sound model for the joint venture would look like but also allowed the respective organizations to agree with one another on improvement steps that needed to be taken in order to maximize achievement.

In 1985 McDonnell Douglas Corporation and the People's Republic of China agreed on a co-production program that involved McDonnell Douglas selling passenger aircraft to the Chinese. The aircraft were to undergo initial construction at the company's Long Beach plant in the United States and then be shipped in the form of sub-assemblies to Shanghai, where final assembly, functioning, testing, and production flight testing would occur. The term of the Technology Transfer Program was for a five-year period and there were numerous other stipulations involved in the arrangement as well. One example of this is that the U.S. company was required to do some work involving the start-up of management development and eventually leading to the formation of an institute. McDonnell was also required to provide the initial management and development required in order for the People's Republic of China personnel to initiate their own development programs.

As the Technology Transfer Program began, there was concern on the part of both parties over how successful the overall operation could actually be. This type of an arrangement whereby sub-assemblies would be shipped to a foreign country had not been tried before to the extent that it would be occurring under this arrangement. In addition, the existing aircraft production facilities were not nearly as extensive or as well developed as currently exists in other parts of the world. There were issues of trust and respect, communication, scheduling, resource utilization, etc. that needed to be adequately dealt with by the management of both sides of the venture.

As part of the initial management training work for the top management groups of the operation, it was decided that the Grid Interface Model developed by Drs. Robert Blake and Jane Mouton of Scientific Methods, Inc. would be used. This model has been used successfully in a variety of interface conflict relationships, corporate merger situations, and other problem areas where interdependent effort was needed but had broken down, was non-existent, or had become ineffective for some reason.

C. L. (Chuck) Nunnally, McDonnell Douglas's Manager of Professional Development, spent several weeks in China in the fall of 1985. One of his charges there was to build and put in place a sound relationship between the Chinese and the American managers. At this point it was already recognized, even though the venture was still in its initial stages, that deeper mutual understanding and cooperation could raise the quality of the joint efforts of both parties.

Grid Interface Conflict Solving is centered around the principle that people can recognize and generally agree on a model of the ideal or soundest relationship. Further, when an agreement exists as to the soundest model, then it can

be used as an effective standard or benchmark against which to view the actual situation. Closing the gap defined by the discrepancies between the soundest relationship, the actual relationship, and the joint commitment in order to close the gap between the two.

Interface Conflict Solving activities began with a joint orientation session attended by all participants. This session covered the objectives, the activities, and the instrumented methods to be used in working throughout the issues. After this step, members of each side, representing their own work units, worked as teams and identified the elements that would be present in the soundest possible relationship between the Chinese and Americans. For purposes of this work, an element is defined as any area in which the performance of one group directly impacts the performance of the other. Using this design, the representative group of Chinese and American managers had no inherent difficulty in coming up with a consolidated list of approximately 15 elements that had been agreed to. It was decided to work three of these in detail. Communications, Trust and Respect, and Scheduling.

After the soundest relationship had been agreed on, the next step was for the groups to describe what the relationship between the two organizations actually looked like. The description of the actual relationship was developed in several steps. One step described the existing relationship as it was viewed from four different perspectives. A second step entailed identifying events in the history of the relationship which may have caused the element to be as it is currently seen. The third step was to evaluate and prepare recommended corrective actions as a basis for operational planning to achieve a sounder relationship between the two groups. As the work developed, joint sessions were attended by the participants of both work groups. The purpose of the work was to examine shared attitudes, thoughts, and feelings common to each group.

One of the key elements identified in the work that took place in Shanghai, centered around the element of trust and respect. The Chinese, not being used to working with a profit-oriented organization, did not have complete trust and respect for their Western counterparts which in turn got in the way of effective communications, scheduling, goal-setting, etc. Similarly, the Americans were not used to working with a socialist organization and reacted in kind. As the group continued to work on elements that needed examination, additional candor and openness developed which assisted in exploring and resolving underlying issues getting in the way of sound relationship.

The result of this initial work is that a task force has been charged with working on coordination issues in order to

reach solutions based on problem solving cooperation. Principles and issues for sound, cooperative action involving two distinct and separate cultures include the following:

- Awareness of the costs involved if a sound relationship is not established;
- Awareness of intercultural dynamics which may result in win-lose behavior;
- Setting mutual standards for the achievement of higher objectives;
- Setting sound standards of excellence for performance;
- Value-based leadership;
- Setting conditions for genuine participation;
- Building sound intergroup cooperation;
- Setting up a sound design for resolving future intergroup tensions.

This process of team building will continue as the teams mature in their collective ability to deal with the technical and management issues.

Footnotes: (1) this illustration is thought to be of some importance partly because if its timing, having been undertaken before the conflicts that were beneath the surface had become so intense as to lead to chronic difficulties that might not be subject to later resolution. It is also significant because the participants were all key people. Most important of all, however, is that by this intervention, the McDonnell Douglas Corporation demonstrated, in action, its concern for working through in a planned way, difficulties being encountered because of ideological differences, national differences, as well as the occidental-oriental mind-set differences. The initiative led to openness, candor and a cooperative attitude based upon the inherent good intentions behind the effort.

References: Blake, Robert R., and Mouton, Jane S. Solving Costly Organizational Conflicts: Achieving Intergroup Trust, Cooperation, and Teamwork. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1984.

TAKING CULTURE SERIOUSLY: A NORMATIVE VIEWPOINT

by Marshall Sashkin

In an enlightening and provocative article, Edgar H. Schein (1984) identified six "mistakes" made by ID practitioners

in dealing with organizational cultures. In many respects, Schein's points ring true, yet in some sense I am dissatisfied with what seems to be an attempt to make OD "culture free." I do not believe that this is a possible or a desirable aim. It is impossible for the reasons Gouldner (1962) identified over twenty years ago when he argued that sociology and, indeed, social science in general, cannot be value-free. At best we must clarify for our clients- and ourselves-the values we bring with us. I would like to explore this issue a bit and comment on each of Schein's six mistakes.

1. Superficial or Incorrect Definitions of Culture – While Schein's definition seems reasonable, we must recognize that it has the same problems as do some of the definitions he critiques: it is one person's viewpoint, not a generally accepted "standard" definition. Thus, it does not really seem fair for Schein to accuse others of having "incorrect" definitions. Those social scientists who have made culture a focus of their fields of inquiry seem to have less disagreement about what culture "is." Ruth Benedict (1961) and Talcott Parsons (1960), for example, have written basic treatments on cultures. Popenoe (1983), in a popular introductory sociology text, notes that "many sociologists and anthropologists define culture as the system of values and meanings shared by a group or society..." In his critique of this "mistake," Schein notes, "If we take culture seriously we cannot rush in with questionnaires to measure it." I would strongly disagree after separating the "rush" from the serious and sound methodology of survey research. Of course, I am biased, having been trained in a program that emphasizes survey research. Still, I would argue that it is indeed possible accurately to tap the essence of an organization's culture through properly designed survey methods, and I have tried to do so (Sashkin & Fulmer, 1985).
2. Too limited a view of what culture covers – here I find little to disagree with. I would modify Schein's assertion that "not all groups or organizations have cultures." Indeed, the culture may be "weak" (see Deal & Kennedy, 1982), or appear to be absent, but for survival over any substantial time period, a culture must exist. I think Schein might agree here, since he qualifies his point by saying, "if a fairly stable group has had a significant history... an organizational culture might be present."
3. Stereotypic organizational categories of types – Schein argues that we do not possess the data base to "type" organizational cultural systems, I would vehemently disagree, not merely in defense of Likert's four-type categorization, but because I strongly reject his point that "any classification that is based on survey data" is questionable. Indeed, I argue that this is one viable and effective way to analyze cultures (see Sashkin & Fulmer, 1985). If one accepts the utility of survey data, it becomes clear that numerous useful databases exist,

including that developed by Likert and Bowers at the Institute for Social Research. Even though some views and categorizations of organizational cultures are so simplistic and limited as to be worth very little, I suggest that we should not reject out of hand any proposal at this stage of the game. We need new hypotheses for testing both the more clinical subjective materials favored by Schein and the more quantified survey research approach.

4. Simplistic views of dynamics and change – Schein goes a bit overboard when he implies that consultants should limit their roles to "clarifying to helping clients to articulate their culture." This is a crucial first step, but I argue that it is, indeed, the consultant's legitimate role to apply expertise to aid in *changing* cultures, when the *client wants change*. I would also take a somewhat different view of organizational cultures as less "fragile" than Schein seems to think. I suggest that cultures are typically quite stable and resistant to the efforts of OD practitioners to change them. I disagree with Schein when he suggests that it is *transition* people resist, rather than *culture* (or changed cultural assumptions). Yes, people do resist the uncertainty of transition, but I bet that many – especially current power-holders and those who benefit from their power – are far more resistant to redistribution of power than to the transition state, as Schein explicitly suggests.
5. Overall assumptions about culture's functions – here I think we psychologists and others with a "micro" focus on organizations can again learn from anthropologists and sociologists, who would seem to be clear in observing the importance of a "strong" culture for the survival of the social unit (be it group, tribe, society, or organization). I think one problem stems from the impression- incorrect, in my view – one gets from the Deal and Kennedy (1982) book that a strong culture is a "good" culture in terms of organizational effectiveness. I would observe that strong cultures may or may not promote effectiveness (or "excellence" as the current fad would have it). Indeed, a culture might provide a set of values, strongly held, that are antithetical to excellence. In the long run, this would probably be dysfunctional in terms of survival (though we can probably come up with some examples illustrating exceptions). Even in the short run, cultural weakness would seem rather likely to hinder the chances of survival and, in terms of survival as the most basic value, we might have to agree that a "strong" culture is always "good." Note that as OD practitioners we assume that "good" normally equals "high performing." The distinction, however, is not just between strong versus weak culture as "good" versus "bad." One must also distinguish between cultures that *promote* organizational effectiveness and those that do not (Sashkin & Fulmer, 1985; Sashkin, 1984). It appears that Schein and I disagree on whether we really know much about this later issue; I think we do.
6. Ethnocentrism – this leads to consideration of the final "mistake" identified by Schein: our commitment to the

"culture of OD." Schein, correctly in my view, notes that we often assume that our own American/OD cultural ideals are directly transferable to other societies. This is, indeed, a dangerous error, yet numerous articles in the Perspectives section of the journal, Group and Organization Studies have explicitly examined the issue of OD applicability outside the U.S. (e.g., see Bates, 1981; Burke, 1977; Kuniya, 1978; Pareek, 1979; Salinas, 1981; Sundaramurthy, 1979).

While we must continue to reflect carefully on just how OD can (or should) be applied in other societies, I would argue that, within the parameters of American culture, the values Schein identifies (e.g., pro-active optimism, egalitarian individualism, individual/organizational goal compatibility, maximum self-control for organization members, high trust and openness) are strongly associated with effectiveness and efficiency (Sashkin, 1984). And I would argue that while we should recognize that striving for effectiveness and efficiency is a cultural value position – a basic belief – it is a *good* one, one that *is* "better" than preservation of face, status, and the relational order.

Thus, I come full circle, and return to my initial statement. OD (and social science in general) is not and *cannot* be value free as long as OD practitioners and social scientists retain their humanity and exist within a larger social structure. I do not suggest that we all become "OD missionaries," seeking converts in far-off lands, but I do believe that for organizations within our culture – and, perhaps even for those within the broader parameters of "western" society – OD does have answers and approaches for developing and changing cultures to create more effective and efficient organizations. And I, for one, think that is good.

(for a list of references cited in this article, please contact the author.)

A REJOINER TO SASHKIN AND FURTHER CLARIFICATION *by Edgar H Schein*

Some months ago I wrote a short precis of some of the issues that are explored in my recent book "Organizational Culture and Leadership" (Jossey-Bass, 1985). Marshall Sashkin has responded to some of these points, but unfortunately has not delved into the book where things are more fully explained so we continue to have some

misunderstanding as well as disagreement. I would like to discuss the most important of his points and attempt to clarify these issues further.

1. On the matter of how culture is defined, clearly Sashkin misunderstood my intent because my assertion that many culture definitions are "incorrect" is based on precisely the same argument he himself makes about existing definitions. There is, in fact, considerable consensus within anthropology and sociology on how to think about culture, and my definition draws almost completely on this consensus. What I am critical of is that many writers in the field of management and OD ignore what anthropologists have worked on. My effort was precisely to reposition the organizational culture concept into a broader social science framework. It is also true that there is a great variation among the definitions given by sociologists and anthropologists, but none of them would disagree that culture is a deep phenomenon that refers to some of the most stable aspects of group functioning. They would also agree that culture is mostly implicit and unconscious and that you cannot use as cultural data the answers to questions on a questionnaire, unless that questionnaire was designed like a projective test to surface things that are normally implicit.
2. Sashkin asserts that questionnaires can reveal culture. I would argue that they can only reveal some of the surface manifestations of the deeper assumptions that I define as culture, and there is no way to infer those assumptions from questionnaire data alone. I would certainly agree that properly designed survey instruments do reveal some of the manifestos of the dimensions of culture, especially some of the articulated values and ideology of the group, some of the aspects of the group's climate, and some of its beliefs. But the problem I have encountered is that until I really understand the culture at a deeper level by a process of intense interaction with it, I don't even know what to put into the questionnaire. And I categorically reject the notion that there are general cultural types that can be surfaced by questionnaires such as those designed to surface beliefs about participation, e.g. System 1 to System 4. The paradox is that once I have done the intensive interactive study of how the culture works, I don't need the questionnaire except as a way of confirming how widespread certain aspects of the culture might be. But then if I do not do further clinical or ethnographic work I don't know whether my data on the new units surveyed are valid or not. They might have similar beliefs on the surface, but different assumptions underneath. Hence my conclusion is that surveys of cultures are both useless and of questionable validity. When Sashkin claims to have validated an instrument to measure culture, I would ask him what he validated it against. He does not tell us what other measures he used and what he gained by use of the survey.

3. On the matter of cultural typologies, when Sashkin "vehemently disagrees" in defense of survey data, it becomes clear that numerous useful data bases exist..." but it has yet to be established whether one can accept survey data as measures of culture. I don't quarrel at all with the utility of Likert's theory, but I certainly would question whether this ever was intended as a typology of cultures. As I point out in my book, Likert's typology is very useful as a way of thinking about basic assumptions about human nature and authority relationships, but that is only one dimension along which cultures should be assessed. The danger of the typologies is precisely that they take one dimension and then imply that they have described a whole culture.
4. On the matter of change, what I said is that when consultants go beyond helping clients to articulate and clarify their cultures, when they actively help to change the culture, they are shifting into a leadership role and are no longer functioning as consultants. Sometimes this is desirable, but we should not kid ourselves that we are still being consultants when we do it. We should take full responsibility for tampering with an aspect of the organization that is fundamental to its own future functioning.
5. I do not believe that cultures are fragile. In fact I think they are remarkably stable, since they serve to create meaning, stabilize the cognitive environment, and reduce the anxiety of cognitive and interpersonal uncertainty. And when culture change is in the offing, I do think people resist the transition more than the outcome because uncertainty is fundamentally intolerable. History is full of examples of people choosing undesirable but predictable things rather than continuing to live with uncertainty.
6. On the matter of the survival value of "strong" cultures, Sashkin reads sociology and anthropology differently than I do. I do not find any evidence that strong culture is correlated with survival, nor do I think there is much agreement about how to define what is strong and what is weak. My argument is precisely the same as Sashkin's that we do not know ahead of time whether any given culture or any given measure of its strength or weakness will in fact lead to effectiveness. But I disagree totally with the subsequent argument that survival and strength are correlated. That would seem to me to depend on the environmental conditions in which the group was operating.
7. Is OD ethnocentric? We both agree that it is. Do we have evidence that some of the OD values developed in U.S. society promote organizational effectiveness? We would both agree that we have such evidence. But, does that license us to prescribe what is an effective culture, either here or abroad? Definitely not, because when we shift from the realm of assumptions about openness and trust to the realm of assumptions about preservation of face and the basic relational order of society, we are shifting to another level entirely and cannot possibly counterpose these as an either-or phenomenon.

Here, again is where I see in Sashkin's critique a misunderstanding of what culture really is, and a tendency to treat it as more superficial than it is. If culture has any value as a concept in our field, it is because it forces us to look at deeper levels of meaning and consensus about the nature of reality, truth, and human relationships. I find many OD practitioners to be neither willing nor able to face these deeper levels and their implications.

I am not reassured by Sashkin's critique that he has understood this difference in levels of analysis. The preservation of face and the rules of interaction that develop in most societies, and the status systems that get communicated through such rules, go far deeper than the trivial arguments we often have about whether or not to be more or less "open." OD practitioners advocate "trust" without showing any signs of understanding how deeply embedded issues of trust are in fundamental rules of interaction, and how hard those rules are to change.

So I must firmly reiterate my point. If we are to take culture seriously we must start with correct definitions and methods of study that produce valid data. Survey instruments, organizational typologies, and OD interventions of the sort we typically use are, from a cultural point of view, superficial and misleading. If we take culture seriously we will need to develop new tools and new intervention strategies, and most importantly new attitudes toward our own role as leaders.

Schein, E. H., Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1985.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Donnellon, Anne; Gray, Barbara & Bougon, Michel G. "Communication, Meaning and Organized Action," Administrative Science Quarterly, 31 (2), 43-55.

Gray, Barbara, "Conditions Facilitating Interorganizational Collaboration," Human Relations, 38 (10), 911-936.

Gray, Barbara & Hay, Tina M., "Political Limits to Interorganizational Consensus and Change," Journal Of Applied Behavioral Science, 22 (2), 95-112.

Murray, F. T. & Murray, Alice Haller, "Global Managers for Global Businesses," Sloan Management Review, Winter, 1986.

Pate, L.E. "Using Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs in OD Assessments," Organization Development Journal, 1986, 4(2), 82-84.

Smith, H.W. "Steps to Improved Performance Counseling," Business to Business, In Press.

Smith, H.W. & Morrison, J.W. "High Impact OJT," Industrial & Commercial Training, In Press.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Brown, Ogden, Jr. & Hendrick, Hal W., (Eds.) Human Factors In Organizational Design and Management II. Amsterdam, North Holland, 1986.

Camp, Richard; Blanchard, P. Nick & Huszczo, Gregory E., Toward a More Organizationally Effective Training Strategy and Practice, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Czander, William. Application Of Social Systems Thinking to Organizational Consulting, Washington D.C., Univeristy Press of America, 1986.

Heller, T.; Vantil, J. & Zurcher, L.A. (Eds.) Leaders & Followers: Challenges For The Future, Greenwich, Conn., JAI Press, 1986.

Josefowitz, Natasha. A Trilogy: Natasha's Words For Friends, Natasha's Words For Families and Natasha's Words For Lovers, Warner Books, Oct. 1986.

Reddin, W.J. The Best Of Bill Reddin, UK, Institute of Personnel Management, 1985.

Rosen, Corey; Kline, Katherine J. & Young, Karen M. Employee Ownership In America: The Equity Solution, Lexington, MA., Lexington Press, 1986.

Sundstrom, Eric. Work Places: The Psychology Of The Physical Environment In Offices And Factories, New York, N.Y., Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Sutherland, Valerie & Cooper, Cary L. Unnamed Accidents Offshore: The Costs Of Stress Among Workers On Oil/Gas Rigs, London, Lloyds Of London Press, 1986.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Dr. Donald W. Cole, RODC, who heads the O.D. Institute, took a team of International O.D. consultants to South Africa August 11-28, 1986 for a multi-racial conference on "Alternatives to Violence: How to Phase Out Apartheid Without Destroying Families".

Cary L. Cooper (Manchester University, England) gave the Bolland Memorial Lecture (Scientist of the year) at Bristol Polytechnic, England.

Dr. Hal W. Hendrick has been appointed Interim Executive Director, Institute of Safety and Systems Management at the University of Southern California.

Natasha Josefowitz has a weekly syndicated column on work issues appearing in over one hundred newspapers, a weekly segment on management on public radio and a monthly segment on television.

Harry Levinson and Stuart Rosenthal's book CEO: Corporate Leadership in Action (New York: Basic Books, 1984) was given the American College of Healthcare Executives – James A. Hamilton 1986 Book Award.

Larry Minks has been appointed to the position of Special Assistant to the President for Economic Development and Executive Director , Longwood Business Innovation Center, Longwood College, Farmville, VA 23901.

Larry Pate is editor of the new research section of the Organization Development Journal. The purpose of the research section is to provide a forum for OD research, for both researchers and those who apply research findings. Two types of manuscripts are appropriate for submission: (1) Research pieces per se, that describe the nature of the research, method, results, and a discussion of implications. (2) Articles on the research process itself, methods

of doing research or analyzing data. Papers describing particular OD interventions, however interesting they might be, lie outside the scope of the research section. Papers should be submitted in triplicate. (3) Following APA style, to : Professor Larry E. Pate, 315 Summerfield Hall, School of Business, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045.

Virginia E. Schein has accepted a position as Associate Professor of Management, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania as of September 1, 1986.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

With respect to Bob Golembiewski's report "Toward Ameliorating Burnout," people in advanced phases of burnout are almost invariably depressed. Therefore, anyone who proposes to work with them should have an understanding of depression. People involved in OD seem not to be aware of the fact that there is comprehensive clinical literature on the subject. A variant of the same issue applies to William G. Dyer's "Ingredients for Achieving Change." There is no indication in the article that in the corporate examples he cites, a diagnostic process was undertaken. Such a comprehensive process, including an assessment of the personalities of the key figures, would have made it very clear which interventions, if any, would have been appropriate, and what the prognosis should be. Planned change requires both diagnosis and prognosis.

- Harry Levinson, Ph. D.