Contents

Call for Papers
by Eric H. Neilsen

The OD Division program at last year's National Academy of Management Meeting was first rate. We did it by keeping our intellectual standards high while varying our presentation formats to maximize audience participation, contact with scholarly practitioners, and the airing of contrasting views on important topics. We need your help in continuing and enhancing this strategy at the 1988 National Academy of Management Meeting in Anaheim, CA.

The Academy has just recently fine-tuned the division domain statements in order to clarify where papers should be sent for review. The domain statement for the OD Division is quite comprehensive: the development of theory and innovative practice relevant to planned organization change. Major topics include: change processes within organizations, with or without assistance by change agents; active at- tempts to intervene in organizations to improve their effectiveness, and scholarly studies of such interventions; and problems of self-awareness, responsibility, and the political consequences of OD theory and practice. One might add that we place special emphasis on dialogue between scholars and practitioners as a major vehicle for generating knowledge about

organization change.

In line with the above statement, we invite you to submit papers and symposium proposals that cover the whole gamut of the planned change process. Paper sessions will continue to be held in both the traditional 3-4 paper plus discussants session format as well as in the roundtable model that has been so successful over the past two years.

This year we will also give a recognition award for the best paper submitted. The finalists will be the top six papers as determined by the ratings on the initial reviews for inclusion in the program (2-3 reviews per paper), and the winning paper will be selected based on a rereading of the finalist papers by a larger sample of the reviewers.

While we assume that change programs in North America and change theories emerging in this region will remain our principal topics, this year's program committee is especially interested in papers and symposia that deal with OD in international settings and/or that compare OD efforts outside North America with those within it. We are also interested in theoretical analyses that provide cross-cultural perspectives on mainstream theories of change.

Besides the quality of proposals as defined by their intellectual content, professional relevance, organization, and the sheer thoughtfulness apparent in the way they are put together, a major criterion for selecting symposia will be the excitement and learning they promise to generate in the audience. Special attention will be given to formats that involve both scholars and practitioners in the presentation of material, audience participation, debates on emerging topics of interest, extensive reports on major change projects, and/or critiques of important writings.

I would be interested in hearing your additional suggestions for improving the format as well as in offering support on the development of proposals. AU submissions, responses, and questions concerning this year's program should be directed to me at the following address: Eric H. Neilsen, Ph.D., Department of Organizational Behavior - Sears 540, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106. Tel-(216) 368-2050.

CONSULTATION: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

This publication facilitates the exchange of knowledge and ideas among individuals dedicated to understanding and improving the practice of consulting in all organizational settings. Its readership includes both those working as

consultants and those receiving consultation. This journal provides the first interdisciplinary forum for research and for assessment of this "increasingly" important field.

Consultation publishes original articles (up to approximately 20 double-spaced pages plus references in three areas: (1) theoretical/conceptual articles that provide information for application in the field, (2) applied articles that focus on distinctive practices and programs, including interventions or analyzed case studies of particular merit or uniqueness, and (3) original research that examines aspects of consulting practice. In addition, Consultation also contains professional notes, including submitted brief reports on research in progress, book reviews, net- working invitations, and professional developments. Occasional issues concentrate on a special topic, sometimes with the assistance of a guest editor. The editors welcome ideas and proposals for these special issues. Informal dialogue with the editors during the idea and development stages of articles is available and welcome. Draft manuscripts and working outlines will be reviewed by the editors and comments will be provided.

All completed manuscripts for articles and re- search notes submitted to Consultation undergo the same anonymous peer review process. The editors determine all decisions regarding publication based on the recommendations of the reviewers. To insure anonymity in the review of manuscripts, attach a cover page stating authorship, institutional affiliation, acknowledgements, and a short biography; provide only the title as identification on the abstract and manuscript. Manuscripts will be reviewed with the understanding that they are not multiple submittals.

GROUP & ORGANIZATION STUDIES CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

Group & Organization Studies is an international quarterly journal publishing reports of research that are relevant and are directly linked to application. G&OS are now in its twelfth volume and publishes only empirical, data-based reports. Articles are anonymously refereed by at least two, and usually three, expert reviewers on the editorial board. Papers should be twelve to twenty typewritten pages in length, submitted with a short biography and abstract on separate pages and must conform to the publication guidelines of the American Psychological Association in format. Case study reports are also welcome, when supported by strong data collection methodology. The journal also publishes occasional features such as interviews with prominent behavioral scientists, reviews of new paper and pencil instruments, and book reviews. Each issue contains one practice-centered article, which need not be data based, but is reviewed and refereed in the Perspectives section. These brief articles focus on important

professional practice issues.

The aim of G&OS is to bridge the gap between research and practice in the fields of human resource management, human relations training, and organization development. No article is published without a clear discussion of practice implications of the research reported. Normal review time is ten weeks and accepted articles are published within three to six months of receipt of the acceptable **final** revision. Very few papers are published without at least one round of revision.

G&OS welcomes manuscripts dealing with any of the issues in its domain. One original and four copies of the manuscript should be sent to Laurie Larwood, Editor, Group and Organization Studies, School of Business, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, NY 12222

ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

Organizational Dynamics is "a quarterly review of organizational behavior for professional managers." The journal is more than this, however. It also serves academicians who teach organizational behavior, students of organizational behavior, staff professionals inside organizations who must deal with the substance of organizational behavior on a daily basis, and organizational context. Each article attempts to address the needs of both the practitioner and the scholar.

All fields and disciplines have their jargon, and organizational behavior is no exception. In Organizational Dynamics, however, we make and effort to publish articles that are written in plain English. We prefer essays that emphasize prose over pedantry.

The scope of content suitable for Organizational Dynamics is broad. The common denominator, of course, is behavior in an organizational context. We therefore seek articles dealing with such subjects as human resource development and management, organization change, motivation, leadership, unionization, the applicability of behavioral science theory and research, interpersonal and inter-group relations, general management and executive behavior, and organizational culture, climate, strategy, roles, jobs, communication, decline, growth, conflict, rewards, de- sign, productivity, effectiveness, innovation, power, planning, and quality of working life. The cross cultural

application of each of the subjects is also a high priority.

Last, and perhaps most important, <u>Organizational Dynamics</u> staunchly refuses to favor any one theory or cause over another. We believe our readers are experienced and intelligent enough to draw whatever conclusions they like from lucid writing presented to them in every quarterly issue. Manuscripts should be double spaced, and three copies should be sent to Peter Vaill, Editor, <u>Organizational</u> Dynamics, American Management Association, 135 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y. 10020.

ED IN OD: THE CASE OF BOBBY KNIGHT
by Robert E. Kaplan

The OD field has long recognized the crucial role that senior management plays in organizational development. We in OD all know that without the active involvement of senior management or at least a key sponsor from those ranks, change projects often either don't get started or fizzle out. We recognize that even when senior management gets involved, projects can flounder if the supposed vanguards in senior management undermine the changes they claim they want by acting inconsistently with their pronouncements, often unwittingly. We know that for organizations to achieve their full potential, its top-level leadership must also grow; executive development (ED) is critical to OD.

What's involved in having executives develop? To get a feel for what we and they are up against, let's take a look at a public figure, Bobby Knight. For those of you who aren't basketball fans, Knight is the coach of the Indiana University basketball team. An admittedly extreme case, he nevertheless provides a graphic example of how senior managers are constituted and why it can be difficult for them to change.

Everyone who knows anything about basketball knows that Bobby Knight throws chairs (and himself) around and that he wins national basketball champion- ships - three to be exact, the latest this year. With the help of John Feinstein's revealing journalistic ac- count, let us look more closely at how Knight leads. Feinstein spent the entire 1985-86 season following Knight, his coaches, his assistant coaches, his players and others in his entourage. The result is a clearcut picture of Knight's leadership in the 1986 book <u>A Season on the Brink.</u>

Knight emerges as a classic case of a leader with a "passion for excellence." He has a compelling vision of a

superbly disciplined team that wins its ballgames. He recruits players and coaches who subscribe to this vision and have the talent to enact it. He molds each year's edition of the I.U. Basketball team by relentlessly demanding the best from each player and from the team as a whole. He pressures, exhorts, swears, berates, intimidates, and throws fits. During practice he regularly banishes players and the entire team to the locker room when they don't measure up. After the team loses, he keeps his assistant coaches up half the night, and sometimes all night, reviewing the tape of the game. He zeros in on mistakes, which make him angry each time he sees them. He puts the team through a similar tape-reviewing exercise (or ordeal). He controls the coaches and the team utterly. To the people who enable him to realize his vision, he is intensely loyal, but he does not show it fully to his players until after they graduate.

To fully appreciate Knight's brand of leadership, one must examine his underlying motivation. Obviously, he wants to win. What is striking, however, is how badly he needs to win and how personally he takes winning and losing. In Feinstein's words: *Knight cannot stand to lose* ... *It tears him apart emotionally, because he somehow equates losing a basketball game with his self-worth.*

Winning then is a ratification of his self-worth, losing, a repudiation of it. No amount of winning seems to quell his apparent doubts about himself, which means on the one hand that he never loses his competitive edge but also gives real meaning to his ritualistic refrain: "Do you think we will ever win another game?" The team is an extension of Knight's ego, and for him to vindicate himself, the team must prove itself worthy.

One lesson, then, from Bobby Knight is how <u>driven</u> he is and how driven most executives are. Knight is more notorious and outrageous than many institutional executives, but the action-research with individual executives that my colleagues, Bill Drath and Joan Kofodimos, and I have done has shown us that executives as a rule are possessed, just as Bobby Knight is possessed. They are compelled to achieve a certain sort of outcome for themselves and their organizations, and their strategies as persons correspond closely to their leadership strategies. Any attempt they make to develop, or we make to help them do so, has to bear directly or indirectly on their driving forces and their associated personal strategies.

But why should Knight or we be concerned about his development? Depending on your values, you may well feel that Knight's leadership is well worth it, that his outstanding track record justifies his methods. Even if you care chiefly

about outcomes, though, you may be concerned about Knight's destructive side as it manifested itself in the 1984-85 season. This was the season of the chair-throwing incident, which was only a dramatic symptom of the downward spiral Knight put himself and his team on. His technique of getting down on his team to get them to play up to their potential spin out of control. For the first time in Knight's career the team finished in the second division of the Big Ten. Reaching the NIT finals did not relieve the gloom that hung over the team for most of the season. In the following season—the one that Feinstein covered—Knight again walked a fine line with his only moderately talented team between his destructive side and leading in a positive sense.

Another major developmental issue for Knight, then, is how he manages his destructive potential as a leader and as a person. Similarly, if executives in general are to grow as leaders, they must come to terms with themselves in fundamental terms. Their issues will not necessarily be Knight's issues but the issues will be no less profound.

A major developmental issue for Knight, then, is how he manages his destructive potential as a leader and as a person. Similarly, if executives in general are to grow as leaders, they must come to terms with themselves in fundamental terms. Their issues will not necessarily be Knight's issues, but the issues will be no less profound.

Managerial development is often defined in terms of modifying behavior or improving skills. Development on the outer, behavioral plane is useful as far as it goes, but it is often limited by the basic character of the manager. For executives to develop, characterological change must also be fair game. Executives - like the rest of us - will not change fundamentally who they are, but they can learn to moderate their compelling drives and modify their personal strategies.

Executive development is hardly easy. The more successful executives' careers have been, the less inclined they or those invested in their success may be to take a chance with change. The more that executives need to succeed to feel good about themselves, the less inclined they will be to take full account of their failings. The more powerful they are, the less opportunity those around them have to confront them with their failings. For example:

Bob Knight's world was filled with people intimidated by him in one form or another. He was, almost always, the controller and dictator of his relationships ... Few people-coaches, players, professors, writers - had any interest in incurring his wrath (p. 53).

But, even in the most challenging cases, there are rays of hope. When the 1985-86 season was in danger of going down the drain like the previous season because Knight's destructive side had taken over, an assistant coach got up the nerve to remind him to have faith in the players and thereby helped keep Knight and the team from once again going over the brink.

CONTINUOUS WHITEWATER: OD'S FUTURE
by Craig C. Lundberg

A couple of years ago, Peter Vaill related the following anecdote. After talking to a group of executives about organizational and strategic change, one executive approached Peter and remarked that while his talk was no doubt erudite and insightful, it didn't really seem to refer to the executive's perception of his own situation which he then characterized as resembling "continuous whitewater." I have been drawn back to this image of continuous whitewater many times since hearing Peter's story. The ideas of continuous change and continuing turbulence are compelling ones to me because they intuitively fit many if not most of the human and organizational situations I am familiar with. In the lines that follow, I will begin to explore the implications of this white- water imagery for our thinking and our practice of OD.

What immediately strikes me when I focus on the notion of continuous change is simply that we have no theory about it. All the organizational change theories I'm familiar with seem to be variants of Kurt Lewin's archetype - the cycle of unfreezing, change, and re-freezing. Change is commonly viewed as the active transition phase between states of quasi-stable equilibrium. Organizational change endeavors are conventionally concluded when the target system has made the changes habitual (alternatively termed stabilized, routinized or institutionalized). Successful organizational change typically means not only have change goals been achieved but they also provide a relatively long period before the next change is needed. An image that portrays conventional thinking is of a stream with placid runs and pools separating riffles and rapids. A boat captain, in the placid stretches can relax his or her vigilance, restore order, bail if needed, generally feel safe and prudently look ahead.

Conditions of continuous whitewater in contrast, continuing the stream image just above, confounds the Lewian model. Stability, even partial stability, be- comes an illusion. No longer is there the luxury of a period to rest between change periods. No longer are there relatively placid conditions to look ahead from. There is neither time for

engendering readiness for change or for the habituation and routinization of newly developed patterns of behavior. Change has conventionally been measured against some more or less stable baseline, but baselines disappear when change is continuous. The image of continuous white- water raises many questions which OD theory is unprepared to answer.

But, we should inquire, does the image of continuous whitewater reflect organizational reality? This is not, of course, a trivial question. My hunch is that organizational reality, both internal and environ- mental, has always been changeful. Pulsating to various degrees of course, with the slower phases even resembling relative stability. With the increasing complexity of both organizations and their environments and with increasing dependency of organizations on their environments, continuous whitewater conditions are evermore probable. Managers and other organizational members certainly appear to be more active today than in years past. The managers I talk to are not only active but positively preoccupied with fine-tuning structures, systems and members, realigning their organizations to key input and output domains, and if not contemplating megatrends then worrying about the probable scenarios on the more immediate horizon. The succession of popular fads in management strongly suggests that managers are seeking answers for new issues and circumstances that familiar formulas no longer suffice for. Change is ubiquitous, from natural evolutionary and life cycle ones to intentionally initiated ones of all magnitudes - from growth strategies and global marketing to leaning staffs and budgeting formats.

I suspect that the illusion of periodic stability in large part stems from the pervasiveness of "control" and "analysis" in our thinking and the concomitant myths that effective organizations are harmonious and homogenous. To control essentially means to adhere to pre-established patterns. Analysis requires a point- in-time posture. An over emphasis on analysis and/or control thus naturally redirects our attention from change to static - change exists but is only undesirable deviation. Conflict and variety in organizations are presumed to be unnatural (and undesirable), the outgrowth of organizational politics, lack of system focus, multiple loyalties, and poor management.

Harmony and homogeneity thus become meta-values. Justice, governance, member development, strategy and other fundamental dynamic developmental themes thus tend to overly reflect the conservative recent past. Ongoing change and turbulent organizational circumstances may just be difficult to discern given the mind-set held by many if not most management and OD practitioners.

The implications of organizational realities being like continuous whitewater are massive. As previously noted, most of our planned OD models are probably inappropriate. Our theoretic beliefs and assumptions seldom allow for meandering change, seldom consider the possibility of organizational decline, seldom include the need for modifying organizational character or culture, seldom require building in renewal mechanisms, seldom include the possibility of bottoms-up or guerilla-based change, seldom explicitly allow for either revolutionary or climacteric change, seldom reflect struggles of social class, seldom are explicitly related to business strategy, seldom promotes system variety or uncoupling of sub-systems or weakening of linkages, seldom promotes simple experimentation, seldom incorporates systematic futurizing, seldom results in organizational democracy, and so on and on. Even the most dynamic of our models, action research, is mostly utilized for re-establishing the status quo and the managerially approved. Conceptually, OD "theory" is in a doldrum and requires a major overhaul if it is to realistically encompass continuous, turbulent change.

Whitewater conditions of change likewise imply that much of our OD practice needs rethinking also. ODpractitioners, as has recently been noted in the literature, need to become much more competent with regard to business strategy, futures work, organizational politics and organizational culture, as well as to recapture older OD concerns with facilitating personal growth, individual counseling, the impact of physical settings, the natural rhythms of change, work design and socio-technical systems. OD practitioners must become much more adept at combining consultancy roles, i.e., technical expert, process facilitator, educator, counselor, values conscience and spiritual advisor, and conceptual coach-therapist, and to really understand the implications for change of sophisticated informational, managerial, logistical and technological systems, demographic, career and legislative shifts, and the roles of innovation and rapid product development cycles of both products and services. In addition, OD practitioners will undoubtedly have to become evermore sensitive for maintaining ecological, psychic and social foundations in the face of uncertainty and ambiguity. For sure, OD's exemplars, team building and survey research, will need to be replaced by devicesless deviation-darnpening. For sure, OD practitioners will most likely have to simultaneously become specialists and generalists; more conceptual as well as more situationally informed and focused.

Continuous whitewater has been a compelling and instructive image. Its implications for OD theory and practice, some of which have been speculated upon, appear to be extensive and upending. Continuous renewal, experimentation, variety, and multi- dimensional, process oriented conceptualization would seem to be themes

necessary in continuous whitewater. OD may be verging on becoming the truly pragmatic as well as integrating conceptual force in the applied behavioral sciences that we have always suspected it could be.

A REVISIONIST LOOK AT POWER AND OD
by Larry E. Greiner & Virginia E. Schein

OD needs to let go of its idealized adherence to a "Collegial/Consensus" model of organizations to accept and work with a "Political / Pluralistic" model. The latter model comes closer, we believe, to representing the reality of how and why influence is exercised in modern organizations, not just because people seek power to control their own destinies but because limited resources must be allocated across organizational units with differing goals. Even in the most "participative" organizations, there will be and inevitable and underlying political process for acquiring, creating, and dividing up resources and rewards.

This does not mean caving into the seamier side of politics. Quite the contrary. Power can be gained from acquiring many of the attributes long valued by OD-knowledge, reputation, and information. But there is also charisma, position, and political access, which have not been so characteristic of OD's traditional power base. Research evidence also exists to show that political strategies used by managers are not antithetical to OD, such as "being persistent," "focusing on the target groups," and "using data to convince others." Line managers approve of and utilize far more of these "above-board" influence strategies than they do in "exaggerating information," "using threats," or "discrediting the opposition." Unfortunately, OD advocates often stereotype the political side of organizations as dominated by these under- handed techniques.

A political viewpoint of organizations also teaches OD that change is far more complex and difficult than simply applying re-education through interpersonal feedback, team building, and inter-group confrontation meetings. Individuals have their self-interests to protect and serve, and the dominant coalition is likely to be more attached to the status quo than opening themselves up to a fluid situation where their privilege positions are in doubt. Hence, organizations change slowly, and then only through piece- meal compromise reached out of an informal bargaining process and occasional political infighting.

All of which might be tolerable if not so many organizations today were facing external threats to their survival,

whether it be from takeovers, technological obsolescence or global competition. In its infancy, OD would have responded to such challenges by preaching "participative management," a not so subtle way of challenging top management to redistribute power to lower levels. Unfortunately, OD was more often the victim than victor, so it reversed fields to "serve" the power structure through confining its techniques to lower levels and the "bottom line," such as QWL programs. This subservient role for OD had continued up to present times where the power structure tolerates and even encourages OD so long as it fine-tunes the existing situation without threatening the essence of the power system. Now, however, that essence is threatened by outside forces. And unfortunately, OD lacks the power, theory and methodology to respond.

A "new" OD can and must emerge to deal more directly with helping the power structure to change not only itself but also the strategic alignment of the firm with its environment. OD can, if properly devised, provide a more effective process than political bargaining for assisting the dominant coalition to address pressing strategic issues that have so far eluded formal approaches to strategic planning. In essence, OD must engage the most cherished agenda of the power elite- the strategy of the company, its top management structure for delivering on strategy, and the manner in which they will lead. Without OD to focus key powerholders on these strategic issues, they will be left to "incrementalism.... poison pills", down-sizing, and golden parachutes to save themselves.

Easier said than done. Simply entering the executive suite is a formidable power issue, since most OD consultants never get beyond the plant level. Political access and persuasive selling strategies are required. And then there is the need for an early political diagnosis, which if left untended, can result in premature exit or being abused by rivalrous factions. If, for example, the consultant's client sponsor lacks power with other senior colleagues, then its back to the plant and QWL.

The OD field has been notably deficient in pro- viding theoretical frameworks for rationalizing the role of OD as it relates to power and strategic change. We propose a four-stage model of strategic change and organization transformation. It is derived from the application of OD at the top management level in a large corporation, Mega Inc.

1.
    1. Consolidating Power to Prepare for Change
    2. Focusing Power on Strategic Consensus

3. Aligning Power with Structure and People
4. Releasing Power through Leadership and Collaboration

At an operational level, the OD techniques used at Mega represent a shift from a traditional approach of focusing (forcing?) explicit discussion on behavioral issues to a different mode of facilitating decision making on strategic content. OD, in essence, provides a guided process for the power structure to engage a series of threatening strategic decisions. At the same time, the participants implicitly "learn" to behave differently through experiencing the benefits of collaboration while creating a new set of future oriented behavioral demands upon themselves.

The limits of OD in strategic change depend upon the antecedent political dynamics in the top management group. There are many situations with a weak CEO and an intensely rivalrous top group that are not amenable to even beginning an OD process. Much depends, too, upon the power of the OD change agent, not only in influencing senior managers but also in upholding the views of those with less power. The success of any large-scale change project depends eventually upon the reactions of people many levels removed from top management.

We look forward to needed research, theory and debate on the role of power in the OD field, which too long has treated power in narrow and stereotypical terms. Our belief is that a deeper and more integrated view of power and OD shows promise of moving the OD field beyond its historical discomfort and inability to deal with serious problems of strategic change and organizational adaptation.

OD COMES OF AGE
by W. Warner Burke & Marshall Sashkin

Little more than a decade ago Frank Friedlander characterized OD as a value-conflicted adolescent, not an uncommon image. OD was, however, quite atypical in his view due to the very different values espoused and behaved by OD's parents and grandparents. In particular, OD appears to have had three, not four grandparents, as a result of some unusual (and value-based) choices. The more traditional of the three were Rati (for Rationalism) and Prag (for Pragmatism). This staid pair produced Sam (Scientific

Management, Mas (Management Science), and a variety of other offspring (such as "Personnel Appraisal, Testing,

and Selection," and "Survey Re- search"). Their stable family relations were interrupted by the appearance of Exi (for Existentialism), who, with Prag, may have produced such offspring as T Groups and Encounter. A qualification is in order, since Exi believed in "open relationships." Several of the offspring of Prag and Exi, along with a few of Prag and Rati's brood, formed a commune. With relation- ships ever-shifting, it is rather unclear just who were biological parents of OD, but it was in this commune that OD was born and raised, exposed to a wide range of values.

In our recent review and assessment of the current condition of OD, we referred only briefly to Friedlander's allegory. Still, we find it a useful (and entertaining) approach for examining the important value conflicts in OD. We believe that those conflicts are core issues in OD research and practice, and that an understanding of them is basic to an understanding of the field of OD. OD's three grandparents are representations of three value stances that underlie OD, yet are not fully integrated as the foundation of a mature profession. While Friedlander dealt with this in depth and detail, our version is more simple. We see Prag and Exi, respectively, as representing the bottom-line and the humanistic-work-life-quality values, values in conflict through most of OD's brief history. In addition, we see Rati and Exi as representing practice- orientation values, specifically, the value of structure as the focus of change (Rati) and the value of behavioral processes as the focus of OD change (Exi, of course). We note that Exi does double-duty; perhaps this is the consequence of Exi's "third party" role. We can even see Chin and Benne's (1969) three strategies of change reflected in the three partners. Prag is the "whatever works" power-coercive, looking toward authority and status as the keys to change. Rati is the calm, traditional rational-empirical one, relying on proof and logic to build a sound argument for change. Exi, then, is the young, newly-discovered normative- re-educative model, whose here-and-now experience was there basis for change. No wonder that OD had such a confusing and troubled adolescence!

But, as we argued in our review of OD in the 1980s (Sashkin & Burke, 1987), considerable integrative progress has been made over the past decade. OD is no longer a rebellious teenager, but has reached young adulthood, is being gainfully employed, and has serious prospects for a successful career. To see how we made our case, in detail, through a review of reviews and a synthesis of the research and practice literature (we found very little literature that qualified as serious theory), we suggest reading our paper in the Summer 1987 Journal of Management. Skipping the meal and moving directly to the dessert, we hope to entice you to examine the entire repast. What follows, then are a few of the sweet conclusions of two years of work, stated as five current trends in OD.

Trend 1: <u>Systematic structure-process integration.</u> More than a decade ago Friedlander and Brown (1974) cited the need for effective integration of process-centered and structurally-focused OD interventions. We find that such integration is characteristic of OD today. Process skills originally seemed useful for making people feel better about their work, one another, or the organization. Today, however, these skills are used to help people learn to solve problems and get their work done more effectively. Moreover, OD today is more systemic, concerned with the entire organization and organizational issues such as strategic planning, reward systems, and management structures. No longer is OD focused solely on teams, interpersonal issues, and training.

Trend 2: <u>Culture by design: Integrating value perspectives.</u> Today's OD practitioner is likely to find clients using the term culture before the consultant! Senior managers in many organizations are aware that major changes in the organization's mission and strategy will produce great frustration and might even lead to failure, unless the organization's culture is also changed in consistent ways. OD efforts now include examination of and work on corporate strategy. In fact, it is by creating cultures, through executive leadership, that the value of bottom-line profit and organizational achievement is integrated with people-centered, quality of work life oriented values.

Trend 3: <u>Managing</u> conflict. For over two decades managing conflict has remained a strong focus in OD practice. Today's decentralized authority structures and flatter hierarchies reinforce the need for effective conflict management. Under such conditions getting work done effectively depends more on normative re-educative influencing skills (a la Exi) and less on the exercise of power as a function of position or status (as Prag might wish it to be!). Collaborative approaches to labor-management relations are on the increase, along with a move away from the classic adversarial model. Finally, the incredible increase in organizational mergers and acquisitions has prepared the ground for much new (and perhaps even more severe) conflict. Managing conflict is a major OD trend that has been stable for a long time and shows signs of increase, not decrease, in importance.

Trend 4: Better research. Recently developed approaches to synthesizing the results of research show that OD effects are real and substantial in size, and that they do not seem ephemeral and quick to fade out. Assessments of the OD research conducted in the 1980s find it to be more sophisticated and more methodologically sound than ever before. We are approaching real, meaningful syntheses of research findings, as more and better meta-analyses are carried out. And, OD practitioners are learning how to apply and use to the benefit of the organization certain 4 "experimenter effects" and research "artifacts," making OD effects even more powerful and lasting.

Trend 5: <u>Improved theory</u>? We are much less certain of this trend than of the other four; perhaps it reflects our hopes more than it does reality. It remains true and more openly recognized that no strong, integrative theory of OD exists. We have broad macro-theories of change, such as that developed by Ronald Lippitt and his associates almost thirty years ago. And we have narrow, small-scale "mid-range" theories (as discussed in Burke's recent OD text). We still lack, however, a widely-accepted theory of organizational change through OD, and none seems to be on the horizon. Our hope is that the increased interest in meta-analysis may indicate an increase at integrating not just various sets of research studies. We hope this interest may eventually lead also to an improved integration of OD concepts into a grounded theory. The continued improvement in quality of OD research is a stimulus toward this end, and adds to our optimism, but we may, nonetheless, be whistling in the dark.

Summary

We arrived, in our review, at three major conclusions about OD today. First, there is much less weird activity going on in organizations that is labeled OD; OD has clearly gained respectability in management circles (even considering OD's odd development, in Friedlander's terms). Many interventions are so standard, such as the off-site team building session, that most any experienced manager in a large American corporation has heard the terminology, if not experienced the event. Rarely does one see the use of T-groups or encounter groups. We even see OD research published (occasionally) in the most respected journals in our field.

Second, there has been an effective integration, resolving the long-standing conflict between structural OD concerns and behavioral process issues as the focus of OD activities. At the micro level we can cite team building as a good example. In the 1980s team building rarely (if ever) involves open-ended examination of interpersonal relations. Team building interventions today typically have a clear task focus; process is a way of improving how the team accomplishes its tasks, not an end in itself. On a larger scale, the sociotechnical systems approach seems to be a vehicle for integrating these same task structure and behavioral process concerns. The "human processual" and "technostructural" cores of OD identified by Friedlander and Brown (1974) are being effectively connected.

Third, there is a new emphasis on organizational culture, not from a pure process viewpoint but from the sort of structural perspective commonly used by organizational sociologists. Such an approach makes clear how values affect critical organizational functions. Future OD research should focus on empirical and experimental

measurement of cultural OD interventions and the effects on the values that concern both performance and people.

The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement or the U.S. Department of Education.

References:

Burke, W. W. (1982). <u>Organization Development: Principles and Practices.</u> Boston: Little, Brown.

Chin, R., & Benne, K. D. (1969). General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems. In W.G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, and R. Chin (Eds.), <u>The Planning of Change</u> (2nd ed., pp.32-59). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Friedlander, F. (1976). OD Reaches Adolescence: An Exploration of its Underlying Values. <u>Journal of Applied Behavioral</u> Science, <u>12,</u> 7-2 1.

Friedlander, F., & Brown, L.D. (1 974). Organization Development. In M. R. Rosenzweig and L. W. Porter (Eds.), <u>Annual Review of Psychology,</u> pp. 313-341). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Lippitt, R. O., Watson, J., & Westley, B. (1958). <u>The Dynamics of Planned Change.</u> New York: Harcourt Brace & World.

Sashidn, M., & Burke, W.W. (1987). Organization Development in the 1980s. <u>Journal of Management</u> 13,205-229.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Buono, Anthony F., Bowditch, James L. & Lewis, John W. "The Cultural Dynamics of a Transformation: The Case of a Bank Merger," in Ralph H. Kilmann, Teresa J. Covin & Associates, <u>Corporate Transformation: Revitalizing Organizations for a Competitive</u> World. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Tony Buono has recently assumed the role of book review editor for Business in the Contemporary World, a new quarterly journal that focuses on the various ways in which business and other sectors of society influence each other. Division members interested in reviewing books should write or call: Anthony F. Buono, Department of Management, Graduate Center 314, Bentley College, Waltham, Massachusetts 02254 (617) 819-2527

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The American Society for Training and Development--Organization Development Division awards an annual OD Research Grant. The award is for $2,400 ($1,200 when the award is granted and $1,200 upon completion of the research) plus $600 to cover travel and expenses for presentation of the research results at the 1989 national ASTD conference in San Diego. The award winner is expected to present the results at the ASTD national meeting and publish the results of the study in the ASTD Training and Development Journal.