

Contents

[1988 OD Division Program by Eric H. Neilsen](#)

[Some Reflections on the Values of Organizational Development by Newton Margulies and Anthony P. Raia](#)

[Articles by Members](#)

[Books by Members](#)

[News About Members](#)

[Announcements](#)

[Research on Team Building in Isolated Groups](#)

[Conference on Latin America and the Caribbean](#)

[Call for Presentations: 8th World Congress](#)

[Call for Papers: The Academy of Management Executive](#)

[Call for Papers: The Academy of Management Review](#)

[Towards a Redefinition of OD: A Critique of Research Focus and Method By Michael Beer](#)

[Where Have All The Heroes Gone? By Alan M. Glassman](#)

1988 OD DIVISION PROGRAM

by Eric H. Neilsen

This year's program highlights international OD with three symposia and a pre-conference workshop related to this theme. We will also have two distinguished speakers, Bill Dyer and Robert Tannenbaum, some excellent sessions on major OD programs and change projects within U.S. organizations, and a mix of the traditional and roundtable paper sessions.

Rupert Chisholm, Penn State University and Max Elden, University of Trondheim, Norway, will run a pre-conference workshop for exploring different perspectives on empowering work. Rupe and Max have assured us that a number of guest scholars from Europe and Scandinavia will attend. Registration (limit 40) is open to all members of the Academy. If you wish to attend, please pre-register by writing Rupert Chisholm, Penn State University, Capital Campus, Middleton, PA 17057.

During the conference itself, one symposium, "Inquiry for Global Development," will explore the theories, assumptions, and approaches underlying new methods of inquiry particularly suited to the development of international or global organizations. Another, "How Liberating is Self Management in America? An International Debate and Critique," will compare the views of American scholars with those of their colleagues in Europe and Scandinavia on American self management efforts. And yet another symposium will look at OD in Denmark, China, and Venezuela; three countries whose respective cultural values ala Hofstede are likely to support OD efforts to markedly different degrees.

The latest approaches to OD in Fortune 250 companies will not go unnoticed with a symposium comparing current OD programs in three of these major organizations. In yet another symposium, the sheer complexity of the change process, especially with respect to issues of authority and organizational culture, will be explored through a comparative analysis of two in depth case studies of planned organizational change.

Some excellent papers were submitted this year. We have grouped them into two "traditional" sessions of three papers each plus a roundtable program. One paper session deals with a trio of field experiments in generating change and a second with three more analytical and broad ranging assessments of change processes and strategies.

The roundtable program, developed by R. J. Bullock and now in its third year, departs from the traditional format by having in effect several single paper sessions occur simultaneously in the same room, each at a different "round" table with a prearranged discussant and interested participants. Following a very brief introduction of each paper, the format allows for someone attending the session to join in the focused discussion of at least two papers over a 90 minute period. This years' session will involve six papers. The format works best when OD Division members have written for, and read beforehand, the papers of their choice. To that end, the titles and authors of the six papers are listed below:

1. "The Focused Labor Force: An Organizational Development Strategy Integrating Job Enrichment with Workplace Design," Coy A. Jones, Fogelman College of Business & Economics, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee, 38152. (with J. Bernard Keys, Georgia Southern College, Thomas R. Miller, Memphis state university)

2. "Conforming Illusory Participation in the 1980's" Gail T. Fairhurst, Department of Communication, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221. (with Robert A. Sarr, University of Cincinnati)
3. "Improving the Effectiveness of Quality Circle Interventions in Public Sector Organizations," Paula J. Konoske, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California 92152 (With Michael A. White, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center).
4. "Attitudinal Effects of Employee Participation Groups: How Strong, How Persistent?" Gerald E. Ledford, Jr., Center for Effective Organizations, Graduate School of Business Administration, Bridge Hall 400-Mc 1421, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089. (With Susan A. Mohrman, University of Southern California)
5. "Quality Circles: Effectiveness as a Small Group," Dwight R. Norris, Department of Management, Auburn University, Alabama 36849. (With James F. Cox, University of Georgia)
6. "Unraveling Alpha, Beta, and Gamma Change: An Application of the Theory of Logical Types to Organizational Change," David W. Roach, School of Business, Arkansas Tech University, Russelville, Arkansas 72801. (With David Bednar, University of Arkansas)

Following up on last years' grand success, we will also repeat a roundtable format for "A Conversation with the Authors of Research in Organizational Change and Development, Volume II," edited by William Passmore and Richard Woodman (JAI Press). To obtain a copy of the chapter of your choice, please write to the appropriate author as listed below:

1. "Organization Development: Part I – An Evolutionary Perspective," Phil Mirvis, School of Management, Boston University, 621 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215.
2. "The Interplay of Organization Development and Organizational Transformation," Jean Bartunek, School of Management, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167
3. "Why OD Must Become Strategic," Mariann Jelinek, Department of Managerial Studies, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106.
4. " A Review of Research on the Change Typology," Achilles Armenakis, Auburn University Dean's Office, College of Business, 226 Thach Hall, Auburn University, Alabama 36849.
5. "Creating Expectation Effects in OD: Applying Self-fulfilling Prophecy," Dov Eden, Faculty of Management, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 68878, Israel.

6. "Gainsharing Theory and Research: Findings and Future Directions," Edward Lawler III, Center for Effective Organizations, University of Southern California, 3551 University Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90007.

My thanks in advance to all of you for your making this year's program a success. Do take advantage of the opportunity to read so many of the papers ahead of time. It is both a significant gesture to the authors and a sure way of maximizing the benefits of the conference. I look forward to seeing you in Anaheim.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE VALUES OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

by Newton Margulies and Anthony P. Raia

We have long held the view that OD values are deeply rooted in the traditional values of America. Central to this tradition is the assumption that individuals are better able to determine their interests and destinies than are collectivities. American values are based on individualism and enlightened self-interests, on achievement and success, on freedom and democracy, on moralism and humanitarianism and on human and civil rights.

It seems to us, however, that modern organizations are transforming the traditional value system of America. Despite the warnings of Whyte's *Organization Man* of the 1950's, the campus unrest and civil rights turmoil of the 1960's and the quality of work life projects of the 1970's, the transformation continues. Scott and Hart (1979), for example, describe shifts to (1) conformity, whereby the organization shapes and molds its members, (2) obedience, whereby superiors demand loyalty and immediate response from subordinates to get the organization's work done, (3) dispensability, whereby individuals are seen as replaceable resources, (4) specialization, at the expense of the collective whole, (5) planning and control, at the expense of spontaneity and creativity, and (6) paternalism, at the expense of autonomy, free choice, and individual responsibility.

While we do not agree that total or radical transformation has taken place, or that managers are necessarily at fault, our knowledge of the literature leads us to believe that the values held by corporate America are regressing in a direction that is incompatible with the core values of the field of organizational development. We ask ourselves why? How can this be, given the vast number of OD programs and activities over the years, the existence of professional internal staffs, the hordes of external consultants, and the countless number of interventions taking place on a daily

basis? There appear to us to be several reasons.

To begin with, organizational life is no longer stable and predictable. The forces of change have stressed the ability to effectively manage organization structures, processes and dynamics. Managers find themselves dealing with "double-blind" situations; productivity and efficiency vs. the quality of working life, collaboration and teamwork vs. competition and entrepreneurship, stability vs. change, to name only a few. The emergence of a global economy and international competition, the technology explosion, the changing demographics and attitudes of the work force, increasing government interventions, and the emergence of multiple stakeholders with conflicting interest and needs have combined to increase the pressures on managers. They must be pragmatic and expedient, think and act within short time frames, make quick decision, and look for quick fixes. For most of them, management has become a predicament.

Responsibility, accountability, control and stewardship are all the hallmarks of the orthodox managerial outlook that still prevails today. The culture of an organization, including its reward system, reinforces the importance of identifying with organization values. Loyalty is to the organization, which often forces managers to choose between organization values and those which may be incompatible or in conflict with them. The more managers work in their organization, the more these values tend to be reflected in their own personal values.

It is not our intention to berate managers or to diminish the importance of organizations in our society. It is also not our intention to discredit the field of organizational development. We are concerned, however, that there has been an unwitting collusion between managers and OD practitioners along the following lines. The interventional technology has been (and continues to be) packaged and sold by OD practitioners and eagerly accepted by managers as a cure-all at best and as a quick fix at worst. More important, the techniques are accepted because (1) they seem to produce more effective employees, teams and /or systems, (2) they are seemingly more humane, (3) they promise to help people realize their potential and to cope with the pressures of organizational life, and (4) they are morally "good".

Professional managers are neither barbarians nor automatons. They are, in fact, people with decent and honorable intentions. OD technology provides them with an automatic, built-in conscience. The techniques in and of themselves are both "right" and "good". If it is believed that the application of "good" means will automatically produce good end

results and "good" people, then the consideration of values becomes unnecessary and a waste of time. This assures managers that they need not engage in the time consuming, intangible, and difficult business of clarifying and integrating incompatible values. They need look no further than the humanness of the techniques. This simplifies the job because they can be confident that no one will be hurt in the normal course of things. On the contrary, the more they are involved with OD, the more humane they and their organizations are.

It is our belief that OD practitioners have become an integral part of this collusion. The field has been and continues to be technology-driven. Many practitioners have become routine in their applications; they have succumbed to management pressure for the quick fix, the emphasis on the bottom line, and the cure-all mentality; they have failed to maintain "marginality" in their roles as consultants and helpers to management- they are for all intents and purposes "in bed" with their client-systems; and more important perhaps, they seem to have lost sight of the core values of the field and the need to engage in the difficult and challenging process of integrating them into the organization's value systems as ends in and of themselves.

The implications for the field are reasonably obvious. We have examined the literature and concluded that OD core values have endured over the last several decades. Our analysis leads us to believe that they are even more important today than they were during the formative stages of organizational development. First, because of the increasing divergence between OD values and those of corporate America, and second, because of what we have identified as an unwitting collusion between OD practitioners and management which appears to be eroding the values of the field. Consequently, if OD is to continue to develop as a discipline and as a profession, a number of changes appear to be in order. More specifically,

1. The issue relating to the divergence or incompatibility of values is not a dialectic. That is, it is not an "either-or" proposition in which either the core values of the field or those of the organization must prevail. We are better advised to adopt a "janusian" perspective, one which recognizes the legitimacy of both organizational needs for survival and efficiency and those of its members as reflected in the OD values.
2. OD professionals need to re-awaken the Messianic spirit that pervaded the field in its formative years. The OD pioneers not only advocated, but applied the core values both as a desirable end state and as an integral part of the OD process. Present day practitioners need to re-ignite the spirit and become more committed to and comfortable with the role of values advocate.

3. OD professionals, both internal and external, need to maintain their marginality to the organization to keep from becoming co-opted by their client systems. There has been a trend to tie OD efforts to the organization's business goals. While this is certainly desirable, the result is often a capitulation of the core values in favor of the objectives of cost effectiveness and efficiency. Maintaining marginality is one way of insuring that this does not occur.
4. A critical role can be played by helping managers to better understand the importance of and the need to integrate the traditional values of America, as described earlier, with the more recent concerns for competitive advantage, efficiency, and productivity. Providing this "conceptual therapy" for management is an important emerging dimension of the consultative role.

As we reflect on the field, we find that our initial views remain unchanged. Organizational development is value based, and more importantly its core values provide the guiding light for both the OD process and its technology. The very identity of the field is reflected in the existence and application of the values it advocates. Without them, OD represents nothing more than a set of techniques.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Nicholas, John. "Small Groups in Orbit: Group Interaction and Crew Performance on Space Station", Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine, 58, (October 1987), 1009-13.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Cooper, Cary L. & Robertson, Ivan. International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. New York & London, John Wiley & Sons, 1988.

Cooper, Cary L., Cooper, Rachel & Eaker, Lyn. Living With Stress. New York & London, Penguin Books, 1988.

Cox, Charles & Cooper, Cary L. High Fliers: An Anatomy of Managerial Success. New York & Oxford, Blackwell Pub., 1988.

Schmuck, Richard A. & Runkel, Philip J. Handbook of Organization Development In Schools, 3rd Edition. (Originally published by Mayfield, has been reprinted in December 1987 by Waveland Press, P.O.Box 400, Prospect Heights, IL 60070.)

Varney, Glenn H. Goal Driven Management. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1988.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Dr. Rene Beregermaier has left Motorola in Munich, where he worked for more than 6 years as Personnel Manager, in order to form with Dr. Ingwer Borg Human Resources Consulting, which is the first outfit in Germany specializing in Employee and Management Surveys. He can be reached at the Prinzregentenstrasse 91, 8000 Munchen 80, West Germany.

Ogden Brown Jr., has received a promotion to full Professor in the Institute of Safety and Systems Management, University of Southern California, effective January 1, 1987.

Lynda Detterman (formerly Lynda Benroth) is on the faculty of Antioch University in New England.

Don McCormick is now a core faculty member at Antioch University in Los Angeles.

Jane S. Mouton passed away on December 7, 1987 in Austin, Texas.

Louis A. Zurcher passed away on December 10, 1987 in Austin, Texas.

CORRECTIONS

In the last issue of the OD Newsletter, Larry Greiner and Virginia Schein's "A Revisionist Look at Power and OD" omitted a footnote referring to a more detailed discussion of the Mega case. That footnote should read, "See Power and Organization Development by Larry Greiner and Virginia Schein, Addison Wesley, Reading, MA., 1988"

ANNOUNCEMENTS

A product of a three-year project on values and ethics in organization and human systems development (OD-HSD), concluded in October 1987 and funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation, this Annotated Bibliography is intended to serve as an educational and reference tool for OD-HSD teachers, students, researchers, practitioners and clients as well as persons in related behavioral sciences and in the applied and professional ethics field. It contains 178 published and unpublished items drawn from the OD-HSD field, related behavioral sciences, applied and professional ethics, and moral philosophy. Both descriptive and normative material that focuses on professional and personal values and ethical issues in OD-HSD is included.

The 178 items are arranged alphabetically according to author and then chronologically. A list of subject headings was developed and for each item, the main subject heading is shown and a listing of all items according to subject heading is provided. A key work index appears at the ends.

Copies can be obtained from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Marketing Department, 1333 H Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005. Cost is \$4.00 for AAAS members and \$5.00 for non-members, prepaid.

RESEARCH ON TEAM BUILDING IN ISOLATED GROUPS

John Nicholas is conducting a survey about the effects of team building and related interventions on the performance of small groups in isolated, confined, or stressful environments. Examples include (but are not limited to) groups in industry (e.g. polar stations, undersea research vessels, exploration parties, off-shore oil rigs), the military (e.g. submarine, missile launch, bomber crews, and combat platoons), and simulated situations. Anecdotal reports as well as empirical research findings are welcome. Send citations or reports to: John Nicholas, Management Science Department, Loyola University of Chicago, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL 60611.

CONFERENCE ON LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN

The Business Association of Latin American Studies announces a special 1989 conference, to be held Feb. 15-18, 1989, in Boca Raton, Florida for the discussion of issues and research that affect the economies and business environment of Latin America and the Caribbean today and the near term future. This conference will be important to

business persons, academics, governments, nonprofit institutions, and other consultants and specialists who have an interest in this region. Papers, panel proposals, and abstracts, transmitted in quadruplicated and subjected to blind review, are being accepted now and until October 8, 1988. Papers and cases should be of high quality. Camera ready final versions of papers must be received by January 6, 1989, for inclusion in the Proceedings, and to compete for outstanding paper awards. To receive more information and be placed on a special conference mailing list, please write to the 1989 Conference Director: Dr. Robert P. Vichas, Florida Atlantic University, P.O. Drawer 7638, Fort Lauderdale, FL. 33338

CALL FOR PRESENTATIONS: 8TH WORLD CONGRESS

You are invited to make a presentation and the 8th O.D. World Congress on "Peaceful Transitions: Models and Strategies," being held November 15-20, 1988 at The Manila Hotel in Manila, The Philippines. For registration information and details contact: Donald Cole, Organization Development Institute, 11234 Walnut Ridge Toad, Chesterfield, OH. 44026.

CALL FOR PAPERS: THE ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT EXECUTIVE

The Academy of Management Executive is a quarterly with a mission and purpose of providing a bridge or a link among theory, research, and practice. The link is a rigorous one, both in terms of assuring that statements regarding practice (a) are indeed related directly to what we know from theory and research that is generalizable and (b) can be written about in why terms-explaining behavior individually and organizationally. Contributors should not simply explain to readers what worked or didn't work, but rather they should explain the why.

The domain for AME is broad. Considering the expertise of Academy members and other likely contributors and readers, however, this means that the domain centers around the content of management and the process of leading and managing an organization. Ideally, articles will show the relationship between content and process. Contributors are encouraged to interact with executives for the purpose of generating the basis for an article. This interaction could lead to a jointly authored manuscript or could be an interview preceded and followed by commentary written by the interviewer. The commentary would provide (a) the linkage to theory and/or research and (b) implications for other executives in similar situations.

A typical article might begin with either a brief case that illustrates the primary theme or pose certain questions and issues that our readers undoubtedly face (or perhaps need to address), or some other beginning that will stimulate a busy person to want to read further. Following an introduction along the lines suggested above, a typical article would then provide thorough coverage of some issue, case study, or an elaboration and explanation of research findings. The final part of the manuscript should address the "so what" question.

Manuscripts should be typewritten, double-spaced, and no more than 30 pages in length, including figures and tables if any, and the endnotes section. Authors are encouraged to prepare their manuscripts on word-processing software. After an article is accepted by AME, the editorial process can be expedited by providing an ASCII file of the manuscript on an IBM-compatible 5 ½ inch diskette. Retaining the original, contributors should submit four clear copies of their manuscript, which will not be returned. All manuscripts should be sent to: W. Warner Burke, Editor, Academy of Management Executive, Box 24, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.

CALL FOR PAPERS: ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW

The Academy of Management Review is a management and organizational theory journal published by the Academy of Management. AMR publishes scholarly works that advance theory development in fields of interest to Academy members. These fields are reflected in the divisions and interest groups of the Academy listed on the inside front cover. AMR does not publish reports of empirical investigations or articles informing management practice. These are published in the Academy of Management Journal and the Academy of Management Executive, respectively. The focus of AMR is organizational and management theory, not organizational practice or management technique.

All articles published in the AMR are subjected to the same anonymous review process. However, manuscripts that are obviously inappropriate or insufficiently developed may be returned for either submission to a more suitable journal or resubmission to AMR following further development. Decisions regarding publication of submitted manuscripts are based on the recommendations of members of the Editorial Review Board and other qualified reviewers. Reviewers' comments are made available to authors.

Reviewers evaluate manuscripts primarily on the basis of their "value added" contribution to theory development,

either in the form of new theories or important improvements in current thought. AMR articles should alter the thinking of content experts; they are not meant to serve as introductions for the uninformed.

Reviews, syntheses, applications, and critiques should be used as means to the end of advancing theory development and informing research practice. Studied examinations of what has already been published should do more than simply note deficiencies or oversights. In addition, they should suggest remedies for flawed models, significantly improve challenged conventional wisdom, and remove blind spots in our research paradigms. New applications should invigorate or redirect established theoretical perspectives, not merely confirm the utility of these perspectives.

Meta-analyses and methodological critiques submitted to AMR should have a strong theory development orientation. If a critique's primary objective is to influence the measurement, rather than the conceptualization of a subject, the value of the improved measurement technique should be demonstrated via an empirical study and submitted to AMJ.

Although articles will be judged primarily on their substantive content, reviewers also will examine style, structure, and length. Quality of expression is very important for conceptual articles. A provocative orientation that will stimulate further debate is also desirable. Articles should be understandable and interesting to all members of the Academy. Specialized argot and jargon should be avoided. Articles also should be written as concisely as possible without sacrificing meaningfulness, comprehensiveness or clarity or presentation. Manuscripts will not be evaluated against a predetermined page restriction. Within reason, length will be judged based on the scope and merit of the topic.

Manuscripts are considered with the understanding that their contents have not been published and are not under consideration elsewhere. Presentation of the manuscript at a professional meeting does not disqualify the paper from consideration. In fact, authors are encouraged to obtain informal feedback on their thinking from professional colleagues prior to formal submission. The purpose of a scholarly journal's editorial review process is not to give suggestions for refining general ideas; neither the interests of authors or the editorial review board are well-served by premature submission. It is expected that submitted papers will reflect an extensive developmental process involving several drafts based on thoughtful, informed critiques.

Submitted manuscripts should conform to the Academy of Management Review Style Guide for Authors, published in each January issue. Contributors should submit five clear copies of their manuscript (which will not be returned). Contributors normally will receive a decision within two to three months following submission.

All manuscripts should be sent to David A. Whetten, Editor, Academy of Management Review, 428 Commerce West, College of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Illinois, 1206 South 6th Street, Champaign, IL 61820.

AMR publishes reviews of current scholarly books of interest to members of the academy. These book reviews are solicited by the Book Review Editor, and unsolicited reviews are not likely to be published. Correspondence regarding book reviews should be sent to Walter R. Nord, AMR Book Review Editor, Graduate School of Business Administration, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130

TOWARDS A REDEFINITION OF OD: A CRITIQUE OF RESEARCH FOCUS AND METHOD

By Michael Beer

In my view the field of OD is dying. In the past twenty years, our focus on the OD consultant as the principal actor in the change drama, and our infatuation with intervention methods such as team building, survey feedback, role definition, inter-group meetings and confrontation meetings has caused the field to be less and less relevant to the central question of interest to managers and leaders. That question is why and how do organizations change and develop greater effectiveness? In the struggle to become more competitive, OD has offered little of substance and value to general managers.

Underlying the focus on the OD consultant and intervention methods is the assumption that these account for most of the variance in improved organizational effectiveness. It is assumed that intervention techniques developed by OD practitioners are the independent variable. Let me suggest that these methods, while perhaps marginally useful in organizing and facilitating change, are the dependent variable. That is, they are employed effectively only when organizations experience difficulties, when leaders exist who are motivated and skilled to lead change, and when leaders' values coincide with those of the consultant and the intervention method. In other words, the external environment and the internal organizational conditions that lead to the felt need for change, and the philosophy and

skills of managers are far more important than the intervention method. Yet this is not what we focus on in our research.

Driven by the "normal science" paradigm, research in the field attempts to evaluate intervention methods using before and after measures. To increase credibility with colleagues and to ensure promotion, quantitative methods and quasi-experimental designs are particularly valued.

Consider a recent study of team building applied in an experimental mine and withheld in a control mine. Numerous statistical manipulations of pre and post attitude, productivity and safety data were performed to no avail. Improvements could not definitely be attributed to the intervention. Nothing conclusive could be said given that there was a strike shortly after the change program started, the control mine closed half way through the study and there were significant management changes in the mine. The researchers mention these events, but nowhere consider that they may be more important than the team building intervention. The goals and objectives of the change program, from top management's point of view, were also not discussed. Might not these events be critical to understanding why the mine management undertook the change effort and why change is under way? Is not the existence of a change process more important than the its specific and immediate outcomes? Moreover, while the researchers interviewed personnel in the mine before designing the intervention, they did not utilize the diagnosis to design a change process nor did they report what people were experiencing, feeling and saying throughout the change process.

In short, research in the field does not attend to context and it does not attempt to describe the process of change over time, as Pettigrew has recently. Its focus on OD techniques causes research to miss the most important variables in organization change and development. Only clinical methods, interviews and participant observation can help us understand what is happening.

OD's fixation on a set of values that should govern the process and content of organization development has prevented a broader assessment of when such approaches are useful and beneficial and when their costs may not warrant such an investment. Convinced that our normative model is "right," we have not recognized that designing systems for collaboration and personal growth is an investment of time and money that must contribute to competitive advantage and/or employee well being. And the latter must be of value to labor markets, to unions or to

society for the investment to be justified.

OD is in need of redefinition. We must focus on the central question of why and how organizations change and develop, not on intervention techniques applied without understanding of the context that enables them to succeed or fail.

The most important question is why? In my experience, the existence of energy for change is the most important variable in accounting for the quality and quantity of change. Despite this we have done an inadequate job of documenting the forces that lead to change or how managers transform them into employee motivation to change. Indeed, a productive research direction is to begin classifying predictable cycles in organizational life and attendant forces for change. We should classify types of changes, such as those due to technology, strategic shift, turnaround and revitalization. We must learn more about what causes these types of changes to unfold more or less productively. This type of research will hopefully yield a contingency theory of change. Such a theory would specify alternative change strategies appropriate to an organization's stage of development or type of crisis. It would highlight the role of leaders and their relationship to other stakeholders in the change. Perhaps the role of consultants and intervention methods in these changes is worth studying, but it is a minor theme which must always be examined in the context of broader and more important variables.

Of course this type of research challenges us to specify what criteria we intend to use in judging the effectiveness of a change. Our criteria need to include both competitive performance and human resource investment. But always the emphasis must be on the long term.

The primary research methodology appropriate to this focus is not that of "normal science," which attempts to answer little questions precisely. Instead we should do broader longitudinal studies which answer more important questions less precisely. I suggest clinical, archival and participant observer methods across several companies. This will yield comparative case studies of organizations facing similar problems.

This transformation in research focus and method would redefine the field away from OD and towards "change and development of organizations," a topic of increasing importance to organizational leaders in a competitive world.

References:

Beer, M. & Walton E. "Organization Change and Development," Annual Review of Psychology, Annual Reviews Inc., Vol.38, 1987.

Pettigrew, A. The Awakening Giant: Continuity and Change in ICI. Oxford/New York: Blackwell, 1985.

WHERE HAVE ALL THE HEROES GONE?

By Alan M. Glassman

The objective of this brief note is to stimulate a much needed discussion among academicians and practitioners on a subject of emerging mutual concern; the current state of organization development. This note was prompted, in part, by the comment of a young colleague, who upon learning of the passing of Herb Shepard asserted, "I bet the initial apostles of OD are proud of the current status and condition of the field." I found myself wanting to disagree, vehemently.

It is generally agreed that OD had its beginnings in the early attempts to apply emerging behavioral science knowledge to groups and organizations. Indeed, any student of OD can cite the pioneering work of Kurt Lewin to our understanding of group processes and the techniques of group self-diagnosis and feedback, or the guidance provided by Leland Bradford and Kenneth Benne in establishing the National Training Laboratories and the use of T-groups and experiential type exercises to assess and learn from our own behavior, or Rensis Likert's efforts in the development of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan and the use of attitudinal studies and data feedback to participants as a means for problem identification and action planning. Closely related to these activities were the theoretical and organizational applications by Shepard, Blake, Mann, Trist, Bion and several others.

An inextricable component of both research and practice during these early years was an abiding concern for the individual, resulting in a "plea" for humanistic values in the workplace and the acceptance of systematic, planned change to meet both individual and organizational needs. Equally important, however, was an established willingness to explore new applications and to critically and openly examine/debate findings in public forums.

Under the aegis of these humanistic values, OD steadily expanded from the initial focus on process consultation, team-building, and T-groups to encompass such diverse technical and human resource areas as organization structure and work design, quality of work like programs, goal setting and strategic planning, reward systems, and career development. The works of Beckhard, Bennis, Dyer, Lawler, Schein, and several others during the 1960's and 70's provided the guidelines for practitioners.

During this period, OD confronted and overcame two major threats to its legitimacy. First, it was attacked as a simple extension of human relations theory, lacking any uniqueness. At professional meetings it was often criticized as a fad (similar to transactional analysis) and OD proponents were labeled as members of the "touchy-feely" school of management. Many of the individuals named above, as well as people such as Argyris, Burke, Greiner, Lippit, Margulies, and Tannenbaum, refused to be intimidated and continued to develop a body of literature around planned change and human systems that clearly established OD as a field worthy of additional attention. Central to these efforts was an internalized commitment to core values concerning the worth of individuals and a spirit of inquiry. Paraphrasing an "old" friend, "When people hurt, I hurt; first I need to know why, then I need to help."

Second, and more difficult to overcome, OD was degraded by respected management colleagues who cited the "softness of the field"; that is, the lack of empirical studies. Even after the Academy of Management approved the OD Division, many members of the more well established divisions frequently scoffed at the annual OD program for its "war-story mentality" and its seemingly endless discussion/examinations of single-case histories. Often forgotten were both the cross-fertilization that was occurring between OD academic/practitioners and "real world" managers and the excitement being generated among younger colleagues. In subsequent years, research and theoretical efforts bounded. The work of Armenakis, Cummings, Golembiewski, Goodstein, Pasmore, Porras, Vail, and many, many others contributed to the establishment of an accepted research base. Overtime, acceptance took place and, perhaps most important, in the early 1980's, OD became a standard course in many university management curriculum.

If this were the current state of OD today, I would agree with the earlier statement of my colleague. After all, it represented acceptance by the established order. I believe, however, that the field of OD faces a new crisis, and internal crisis. Simply stated, many of the emergent generation of OD academics/practitioners have become "master mechanics;" that is, they appear less concerned with people, less committed to inquiry and critique, and

much more interested in technique specialization. Two indicators of this phenomenon include:

(1) The increasing number of stories (always discussed informally) of articulate, aggressive OD consultants "selling" clients on canned approaches. And, while these new consultants are quite successful at implementing their canned approaches, we are all aware that they are often inappropriate for the clients' needs.

As an aside, a past chairperson of the OD Division told me that he finds himself attending fewer of the Division's sessions. He noted that this was due to the increasing narrowness of the topics and concluded that we are becoming more and more like the OB Division where everyone has their own little niche.

(2) At the beginners' workshops, often held at professional meetings, to acquaint newcomers with the intricacies and subtleties of practicing OD, participant questions most often focus on marketing techniques and billings. Indeed, it is not unusual for these two topics to dominate the discussion, as one well-known colleague commented after conducting a workshop, "I wonder if they really understand what OD is, what it means?"

From my perspective, it is becoming clear. The new practitioners of OD are focusing on the economics of the field and are not internalizing the values or ethics of OD.

In a recent article in *Organizational Dynamics*, Fitzgerald noted that the OD field seems to have an aversion to criticism and that the OD field is unwilling to examine itself. It is my contention, perhaps wrongly, that the field of OD, like many of our client organizations, is reluctant to engage in the difficult process of self-analysis. I suggest that the new heroes for OD will be heretics, those who question where we are and where we are going—those individuals who make us feel uncomfortable. I wonder if we are willing to risk such an examination. I would like to hear others' thoughts.