

Contents

[Call for Papers by Jean M Bartunek](#)

[Promise Not To Tell: Useful Guide for Consultants, or Snare and Delusion? by Robert T. Golembiewski](#)

[Articles by Members](#)

[Books by Members](#)

[News About Members](#)

[Team Building: A Microcosm of the Past, Present, and Future of O.D by William G. Dyer](#)

[Three-Star Cosmic Cultural Transformation: We Have to Start Meeting Like This! by Marvin R. Weisbord](#)

[Call for Papers: Journal of Organizational Change Management](#)

[ASTD Annual Research Grant](#)

Call for Papers

by Jean M Bartunek

The discussion in the OD business meeting at the 1988 Academy of Management raised several timely issues. These included: Where do organizational innovations come from? From OD practitioner or scholars or from other sources later to be adopted by OD? Is OD at the forefront of new understandings of organizational change (such as organizational transformation)? Or is it merely a set of techniques aimed at implementing other people's innovative ideas? What are the links between OD and strategy formulation, or between OD and technological change? Should OD be an integral component of executive education?

These issues all point to important concerns for our division. We invite you to address these concerns in papers and symposia that you submit to the OD division this year.

We also welcome proposals that address any topic within the domain of the OD division: the development of theory and innovative practice relevant to planned organizational change. Some possible topics are: change processes within organizations with or without assistance by change agents, active attempts to intervene in organizations to improve their effectiveness and scholarly studies of such interventions, the roles of change agents, and problems of self awareness, responsibility and the political consequences of OD theory and practice.

Finally we encourage submissions that deal in some way with the general theme of the 1989 Academy meeting, "the social consequences of management." How can OD scholarship and practice address social issues including (but not limited to the management of high risk technologies, occupational safety and health, the human cost of merger and acquisitions of the management of diversity in the workplace?

Following the pattern established in 1988, the OD Division will present a recognition award for the best paper submitted. The finalists will be the top six papers as determined by the ratings on the initial review for inclusion in the program and the winning paper will be selected by members of the executive committee using a blind review process.

Prior to the 1989 meeting, the Academy established a guideline allowing the divisions to accept about one third of the papers and symposia submitted. Both the number of papers accepted and the number of papers published in the proceedings depends on the number of papers submitted. Last year, while the number of symposia submitted to the OD division was about the same as the year before, the number of papers decreased. This lowered the number of submissions we could accept and publish.

Given the guidelines established by the Academy, we strongly encourage you to submit your best work to the OD division! All of it! (That is up to three total submissions, according to the policy published in the Academy newsletter). Your papers and symposia will be evaluated on the basis of their intellectual content and relevance for practice. Symposia will also be evaluated in terms of the extent to which they include specific designs for two-way communication between presenters and the audience during presentation. We recommend that you develop innovative formats for symposia. These might include both scholars and practitioners presenting material, debates on emerging topics of interest, extensive reports of major change projects and/or critiques of important writings.

The executive committee is interested in hearing your comments and suggestions regarding the OD program for the Academy. All submissions, responses, and questions concerning this year's program should be directed to me at the following address:

Jean M. Bartunek, Department of Organizational Studies, School of Management, Boston College, Chestnut Hill MA. 02167 617-552-4006. The deadline for papers and symposia submission is January 9, 1989.

Promise Not To Tell: Useful Guide for Consultants, or Snare and Delusion?

by Robert T. Golembiewski

The longer form of this argument appeared in Consultation (Spring 1986), and its title reflects my mixed reactions to conventional confidentiality. That title could refer to trustful sharing, but it really quotes a molester's entreaty to a child.

Two Kinds of Confidentiality

Why mixed reactions? Distinguishing two kinds of confidentiality and their effects helps explain those reactions.

1. **Absolute Confidentiality.** The dominant view of confidentiality share a basic kinship with the folk view of the confessional -- intimate materials shared between persons, with one party being specially ordained for the task, and with God as the only witness.

Most OD consultants support unrestricted confidentiality, over much of the range of consultation, and for credible reasons. Thus absolute confidentiality may encourage sharing materials necessary for a professional to help a client, or to help the client help themselves. Indeed, those materials may surface in no other way. National security issues also clearly require conventional confidentiality; "insider information" has to be tightly held, both legally and ethically; and some clients might have very strong preferences in this regard, just because.

Nonetheless, absolute confidentiality presents real problems. An extreme case involves an "imminent evil act," as in a client's failure to divulge a quality-control problem that endangers public health and safety. For such cases, some professions respect a "principle of required disclosure."

Even garden variety cases raise concerns about conventional confidentiality, moreover. More than once, I have been trapped by a "confidence." Witness the breathless disclosure that an executive's spouse was having serious problems that, at least potentially, made the executive a target for blackmail. The source declined to accompany me to the executive to discuss the situation, and moreover, noted he would deny the story if I revealed it. The reader can

ruminate on the several reasons why this "confidence" induced multiple-binds, and probably was intended to do just that. Elsewhere, I discuss five ways this "confidence" was seriously blocking. (1)

2. Restricted Confidentiality. My ideal is both more relaxed and energizing, and seems to me especially appropriate in mature consulting relationships. My ideal gets expressed in some such terms:

We can go absolutely confidential under explicitly-signaled conditions, but in general, I believe we'll both profit if you basically trust in my discretion concerning the possible and infrequent use of any information. Generally, I'll try to check with you before hand when I have the least doubt about using materials, or about whether and how the sources should be disguised.

But sometimes that will not be possible when I believe use of materials is not only prudent but urgent, and when the moment is not likely to be recaptured.

If that makes you nervous, let's talk about why.

Restricted confidentiality seems to me, particularly applicable in consultation in complex systems, which place a premium on quick reactions and where absolute confidentiality not only misses opportunities to be proactive, but also can be seriously counterproductive. The original source provides details, but here consider only a few advantages of restricted confidentiality and of the processes underlying them:

Restricted confidentiality implies working toward a sharper understanding by client and consultant -- a quality of careful and prudent awareness of the other, extending throughout the association.

Restricted confidentiality implies evermore comprehensive sharing of goals, strategies, and world-views between client and consultant, so that consultant interventions reflect increasingly informed choices.

Each of the choice-points for possibly "making it happen" -- as opposed to "letting it happen"-- can help keep the consultant alive, vital, and checking facts and interpretations. This will be the case even though a consultant seldom inclines toward "making it happen."

Facing choice about disclosure helps shape a greater precision about those things the client is being helped with and their several priorities.

Facing choice about disclosure helps the consultant avoid frustration with aspects of the role-- e.g., over scrupulosity in trying not to influence or control.

The choice-making can deepen trust between client and consultant, even as it tests trust.

The choice-making can serve as an important indicator of appropriate openness as well as a stimulant to it.

Some Factors Favoring Restricted Confidentiality

Despite this list of advantages, which might easily be extended, many intervenors seem to profess a significant degree of discomfort with "restricted confidentiality." Indeed, the reaction of one reader to the original article allowed that: "You will never work for me." In short, restricted confidentiality seems to be norm-breaking, as far as a substantial number of those involved in planned individual or systemic change are involved.

Now, I can only guess why such norms about "absolute confidentiality" exist, But I am quite certain that such norms have sharp limits, and especially so in complex systems and in mature consulting relationships. Five points provide useful detail.

First, consider the probable locus of "absolute confidentiality" -- personal counseling or therapy. There, one can argue that the benefits of absolute confidentiality far outweigh any costs. But even there, the issues are very far from settled. Consider a case from a college campus -- a case that is admittedly extreme, but which nonetheless raises issues that may extend to a range of cases even in one-to-one situations. A young man revealed to a university counselor/therapist that he had fantasized about harming a specific young woman, whom he had tracked in her daily coming-and-goings on campus and at her part-time job. The young man subsequently killed the woman in much the same manner as he had divulged in reports about his fantasy to the university employee.

That case is now in the courts, with the woman's parents contesting that the university employee should have warned authorities about imminent harm to their daughter. The university's position is that the employee should have

provided such information, but only if the employee were convinced of the probability that the young man would perform the violent act about which he fantasized and reported. The university employee had not come to such a conclusion, the courts have been informed.

Second, exact analogs of such a case are no doubt rare in organizational consultation, but I am convinced that the generic problem not only is encountered but will be more frequently encountered as OD intervenors and consultants play broad roles. I can recall several such situations in my own practice, and they occur several times a year. For example, I was in the office of the CEO of a pharmaceutical firm when a report of certain severe adverse reactions to one of their prescription medicines surfaced. The firm took quick affirmative action, and recalled the product, an action which forfeited many millions of dollars in annual sales. The individual and collective choices were clear to all, however, with both legislation and ethical considerations applying to a decision with significant economic impacts.

Third, much organization consultation is done by teams, and here "absolute confidentiality" can cause special mischief. What can be shared with one's fellow-consultants? Limitations on shared materials undercut the rationale for assembling a team, and especially where reasonable interpretations of data require specialized judgments by several individuals or groups.

I have on occasion, withheld data from fellow members of a consultant team at the unflinching insistence of disclosers, so I do not presume to argue that absolute confidentiality is never appropriate. On occasion, indeed, it may be vital. But these cases all involve difficult judgment calls, and are fraught with major implications for the character and consequences of specific consultative efforts and of the consultation team. (2)

Fourth, organizational dynamics can be quick-silvered and -- although one can be melodramatic about the point -- "magic moments" can occur that might never come again. Here, absolute confidentiality can be crippling, and especially in the case of an OD'er who really believes in and acts on the goal of linking separate and even antagonistic systems.

I can recall a few such cases of a dramatic nature, spotted over 20 years of consulting. So these cases are not ubiquitous, but they do exist and can be significant. Almost by definition, they occur in "mature consulting relationships" where the consultant has been around for a while, has the confidence of major actors, often from

several camps, and where the consultant knows the wrinkles of the policy and technical landscapes.

Fifth, norms associated with "absolute confidentiality" may be professed by some or many professionals involved in individual or systemic change, but the major set of guidelines applicable to their professional behavior contains no such requirement. The relevant Section E, "Define and Protect the Confidentiality of My Client-Professional Relationships," is perhaps best quoted in detail: (3)

1. Make limits of confidentiality clear to clients and participants.
2. Reveal information accepted in confidence only to appropriate or agreed-upon recipients or authorities. Implicit within "appropriate recipients" are professional colleagues when discussion with them is confidential and is compatible with the interest of our clients and informants.
3. Use information obtained during professional work in writings, lectures, or other public forums only with prior consent or when disguised so that it is impossible from my presentations alone to identify the individuals with whom I have worked.
4. Make adequate provisions for maintaining confidentiality in the storage and disposal of records, make provisions for responsibly preserving records in the event of retirement or disability.

References:

1. "A Critical View of "Confidentiality" in Consultation, Consultation, 5 (Spring, 1986) p. 75-76.
2. For details about one such consultation in which team a member was deliberately distanced from certain information known to two other members of the consulting team, see Robert T. Golembiewski and Ronald G. Fox, "Diagnosis, Design, and In-Process Adaptation in an R & D Organization," pp. 247-254, in Paul R. Mico, editor, Visions of Tomorrow, Actions of Today (Plainfield, N.J. Organization Development Network, 1980).
- 3 "A Statement of Values and Ethics for Professionals in Organization and Human System Development," p. 96, in Mark S. Frankel, editor, Values and Ethics in Organization and Human System Development (Washington, D.C.:

American Association for Advancement of Science 1987).

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Baburoglu, O.N. (1988). The Vortical Environment: The Fifth in the Emery-Trist Levels of Organizational Environments. Human Relations, 41(3), 181-210.

Harris, Marilyn E. & Walck, Christal. (1988). Managing Megasystem Transformation in the Ford Motor Company: Retrospective Retrieval of the Progress of Change. Consultation, 7 (2).

McLean, G.N. & Pakenham, Walsh S. An In-Process Model For Improving Quality Management Processes. Consultation 6 (3), 158-174.

Smith, Wayne. (in press). Rebuilding Morale in a Battered Industry: Applying a Recovery Strategy in Oil and Gas. Human Resource Planning.

Smith, Wayne. (in press) Steps to Improved Performance Counseling. Journal of Managerial Psychology.

Smith, Wayne. (in press) The Phillips Advanced Management Program: Changing to Meet the Times. Journal of European Industrial Training.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Beckhard, Richard and Harris, Reuben T. (1987) Second Edition Organizational Transitions: Managing Complex Change. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Boss, R. Wayne (1989). Organization Development in Health Care. Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley.

Burke, Warner W. (1988). Organization Development: A Normative View. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cummings, Thomas G. & Huse, Edgar F. (1989). Organization Development and Change. (4th ed.). St. Paul: West.

Dyer, William G. (1987). Team Building: Issues and Alternatives. (2nd ed.). Reading MA: Addison-Wesley

Fiedler, Frank E. & Garcia, Joseph E. (1987). New Approaches to Effective Leadership: Cognitive Resources and Organizational Performance. New York, NY. John Wiley & Sons.

Fox, William M. (1987). Effective Group Problem Solving. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gerstein, Marc S. (1987). The Technology Connection: Strategy and Change in the Information Age. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley .

Golembiewski, Robert T. (1988). Ideas and Issues in Organization Development: Circumscribing the Emerging Profession. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.

Golembiewski, Robert T. & Kiepper, Alan. (1988). High Performance and Human Cost: Public Sector Model of Organization Development. New York: Praeger.

Golembiewski, Robert T. & Munzenrider, Robert F. (1988). The Phase Model of Burnout: Developments in Concepts and Application. New York: Praeger.

Golembiewski, Robert T. (1989). Ironies in Organization: Consultant Competencies Plug Analytic Gaps. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.

Greiner, Larry E. & Schein, Virginia E. (1988). Power and Organization Development. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Keidel, Robert W. (1988). Corporate Players: Design for Working and Winning Together. New York: Wiley.

McLean, Gary N. & DeVogel, S.H. (eds.) (1988). The Role of Organization Development in Quality Management and Productivity Improvement. Theory to Practice Monograph Series, #2. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Training and Development.

Porras, Jerry I. (1987). Stream Analysis: A Powerful Way to Diagnose and Manage Organizational Change. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Quinn, Robert E. (1988). Beyond Rational Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, Edgar H. (1987). The Clinical Perspective in Field Work. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

Schein, Edgar H. (1987). The Art of Managing Human Resources. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schein, Edgar H. (1987). Process Consultation: Volume II. Lessons for Managers and Consultants. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

Schein, Edgar H. (1988). Process Consultation: Volume I. It's Role in Organization Development. (2nd ed.) Reading MA: Addison-Wesley

Tubbs, Stewart L. (1988). A Systems Approach to Small Group Interaction. (3rd ed.) New York: Random House 1988.

Walton, Richard E. (1987). Managing Conflict. (2nd ed.) Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weisbord, Marvin R. (1987). Productive Workplaces: Organizing and Managing for Dignity, Meaning, and Community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weiss, Dimitri (Ed.) (1988). La Fonction Ressources Humaines. Paris, Les Editions d'Organisation.

Woodman, Richard W. & Pasmore, William A. (Eds.). (1987). Research in Organizational Change and Development. Volume 1. Greenwich, CN.: JAI Press.

Woodman, Richard W. & Passmore, William A. (Eds.). (1988). Research in Organizational Change and Development. Volume 2. Greenwich, CN.: JAI Press.

Woodworth, Warner W., Meek, Chris & Dyer, W. Gibb. (1988). Managing by the Numbers. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Dr. Donald W. Cole was presented the 1988 Outstanding O.D. Consultant of the Year Award by the OD Institute.

Gary R. Frank has taken the Director of Organization Development position at Storage Technology Corporation.

Barbara Gray and other colleagues at Penn State have received a grant from the Hewlett Foundation to establish the Center for Negotiation and Conflict Research housed within the College of Business Administration.

Kathryn L. Goldman is now an Organization Development Consultant with Exxon Chemicals in Linden New Jersey.

Mark L. McConkie has been appointed the Acting Dean of the Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs Campus.

Team Building: A Microcosm of the Past, Present, and Future of O.D (1)

by William G. Dyer

Team building is undoubtedly the grandfather of all OD interventions, and if we examine the development of this important organization improvement activity, we will also see the shifts and alterations that have taken place in the OD field generally. Additionally, if we can assess what constitutes success or failure in team building programs, we may also determine those factors that will have similar impacts on other attempts to improve organizational processes and outputs.

Beginning of Team Building--an OD

OD is the offspring of the merging of two areas that combined in the late 1950's--management theory and management training. The great training innovation at that time was the T-group, which fathered most of what is involved in current team building. Under the sponsorship of NTL, many of those who were writing about management and creating management training and development programs came together and produced exciting new methods for improving management performance.

The theories of the time were all clearly saying that if managers and organizations were to improve, they needed to move from theory x to theory y or from 9-1 to 9-9 or from system 1 to system 4. The T-group was the new method that would show managers both how people might be able to create more personal, humanistic, people oriented system and at the same time, allow the manager-participant to see how his/her behavior actually affected others. So both the OD and team building orientations grew out of strong value oriented beginning-high concern for people and desire to create systems that strongly took people into account.

The early problems occurred when managers thought they could take the T-group method intact into the back home organization. This was often a failure--not because the values were skewed, but the assumptions of the Y-group did not fit the workplace. T-groups were conducted for people who were strangers and one could focus on here and now behavior since there was not group history. Work groups had a history and it was not clear how much of that background should be dealt with in the group sessions. It was also clear that work groups could not just look at interpersonal processes, which was the sine qua non of the T-group and most early OD activities. In the organization,

a department or work unit has goals to meet, deadlines and schedules to follow, and legitimate result-focused actions began to enter the group processes. Because of this shift, and the tainted reputation that T-groups had received, group facilitators and consultants began to identify their concern with "building teams--not just having a "touchy-feely" T-group session.

The general shift continued as people in the field of OD thought of themselves more as process consultants and not group trainers, and also became more sophisticated in work processes as well as interpersonal processes.

Conceptual Unclarity

While refinements were being made in the shift from T-groups to team building, it was also apparent that the conceptual models in the emerging OD field were not clearly focused. For example, when you see an OD or team building effort designed to help an organization move from theory x to y, are you trying to impact the total organization culture, or modify part of the management system? Systems theory was in vogue at the start of OD, but all of the recent work of culture was developed in the years after OD activities had been in place for some time. There is still some confusion regarding the thrust of OD--is it a method of changing the culture of an organization, or to modify something in the system?

McGregor seemed to have in mind the changing of the organization's culture for he wrote about the basic assumptions managers held and the fundamental assumptions in an organization are cultural building blocks. Also the theoretical orientations at the time, emphasized "management" as the central focus of the guiding, directing, motivating processes in organizations. Leadership which is such a popular buzz word today, has been examined in a series of studies at Ohio State, and the general feeling was that leadership was too broad and global to be useful in improving the performance of superiors. Some new dimensions have been added because of the recent research and writings on leadership but often the differences between management and leadership development are matters of semantics and not of substance.

Trends in Team Building and OD

If we look at the development of these two areas from the inception, the following trends seem to emerge:

1. A shift from individual and interpersonal dynamics to productivity, profits, and problem solving as discussed above.
2. A movement from being facilitator directed to being managed by managers. In both team building and OD programs early on, it was felt that a trained facilitator was needed to run the activities. Now there is strong emphasis on having the line managers the person responsible to conduct the activities although a facilitator may assist.
3. It was often described in the beginning efforts, that either team building or OD were events. One would hear someone say, "We die team building in January of 1978." Currently there is almost the mandatory emphasis that all of these change programs be seen as a process and not an event.
4. Movement from "canned" programs to devising the program after careful diagnosis. When the field was young, it was common for people to read about a successful team building or OD program someone had tried and then for others to indiscriminately try to duplicate the activity without determining if it fit the current situation. Now specialists are much more able to do careful diagnosis and they design the program to fit the special situation.

When Team Building and OD Efforts Are Successful

Having been involved in team building and organization change or development programs for thirty years, I have observed that the following conditions need to be present if the effort is to have some success.

1. High commitment from management and all those who are to be involved.
2. People who are involved need to have as much information in advance as possible as to what is to happen and why they will do what they are to do.
3. The program is connected to other parts of the organization, especially the evaluation and reward systems. If people cannot see their efforts in team building or OD will be rewarded, they lose motivation.
4. The effort needs to be managed by the line manager--assisted by facilitator if necessary.

5. The whole program is based on good diagnosis and the design is consistent with the conditions in the system.
6. There is commitment to carrying out a follow through phase or the program--it is not a one time event.
7. An evaluation is made regarding the impact of the program--this is more than asking people how they felt immediately following the activity.
8. People clearly see the connection between the program and the mission and goals of the organization.
9. The facilitator, if used, is clearly competent.

Both team building and OD have had a history of development and change. Their roots are based in a strong set of values around the worth of human beings. Since OD has had a somewhat tarnished reputation in some quarters, the title of change programs has changed. But whether the title is OD or quality of work life, organization excellence, organization improvement or somethin else, the matter of continually working towards improving the productivity and morals of people in human systems seems to be a continuing challenge.

References:

1 This article is a summary of William G. Dyer's presentation at the 1988 OD Division's Distinguished Speaker at the Academy of Management meeting in Anaheim CA.

Three-Star Cosmic Cultural Transformation: We Have to Start Meeting Like This! *by Marvin R. Weisbord*

In this article, I suggest a simple way to transform large bureaucracies. I propose to restructure company meetings. A dramatic cultural improvement will occur in any company that brings people together regularly, across many levels and functions for two or three days and manages the time for high interaction. Not now and then, or in a crisis, but regularly. Once a quarter has a nice ring to it. These needn't be add ons. They can be meetings people already have

anyway.

People complain they have too many meetings because they don't use their time well. Example: If 10 middle managers in Unit Q meet for three days with a common boss and decide something, then 12 more meetings are needed to implement their decision-with the boss's boss and peers and with each set of subordinates. No wonder it takes so long to do anything. If all were there together once a quarter, things would move.

This is not a brainstorm. It's based on my own experience since 1980 in managing reorganizations and the redesign of work in big companies. In these projects, several teams from many levels and functions--perhaps 60 people--work in the same room or facility on system-wide tasks--to create a new organization for Company A, or new work system for Factory B, or more responsive customer service for Company C, or more competitive use of new technology for Company D. It takes half a dozen two-day meetings over four to six months to make an implementable plan.

I started this all-levels-and-functions-into-the-water practice in response to client complaints about change taking too long, buy-in being too hard to get, decision-makers being too remote from the action. My practice is based on discovering economical democratic methods for organizing work and managing technology. Unless I can leverage a few consultants' time and reduce client dependence on outsiders, it is hard for me to help people realize their aspirations for dignity, meaning, community--those dimensions of corporate life that correlate with output, quality, and customer/employee satisfaction. These methods embrace anxiety and confusion, releasing energy as people take more initiative themselves. What happens during the mucking around phase is what attracts me. I have noticed unintended consequences in these project-events, solutions, major breakthroughs that were not "goals," not planned for nor anticipated. I have witnessed many unprecedented outcomes when a lot of people meet regularly across levels and functions. I can imagine these happening routinely.

McCormack & Dodge, the software developers, for example, discovered how to cut the time from idea to market from six months to a few weeks--within eight weeks of starting a reorganization planning exercise and long before a new organization design emerged. Soabar's order processing department figured out how to get orders into production in a day instead of 19. McNeil Consumer's Ft. Washington plant was on its way to a "paperless" factory soon after 50 people collectively had searched out and mounted on bulletin boards the 500 forms required to make various products. The paperwork had accumulated for decades. The discovery took a few weeks. Similar results are

reported in any systemic change-just-in-time inventory systems, for example, or "focused factories." These results can be accelerated, multiplied, and extended into unplanned (but essential) areas through the method propose.

If my hypotheses are right, these methods as ongoing management will achieve even better sustained results than the ad hoc, once-and-for-all way we use them now. My hypotheses are three. First, when people meet repeatedly across levels and functions to learn more about the whole contraption, they solve more problems quicker.

Indeed, they do better than task forces trained to make problem lists, prioritize, and knock off one issue at a time. It's synergy-more data available, more energy flowing, more possible combinations and discoveries, more links to the outside. There is more and better problem solving (first hypothesis) when the agenda is systems improvement rather than "problem solving!"

Second, between meetings, each person makes wiser everyday decisions no matter what their job is. They have learned (second hypothesis) how what they do affects everybody else.

Finally, because decision-makers and implementers are there (third hypothesis) people decide and commit in real time. Long before a new plan is made, quality improves, performance to plan and output go up, customer service gets better.

Oddly enough, hardly anybody notices anything unusual. When I ask people six months later to review what has happened, their first response is, "Oh we've hardly had time to implement anything." Their next response is a long list of major changes--increased sales, less turnover, lower costs, problems solved that astonishes them. When asked how come, they look blank.

For decades, OD's main function had been infusing common purposes-personal and organizational-into large enterprises. Interlocking team building, Floyd Mann's cascading survey feedback, Blake and Mouto's Grid OD, Dick Beckhard's inter-group mirror, Rensis Likert's "link pin" organization chart, Dale Zand's "collateral organization," Lawrence's and Lorsch's "integrator," Russell Ackoff's "circular organization,"--all are intended to integrate functions by building trust, responsibility, and commitment within the whole. This trick becomes harder to pull off one unit at a time in companies swamped by permanent white water--fast, unpredictable change.

I won't tell you whom to invite to these mass meetings. When clients ask, I say "Everybody." After they tell me that's preposterous, we conclude that maybe 50 or 100 is practical--the top three or four levels. Potential agendas are infinite. In Productive Workplaces I describe a "future search" conference that embodies my idea. There are even simpler formats. One is to give each main function--R&D, operations, sales, finance, personnel--two hours to use any way they want with the others. Invite customers and suppliers. I promise you some important, electric outcomes.

I believe any gutsy leader can pull off a low cost, high impact cultural transformation this way if a critical mass of managers agree to a one-year trial as follows:

a. Cut out one-way segments. Ask people to interact in small groups after every speech to collect their thoughts, ask questions, and express opinions. Many people (I'm one) don't know their own reactions until they start thinking out loud. I don't know right off what to ask the speaker. After a two-minute conversation with my neighbor, I usually find out.

b. Combine one-level and/or one-function off-site meetings into "3x3's"--at least 3 functions and 3 levels every time. That's the minimum, not the max. For instance, instead of 11 project manager meeting, have each bring four others with stake in their work. The 11 might still meet alone, but for three hours at the start and three hours at the end, not two whole days. The rest of the time, they interact with others in various groups. Have their bosses there for a half day too.

c. Structure it so that people meet in various configurations--as a total group, by function, by level, and in self-selected groups. Think of a corporate fugue, interweaving themes and functions.

Think of regular events. If I know I'm going to spend three days with P, Q, and R, I can save up my issues and resolve them. When such place doesn't exist, play telephone tag, organize a zillion task forces and always feel vaguely--no matter what the agenda--that the wrong people are in the room. That's it.

Here's what will happen:

1. People will solve day-to-day problems previously considered insolvable.

2. New, more practical policies will emerge and be implemented because the decision-makers are there.
3. Information will spread faster and be more accurate.
4. People will make wiser, faster decisions.
5. Cycle times to do anything will be shortened.
6. Frustration with meetings will decrease.
7. New technologies will be implemented faster.
8. Costs will be reduced.
9. Marketing and technical breakthroughs will be made.
10. People at all levels will achieve more control of their work and higher trust and influence with each other.

If any six of the above happen, you have at least a three-star cosmic cultural transformation on the OD meter. My plan requires no weird programs, training, jargon, charismatic speakers, hoopla, or extra costs. Least of all, does it require explicit exhortations to cultural change-- a sure-fire resistance generator. When an organization brings many people together regularly across levels and functions, for two days to do business with each other that they want and need to do anyway, that culture is improving dramatically.

If it's that simple, why doesn't everybody do it? Because it's not easy to overcome our Darth Vader complex--the widespread belief that people's careers are dead if they say anything honest or meaningful with their boss's boss in the room. The only way to test that--and get over it--is to start meeting like this!

CALL FOR PAPERS: JOURNAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT

The Journal of Organizational Change Management is a blind-review state-of-the-art journal in change and intervention processes. Both conceptual and empirical articles will be published on a variety of topics such as: organization development, quality of work life, organizational behavior modification, and consultation methods. The inaugural issue to be published in July, 1988 contains articles by Newt Margulies and Tony Raia. Sue Mohrman and Ed Lawler. Chet Schrieshein and Donna Cooke. Helen Taylor, Cary Cooper. Fred Luthans and others. The Editorial Board includes Chris Argyris, (Harvard), Warner Burke, (Columbia) Tom Cummings, (USC), Alan Filley, (Wisconsin-Madison), Wendell French, (Washington), Frank Friedlander, (Fielding Institute), Steve Kerr, (USC), Ralph Kilmann, (Pittsburgh), Ed Lawler, (USC), Craig Lundberg, (Cornell), Charles Margerison, (IMCB), Newt Margulies, (California-Irvine), Greg Odham, (Illinois), Tony Raia, (UCLA), Chet Schrieshein, (Miami), and others. Articles for publication consideration are welcome and should be submitted in triplicate (following AP guidelines) to: Larry E. Pate, Editor Journal of Organizational Change Management, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA. 9008-1421.

ASTD ANNUAL RESEARCH GRANT

American Society For Training and Development Organization

PURPOSE: To foster original research in the broad field of organization development, the ODPPA has established \$2,400 (\$1,200 on acceptance and \$1,200 on completion) grant plus \$600 for travel expenses to the 1990 ASTD national conference where the results will be presented in a concurrent session. Our membership is made up of practitioners and more concerned with application than theory generation.

CRITERIA: The executive committee will evaluate each proposal based on the clarity of writing and thinking plus the proposed topics: (1) originality (2) usefulness for the membership (3) fit with the strategic direction of ASTD (4) study methodology (5) timeliness for the field.

PROPOSAL FORMAT: We are not looking for lengthy proposals and a review of related research. Each proposal should succinctly cover: rationale, purpose, methodology, expected outcomes/applications of the findings, and the qualifications of the researcher(s). We do not expect this to take more than a total of 4 - 5 pages.

SUBMISSION: Deadline for submission is March 31, 1989. Send these to: Matt M. Starcevich, Ph.D., Director, Center For Management and Organization Effectiveness, P.O. Box 2505, Bartlesville, Ok. 74005.