Contents

1987 O.D. DIVISION PROGRAM

by Robert E. Kaplan

This year's program features two invited speakers; Clayton P. Alderfer speaking on "Changing Race Relations in Management: The Results of a Ten Year Project" and Elliott Jaques speaking on "Organization Design and the Structure of Complexity in Work and in People." The program also features participative formats in most of its sessions. Alderfer's talk, for example, includes a small group discussion of a case. The two traditional paper sessions use a non-traditional format that divides participants, after the papers are presented, into groups to discuss one of the three papers with the author and the discussants for that paper.

The program includes a repeat of last year's successful roundtable paper session, chaired by R. J. Bullock, in which the author(s) and a discussant and interested participants gather around a table to discuss a given paper. For this session to work well, OD Division members should write for, and read beforehand, papers of their choice. The session will be split into two periods to allow attendees to sit in on discussions of two papers. Following are the authors of the 11 Roundtable Session papers and the first author's address. Note that the first "paper" is actually a workshop.

1. The Ways in which Change Agents' Maps Relate to Their Actions: A Conceptual Workshop.

   Courtlandt Cammann, University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, P. O. Box 1248 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. (Devorah Tracey University of Michigan) This workshop requires that participants send for an open-ended questionnaire, which will take 2-3 hours to complete, and return it by July 1st. The results will help participants understand how their frameworks influence their practice of change.

2. The Critical Contingencies of OD Evaluation: A Review and Propositions. Thomas C. Head, Texas A&M University, College of Business Admin, College Station, Texas 77843. (Peter Sorenson, Jr., Illinois Benedictine College)
3. Improving Teamwork Through Gainsharing: Hypothesis Tests Using Actual Practice. R. J. Bullock, University of Houston, Department of Psychology, Houston, Texas 77004.
4. Evolution of Transformation? Incremental versus Transformational Ideologies for Organizational Change. Dexter C. Dunphy, University of N. South Wales, P. O. Box 1, Kensington, New South Wales 2033. (Douglas Stace, University Of N. South Wales.
5. Great Expectations: When Hopes for a Better Life Following a Merger Turn Sour. James L. Dowditch, Boston College, School of Management, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167. (Anthony F. Buono, Bentley College)
6. Championship and Change: Three Mysteries and Three Theories. David Rubinstein, Texas A&M University, College of Business Admin, College Station, Texas 77843. (Phyliss G. Washburn, Texas A&M University).
7. Organizational Transformation: The Manifestation of a New Context. Kareen Tidball, The University of Texas at Dallas, P.O. Box 830688, Richardson, TX 75083. (Donald Brush, The University of Texas at Dallas.
8. Long-Term Effects of an OD Program in the Silver Mining Industry. Cecil H. Bell, Jr., University of Washington, Graduate School of Business Admin., Seattle, Washington 98195.
9. Toward a New Concept of Large-Scale Organizational Change: Transformation. Brian Uzzi, University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Business, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
10. Changing Organizational Ethics: A Cultural Approach. Linda K. Trevino, Department of Management, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.
11. The Symbolic Nature of Organizational Change: A Study of a Corporate Relocation. Suzyn Ornstein, Southern Methodist University, Edwin L. Cox School of Business, Dallas, Texas 75275. (Lynn Isabella, Southern

Methodist University).

Another session using roundtable discussion format is a "Conversation with Authors of Research in Organizational Change and Development, Volume I," edited by Richard Woodman and William Pasmore. Although authors will give a brief summary of their chapters at the start of the session, members should write for a copy of a chapter they would like to discuss. The book itself, published by JAI Press, should be available in June.

1. Organization Development theory: A Typology and Evaluation. Jerry Porras, Stanford University, Graduate School of Business, Stanford, California 94305. (Peter Robertson, Stanford University)
2. Development at the Top: A Review and a Prospect. Robert Kaplan, Center for Creative Leadership, P. O. Box p-1, Greensboro, NC 27410. (Joan Kofodimos, CCL, Wilfred Drath, CCL)
3. Appreciative Inquiry in Organizational Life. David Cooperrider, Case Western Reserve Univ. Weatherhead School of Management, Cleveland, Ohio, 44106. (Suresh Srivastva, Case Western Reserve University.)
4. The Case Mets-Analysis Method for OD, Mark Tubbs, University of Missouri, 8001 Natural Bridge Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63121.
5. Self-Designing Organizations: Towards Implementing Quality of Work-Life Innovations. Thomas Cummings, University of S. California, School of Business Admin., Los Angeles, California 90089. (Susan Mohrman, University of S. California)
6. Reasoning, Action Strategies, and Defensive Routine: The Case of OD Practitioners. Chris Argyris, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Nichols House, Appian Way, Cambridge, Ma. 02138

And another session that builds in participation and is enhanced by homework beforehand is a debate-style discussion of William Torbert's new book, Managing the Corporate Dream: Restructuring for Long-Term Success, with Karl Weick speaking for the book and Robert Quinn speaking against. Following a discussion in small groups, Torbert will respond.

There's also other good stuff on high-involvement organization, OD in the GM Saturn Plant, OD in the public sector, a debate on Argyris' book Personality and Organization (Published in 1957), integration processes after mega-mergers, integrating OD and strategic management, and re-conceptualizing organizational decline, as well as OD Division Meetings and the social hours. Remember the credo for this year's OD Division program: You get out of it what you put into it.

"OD AND SOCIAL CHANGE – THE CREEK IS HIGH AND RISING"
by William A. Pasmore, Ph.D.

Recently, I've been struck by the number of invitations I have received to events which are focused on social change issues. NTL and the OD Network both have conferences planned on the topic—challenging all of us to become a bit less complacent in our lives and practices. I'm excited by all of this; perhaps because I began to get interested in social change myself a few years ago; but also because it feels to me like our profession is on the verge of a major transition in its character, potency and vitality.

Like most ordinary citizens, I watch the evening news and complain about the miserable state our world is in and the stupidity of politicians when it comes to doing something about it. "Don't those idiots know anything about planned change?" I ask myself. The answer, it would appear, is clearly "No" – but then that makes sense. We don't elect politicians because they have advanced degrees in the behavioral sciences or successful consulting practices – I'm not sure why we elect them, but I'm pretty sure it's not because of that. So what right have I got to complain? Plenty—but not about them. Charity begins at home—and so too, I guess, does social change. What have I been doing to create the kind of would I want my children to grow up in? I'm embarrassed to say, not a hell of a lot. And until recently, I think I could say the same for the majority of people in our division.

Wait a minute you say—doesn't the work we do in organizations and our research on change count for something? Sure it does. I'm proud of what I have done; I haven't changed the world, but I sincerely believe that I have made a difference in the quality of a few peoples' lives. In fact, when I think of the teaching I've done, it's probably more than a few. Maybe others read some of what I write and decide to do something themselves—certainly, I was inspired as I read the books written by the founders of our fields. All of this is well and good—in fact, for a long time, it exceeded my own expectations. Lately though, it has left me feeling a little empty—I haven't been able to stop asking myself if there isn't more that I could do.

I've been a bit surprised do discover that I'm not alone. In fact, I find myself discussing the role OD professionals should play in social change more and more at professional gatherings, cocktail parties and in the classroom. The conversations are pretty lively—people seem to have some interesting ideas about what we could be doing and there is apparently no shortage of opportunities—everyone seems to be aware of at least one interesting project that could use some help from us.

I'm not one of the founding fathers of our profession—but for the first time, I sense some of the excitement about this that I imagine they must have felt in the late 40's and early 50's. There's a new discipline about to be formed—perhaps it will remain an offshoot of OD (like socio-technical systems or team building) or maybe it will become it's own master. I don't know. For now, it seems important to keep it tied to our skill base—even though part of the excitement for me will be in the development of new skills that match the level of complexity of the systems we are going to have to deal with. At some point, there may be a need to differentiate social from organizational development, just as organizational transformation has deemed it necessary to set itself apart from OD in order to say, "this is something new". But for now, there is more to gain from collaboration than from distancing. We will need all of the Elfin magic we can get—and more.

What are some of our needs for growth and learning in this arena? Brown and Covey (1987), in writing about their interactions with development organizations, offer the following challenges to OD practitioners who would become social change agents: to develop more sensitive methods of qualitative investigation and analysis that are able to discern the core values, beliefs, myths, rituals and language systems of the organizations under examination; to be more open to self-examination of one's own values, beliefs and aspirations, since these will often be more focal than the skills one brings; to develop enhanced conceptual skills, symbolic sensitivity and personal charisma (identifying yourself as an OD practitioner and working out of traditional OD models won't get you very far in a culture that has no knowledge of our field and couldn't care less about finding out); to become more comfortable with ideological negotiation, since ideology underlies all efforts at social change; and to be more open to dialectical learning, which recognizes that differences exist and world to create new, overarching syntheses that permit cooperative behavior. Kiggundu (1986), who addresses the limitations of applying socio-technical systems thinking to organizations in developing countries, adds that western change agents could benefit from becoming more sensitive to their own values in doing work abroad, so as not to offend local clients whose values differ from our own; from more exposure to the areas of economic development, technology transfer, history, colonial administration, international relations and the management of cultural differences; from being more aware of the multiple and often conflicting constituencies that affect the outcomes of most change efforts in developing countries; and from avoiding short-term trips in favor of spending enough time living, studying and working in a system to fully understand it before making prescriptions for change.

It seems that we have indeed got a lot to learn. I'm pretty sure that that's part of what excites me about all of this. I think our professional meetings would take a dramatic step forward if we spent relatively more of our time together talking about what we don't already know versus sharing what we have already learned (and in fact, what we are no longer doing or particularly interested in). I'll be the first to admit that I don't know as much about societal change as I would like to – my guess is that many of you feel the same way. I have a hopeful fantasy that legitimizing our common ignorance will make it easier for us to talk about it. From what I have seen, there my not be a flood of interest yet—but the creek is high and rising. Let's find a way to take the next step.

References: Brown, L. D. & Covey, J. G. (1987) "Development Organizations and Organization Development: Toward an Expanded Paradigm for Organization Development". In R. Woodman & W. Pasmore (Eds.) Research in Organizational Change and Development, Greenwich, CN, JAI Press, Vol. 1. Kiggundu, M. (1986) "Limitations to the Application of Socio-technical Systems in Developing Countries". Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 22, #3, 341-353.

EXCERPTS FROM NEW PATHS AND UNEXPECTED BEDFELLOWS IN OD'S FUTURE

by Walter R. Nord

Commitment to a core set of humanistic values has distinguished OD from other sub-fields of applied behavioral science. I begin by assuming that these original values (what I will refer to as the human betterment objectives) are still worth pursuing. However, I will argue that we need to be more articulate and realistic about them and about what choices they may require.

How can we uncover what lies in our shadow? Since the shadow covers the things we fear the most, we might expect to learn the most by examining the thoughts of those we fear. In this spirit, I suggest that some strange bedfellows—some fairly conservative economists—may help us to become aware of some important matters we have repressed. As unpleasant as such therapy may be, it may help us to develop a realistic platform for advancing our core values by helping us to see our blindspots and forcing latent tensions and omissions in our thinking into the open. Before turning to the economists, let us look at some of what I see as long standing unresolved tensions in the foundation of OD.

In retrospect, the values advanced by the founders of OD were a curious mixture of faith and science. The path they envisioned to realize the values was forged by a combination of pragmaticism and fortuitous circumstances. Their followers have understated and misunderstood the role and nature of the fortuitous circumstances. For example, we have virtually ignored chapter 2 of McGregor's (1960) Human Side of Enterprise in which McGregor developed the basis for Theory Y as a pragmatic approach to control. In chapter 2 McGregor observed: "… the appropriateness of authority probably varies as a function of dependence." (p.25) And that because of unions, legislation and other social changes, employees had become less dependent on employers. Even casual reading of this chapter makes it clear that McGregor was offering Theory Y as pragmatic response, whose utility was contingent upon changes in the relative power of employers and employees. Theory Y values were justified because they worked better when power had become more evenly distributed.

Because we have allowed ourselves to believe that the humanistic goals involve only benefits and no or minimal costs, and because the value goals are not stated in real terms—i.e. their costs, they are not solid commitments. If the values are not to be easily by-passed and separated from action when they are in tension with other objectives (e. g., organizational goals), the tensions need to be addressed. Sometimes increases in productivity and the human betterment objectives go together. However, sometimes such fortunate combinations do not occur, and the betterment objectives can only be achieved at a price. Too firm a belief or hope that the two objectives are mutually supportive can lead us to misperceive or overlook the cases where they are not and to fail to develop approaches for such situations.

Similarly, the influence of another legacy from our founders—the non-zero sum view of the world—needs to be reduced. While such beliefs as "the more power is shared, the more power everyone has" can be helpful, they also can predispose us to expect a non-zero-sum world and thereby cause us to overlook zero-sum situations and to fail to develop frameworks for dealing with trade-offs. The economists demand that we think of trade-offs.

Another legacy the economists force us to question is our attachment to human potential models. The potential models have been useful in encouraging us to explore nonmaterial rewards and outcomes (e.g., self-esteem, social approval) that most everyone can have simultaneously. However, they have also caused us to give far too little attention to material incentives and to the nature of systems that spawn competition and revenge (see Axelrod, 1984) rather than cooperation.

Here is where we perhaps have the most to learn from some of the strange bedfellow I propose. The economists are concerned with scarce resources—resources that not everyone can possess at the same time. Moreover, they assume individuals are very different. They tell us that individuals rationally pursuing their own self-interests "shirk." Moreover, rather than working towards common ends, the rational individual will often free ride—he/she will let others do the work but eagerly share in the rewards. We must begin with s4elf-interested individuals who, when they operate rationally in the existing world, shirk, free ride, and may even seek revenge over cooperation. In a world where the potential differs so much from the real, the models that only emphasize potential can actually hinder achievement of the betterment values.

Bedfellows in our future.

What are the paths to the betterment values in a wold where efforts to achieve them have costs and people are self-interested? My answers are woefully inadequate but I hope they may contribute to a dialogue that will lead to better ones.

One possible starting point is affirmation of the view that, under certain conditions, markets are a very good way for helping to influence individual preferences as well as to influence the allocation of scarce resources. In markets, preferences are recorded by people selecting among alternative goods and services through exchanges of resources that they control for the things they desire. If (and admittedly a big if) the market has been operating in a reasonable free way, changing this allocation is indeed difficult to justify while maintaining that one is proceeding from the basis of free choice. The argument for non-market intervention needs to be made in terms of altering rules and power relationships that introduce imperfections into the market and that prevent people from expressing their true preferences. Even this approach can be troublesome because we might ask why those who are affected have not sought to make these changes for themselves? In other words: why have they not spent their scarce time, energy, and other assets to change these rules rather than to spend as they did?

Another course we might pursue is a market-oriented approach for designing organizations that increase the number of choices people can make, without reallocating the distribution of wealth. Suppose that at least some people want a certain change in their work job enrichment, for example. Also, suppose that for whatever reasons, providing such work is not profitable to the employer. In other words, at least some people would prefer to work in ways that are not maximally productive for the firm. Following the economists we might come to see job enrichment as consumption and invite those who prefer this type of work to "purchase" it—say in the form of reduced wages or as part of a fringe benefit.

Alternatively, we may consider "imposing" enriched work on employers or employees to satisfy the desires of the group that wants it or to provide for some compelling externality. Following the economic perspective, we would come to view such changes as redistributing wealth. Viewed as such, two somewhat different, but possibly mutually supportive approaches are suggested. First we might simply impose these costs through public policy, as Lawler has argued. Second, we might compensate those whose interests were sacrificed. While there would be many problems to work out, and this perspective offers one way that can extend choices about the nature of one's job to situations where there is not complementaryity between the nature of work people desire and other goals such as productivity.

Another approach we might consider is really an extension of Williamson's transaction-costs approach embodied in Ouchi's concept of clans. The transaction cost approach (Williamson, 1981) centers on

"… an examination of the comparative costs of planning, adapting, and monitoring task completion under alternative governance structures" (p. 552-553). In some ways the notions of participation, trust, and involvement that we promote represent modifications of current governance structures. Stated in these terms, much of the OD message has always been that these modified governance structures, when all benefits (e.g., ability to adapt to change, value of the human asset, and so forth) are more effective. The transaction-costs approach points to a way to frame our position that we have overlooked—a comparison of the relative costs of the governance structures we propose, relative to the ones we seek to replace (e.g. industrial engineering, supervision, hierarchy and so forth).

Finally, the economists force us to focus on incentives more fully than we often do. They remind us that the incentive systems we design must deal with shirking and free riding. Similarly, the monitoring problem I noted earlier is one of the incentives. Here, we have much to teach the economists; our experience with incentive systems in organizations helps us know the problems better than they do.

Conclusion.

I am not suggesting that we sleep with the economists forever. However, it is useful to recognize the complementarity between the values of OD and the values of the economists—namely the exercise of self-determination and choice. It is also useful to recognize that to some degree, the existing social and economic order represents the choices that people have made and continue to make. As a practical matter, we must begin here. We can help design systems where freer and more informed choices are made and eventually, the world my look quite different than it does.

References:

Axelrod,, R. (1984). The Evolution of Cooperation. New York: Basic Books.

McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Williamson, O.E. (1981). The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. American Journal of Sociology, 87, 548-577.

OD AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
by L. David Brown

In his last article for this newsletter (winter 1986), Herb Shepard advised those of us concerned with promoting constructive social and cultural transformations to combine local action with linkages to wider networks—"think globally and act locally." I think he was right, but he was not ver specific about how we might proceed.

In January 1987, I attended the International Conference on Organizational and Behavioral Perspectives for Social Development at the Indian Institute of Management in Ahmedabad, India. This conference brought together scholars and practitioners from four continents for what I found to be intensely interesting and exciting discussions of OD and OB that promotes social and economic development. Our hosts, Pradip Khandwalla and his colleagues, will edit a book of conference papers and discussions for those interested in the specifics. But the conference also produced some ideas about "thinking globally and acting locally."

On acting locally. It is often not clear how "local action" can contribute to social development, no matter how fervently we believe in promoting constructive change. Pradip Khandwalla (1986) articulated for the conference the concept of strategic organizations,, whose enhanced effectiveness will promote desirable large-scale social changes. OD with organizations that play key roles in social development may produce large-scale effects from small-scale interventions. For example, after the Jamestown Area Labor Management Committee began to improve regional union-management relations, they used QWL strategies from Eric Trist and his colleagues to improve the performance of local plants and at the same time create a climate for cooperation and innovation in the whole region (Trist, 1986). The committee emerged as a strategic organization for the region from rather humble and experimental beginnings.

How can you identify which organizations will be strategic? In part it depends on the kind of social problems you hope to solve, since different organizations are relevant to different problems. Some choices are obvious: the position occupied by the World Bank is potentially strategic to Third World development problems, and the UN Security Council is potentially strategic to war and peace. Others emerge in strategic roles from comparative obscurity. Few recognized very early the role that the NAACP would play in the Civil Rights Movement, the impact of Amnesty International on human rights activity, of the role of Physicians for Social Responsibility on the peace movement. Identifying organizations that are strategic to local problems may be difficult, and working with them is likely to be different in several ways from OD in more familiar organizations.

First, organizations are strategic because of their relationship to social problems. We need a *social analysis* that shows why the organization is strategic and how its improved effectiveness will contribute to constructive social change. It is not enough in this context to be sophisticated about organizational characteristics and dynamics-—we need some reason to believe that improving the strategic organization’s performance will contribute to the larger society.

Second, work with strategic organizations may require an *activist search* for clients. Strategic organizations are often pushed and pulled by a bewildering array of internal and external forces. The characteristics of high-potential

OD customers—readiness for change, self-definition as an OD client, time/energy/money to support planned change—may be less common in strategic organizations. If we are to work with such organizations, we may have to actively "create" clients and "sell" services to agencies with little experience with OD, few resources, and severely limited freedom for experimentation.

Third, work with strategic organizations will also call on us to be more explicit about *social values and ideologies* that inform our social and organizational actions. Social changes almost always favor some values and ideologies at the expense of others, and social change tradeoffs are often more visible, more stark, and more openly disputed that there equivalents inside organizations. The literature of social development rings with debates about economic productivity, ecological sustainability, equitable distributions or resources, liberation from oppression, empowerment and self-reliance, spiritual fulfillment, and a variety of other value issues. Clarifying our own social values and ideologies can help guide complex choices in work with strategic organizations. Those values and ideologies can help guide complex choices can also be a source of intrinsic rewards when there are few resources available in those organizations to pay our fees.

I am convinced that local action with strategic organizations can contribute substantially to social change. We need to marry our sophisticated technology for improving organizational performance to better understanding of the social roles of strategic organizations. But current innovations all over the world suggest that OD applied in the right place at the right time can have enormous multiplier effects for positive social change.

On thinking globally. It is often difficult to contact others with similar interests, perhaps especially if you are caught up in lots of local action. The International Conference brought together seventy-odd scholars and practitioners interested in the application of OB & OD to development problems, but we knew of many others who could not be present. The participants agreed that efforts should be made to let others know about the conference, to form a wider international network of interested scholars and practitioners, to plan further conferences for the future, and in other ways to promote a continued and expanded dialogue.

The participants asked Pradip Khandwalla to coordinate a temporary working group of Bob Golembiewski, Rolf Lynton, Vijay Mahajan, Udai Pareek, and myself to take initial steps to expand the network and plan for future events. So if you are interested in this sort of work, please contact me or others in the working group, and let us know about your interests and your work. We will keep you abreast of plans as they develop.

WHERE TO LOOK FOR AN ORGANIZATION INTERVENTION "MODEL": SOCIOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY, OR SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY?

by Robert R. Blake & Jane S. Mouton

One of the striking observations of recent times is the increasing interest in human resources and how to develop them in the American scene. Much confusion has been produced by virtue of inadequate, in-depth understanding of what really is entailed, thus, pragmatism has prevailed over principle. When pragmatism is relied upon, "solutions" that have been developed and have worked well in one setting are picked up and transferred for use in another setting that may be highly inappropriate.

The confusion can be penetrated by stating the problem in systematic terms. It is a confusion in which the sociology of the problem is concentrated upon to the exclusion of its psychology. The sociological point of view emphasizes structure as contrasted with the psychological point of view, which emphasizes motivational considerations. By contrast with the sociological or psychological perspectives, it is useful to think in terms of social psychology as an approach, which provides for an integration of the two. In the social psychology context, structure cannot meaningfully be discussed without attending to motivational dynamics as well. When both perspectives are simultaneously applied, the otherwise unsound separation between structure and dynamics can be recognized and dealt with and principles can be relied upon as the foundation for designing organization development interventions to replace blind pragmatism.

Are there practical implications? It is obvious that there are many and that much of the present-day confusion in the human resources field is subject to clarification through this approach. For example, it became a fad a few years ago to pick up Quality Circles—a structure or sociological mechanism—and to use them without regard for the motivational dynamics that have to be present for Circles to work well. Thus the track record for Quality Circles in the United States has been spotty indeed, though on occasion they can be seen to work in circumstances where the underlying dynamics are congruent with them. Congruence occurs when shared commitment to organization effectiveness is part of the warp and woof of the motivational system as contrasted with reliance on authority-obedience by bosses who dominate subordinates who in turn resist contribution. When the latter motivational condition for promoting performance is present, Circles simply do not work. Quality Circles as a "structural mechanism" are potentially highly useful but their actual utility can only be realized when those who participate in them are proactively motivated to contribute.

The same analysis can be applied to many so-called "techniques and gimmicks," most of which are understandable as structural mechanisms where the underlying motivational considerations are not attended to. For example, flex-time is a structural solution that has worked sometimes in a sound way and sometimes has either no or a negative impact. Financial reward systems such as the Scanlon Plan, and other forms of profit sharing to stimulate increased productivity and innovation also have uneven track records. The same applies to brainstorming or nominal group technique to stimulate creativity or to teach managers to apply a rational model for solving day-today- problems. These work when people are motivated to take advantage of them but not when the motivational system is adverse to problem solving.

The list of sociological mechanisms, i.e., structures for solving problems that have been developed in one place in which they have worked well and then transferred willy-nilly into other contexts where they have not worked, is essentially endless. Seeking a structural solution without regard for dynamics appears to appeal to rational thinking as an easy, logical, and often quick way to dispose of inconvenient "people" problems.

The developing readiness to reach into unconscious motivation of the sort originally formulated by Freud to explain organization phenomena without giving sufficient attention to structure is an illustration of the bias on the other side. The assumption that operational problems can be traced to the breakdown of trust with interventions designed to reduce distrust by changing organization policies and procedures that promote secrecy is another example.

The goal here is not to elaborate examples but to point out that the sociological view in which human motivations are not attended to is no better than the psychological point of view in which structures are disregarded.. it takes a social-psychological view of operational problems within the organization context to see possibilities for effective intervention in its *full* complexity.

MORE ON AMELIORATING BURNOUT
by Robert T. Golembiewski

Harry Levinson's recent letter (1) establishes in a few words that the essence of "Toward Ameliorating Burnout" (2), did not get communicated to him. He sees the piece as neglecting the literature on depression, which he identifies as central in all burnout.

Since this view precisely misses the thrust of the piece, let me try to rephrase the earlier argument in terms that include "depression." Readers unacquainted with the phase model, for present purposes, need to know only that the approach proposes to classify all individuals in one of eight phases of burnout—from least (phase I) to most (Phase VIII).

Basically, the piece proposes that those in advanced phases of burnout are *not* homogeneous. Most seep "passive," but a substantial minority seems "active." Real dilemmas inhere in responding to the former. For example, they may be vulnerable to over stimulation by the high-stimulus designs with which Od'ers have the most experience. The focus on the "actives" in advanced phases tests the usefulness of the opportunity for providing amelioration and yet not risking overstimulation.

Hence the article's dub-title: "A tough Nut Cracked, In Part."

The research does not deal with the "passives" in advanced phases, and that leaves much to do even as some apparent progress has been made with the "actives." Better said, most of the job remains to be done, in at least two senses.. not only do the "passives" appear more numerous in the advanced phases, but they probably pose inherently more difficult challenges.

Now, "depression" may be a useful higher-level concept to describe what was done and what was left undone. I find it hard to view "active VIII's" as "depressed," but the case seems stringer for so describing "passive VIII's."

This "maybe" involves a major conceptual leap and, conservatively, the article sticks with "active" and "passive" or lower-order conceptualizations than "depression." It remains for other investigations to determine whether the label "depression" can reasonably apply to the "passives" in advanced phases. Ideally that will involve clinical interviews with those in Phase VIII, both "active" and "passive."

I urge Levinson to apply his clinical skills in such a venture, indeed, for the stakes seems substantial. Consider only one possibility. Active VIII-ism may be a prior condition of passive VIII-ism. If so, it provides both an early warning of, as well as identifies an easier target to deal with than, passive VIII-ism, and especially if the latter shares substantial ground with the several depressions.

In this sense, the phase model may provide a valid, reliable and convenient early warning to do something with and for "actives" before the ameliorating challenge escalates, as it may well do for the "passives."

So Levinson is correct in his view that the piece does not focus on depression. Right or wrong, however, that was not an omission but a conscious intention. What he sees as an inadequacy was a test of the easier part of a solution, in short.

References: OD Newsletter, Winter 1986, P.8. OD Newsletter, Summer 1986, PP.4-5.

RESEARCH ROUTABLE II
by R. J. Bullock

Imagine going to an academic paper session (ugh!) and hearing:

-The best session I’ve ever heard.

-A bold adventure.

-Outstanding.

-The best feedback I’ve ever gotten.

-There was an exponential increase in interest.

-We’re really aligning the two purposes of research and practice.

-An intellectual yard sale.

-Whatever disadvantages this had, they are more than outweighed by its advantages. And it may not have any disadvantages.

Believe it or not, these were the comments from the first Research Roundtable, held in Chicago at the 1986 Academy. You missed a winner! At the end of the session, I asked the 50+ people in the room whether we should continue this format, and the show of hands was unanimous. So you'll get a second chance.

The Research Roundtable is part of a new focus. The mission of the OD Division is practical scholarship and scholarly practice. That means a healthy interchange between OD research and OD practice. Which is what the Research Roundtable is all about.

It works like this: instead of trying to squeeze a paper presentation in too short of time frame, we assign each paper to a roundtable, where the authors can discuss their paper with anyone interested. Each paper is given a discussant and each discussant has only one paper. Instead of superficial reactions we got an in-depth exploration of some key research issues, with input from participants, discussants, and authors. After an hour and a half, the discussions were still going hot and heavy.

To pull this off in 1987, we need your help. Pick up the horn, call a colleague. Their phone numbers are in your hand. This year's paper presenters have a stack of their papers on their desk, and one of them has your name on it. The author just needs your address. Call, ask for your copy of the paper, and you can get it as part of the Research Roundtable II.

There is a catch, though. You have to provide feedback. Practical scholarship and scholarly practice is a two-way street. You need to tell the authors what you liked about the paper, what you did not like, and give them your suggestions for improvement. I've asked the participants to include with their papers a simple feedback sheet with those questions. Use it, or invent your own evaluation.

You can ask for as many papers as you're interested in, but you need to give feedback on each one. Then come to our Research Roundtable session in New Orleans in August and participate in what may be one of the most rewarding research interchanges you've ever attended.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Ofner, J. Alan. "Maximizing The Productivity of High Achievers and Plateaued Managers," Commerce, 83(9), 9-11.

Ofner, J. Alan. "Managing Change and Growth," Executive Speeches, 1 (4), 24-28.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Davis, Donald D. (Editor) Managing Technical Innovation: Organizational Strategies for Implementing Advanced Manufacturing Technologies. Jossey-Bass.1986.