

Contents

[A Diverse 1992 Program by Luke Novelli](#)

[Some Thoughts on Organization Development in Transition by Susan Albers Mohrman](#)

[Articles By Members](#)

[Books By Members](#)

[News About Members](#)

[Announcements](#)

[Call for Papers: Journal of Engineering and Technology Management](#)

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

[The Internal Practice of OD:An Investigation of Large Industrial Organizations by Gary C. McMahan](#)

A DIVERSE 1992 PROGRAM

by Luke Novelli, Jr.

The Academy of Management meetings will be held in Las Vegas, August 9-12, 1992. This year's program contains significant diversity, bringing together a variety of perspectives for addressing organization development and change related issues.

Several excellent symposia will be presented. There are three "showcase sessions" that were designed around the conference theme. Jay Barney will chair a session that focuses on managing diversity at Texas Instruments. Ann Morrison has convened a panel of presenters that will address diversity related best practices among progressive companies. Dave Boje and Bob Gephart will focus their session on the challenges Postmoderism offers to understanding organizational issues.

One symposium asks the question "Is Theory in Organizational Behavior Useful? Discussion and Debate on Contemporary Issues," (Bill Pasmore, chair). Another deals with "Modeling the Dynamics of Transformation: Complexity, Chaos, and Drastic Change in Organizations," (Frank Dubinskas, chair). We will have an opportunity to

be self-reflective as a division in the session "Four Score and Eight Years of Academy Meetings: Reflections on Designs for the Next Century," (Kim Boal, chair). A current issue will be addressed by "Potential Academic Contributions to Total Quality Management," (David Waldman, chair). "Research in Organizational Change and Development: A Conversation with Authors," (Dick Woodman & Bill Pasmore, chairs) will be a highly interactive session that has been very successful in the past.

The program includes three paper sessions and a poster session. One paper session focuses on model based implementation strategies, a second on the "dark side" of the diversity issue, and the third on assessing the impact of OD interventions. The paper session chairs and discussants have been asked to use their imagination and creativity to develop innovative session designs. We are hoping to create a more learningful setting, for both presenters and the audience, than is normally the case with paper sessions.

The poster sessions are an Academy innovation for this year's program designed to give people an opportunity for meaningful interactions with authors around specific common-interests. T. R. Schumacher will examine "Changing Organizational Culture with Simulation Experience." Anne Reilly, Jeanne Brett and Linda Stroh will address "The Impact of Corporate Turbulence on Employee Attitudes." Dennis Turner and Michael Crawford will explore the "Competencies for the Achievement of Value Creating Change."

The division business meeting will be held from 5:15-6:15 on Monday, August 10, followed by the social hour. Please plan on attending so that you can voice your preferences and concerns about division issues and direction. The Best Paper Award, which carries a \$500 prize sponsored by the Journal of Organizational Change Management, will be announced at the business meeting.

There are several preconvention activities and a post convention workshop. We are jointly sponsoring the doctoral student consortium with OMT and OB. Bob Quinn is the division representative for designing this event. As in the past, Rupe Chisholm and Max Elden have organized a workshop entitled "Varieties of Action Research and Change: An International Exchange of Views and Praxis." This session is primarily a networking activity that seeks to promote information sharing, knowledge exchange and building links for possible joint research. Mark Michaels will present a workshop on, "The Chaos Paradigm: Applying Complex Systems Theory to Organizations." Mark will provide an experiential exercise, explore applying chaos theory to ongoing processes of change within systems and elaborate

the implications for leadership. Since the number of workshop participants is limited, please contact the organizer (Rupe Chisholm [717]948-6052 & Mark Michaels [217]328-0032 x14) to preregister for a workshop. "Feedback on Sources of New Ideas for Action Research and Empowering Work: An International Perspective," is a postconvention workshop (R.J. Bullock, organizer) that has been designed as a follow-up to the preconference session.

I express my sincere thanks the following people for their timely and thorough efforts in the review process for this year's meetings: Achilles Armenakis, Auburn University; Frank Barrett, Naval Postgraduate School; Jean Bartunek, Boston College; David Bednar, University of Arkansas; Dave Boje, Loyola-Marymount University; James Bowditch, Boston College; Donald Bowen, Tulsa University; Tony Buono, Bentley College; Gervase Bushe, Simon Fraser; James Cashman, University of Alabama; Tom Cummings, University of Southern California; Joel DeLuca, Coopers & Lybrand; Evelyn Dravecky; Robert Golembiewski, University of Georgia; Susan Hocevar, Naval Postgraduate School; Phillip Hunsaker, University of San Diego; Marty Kaplan, Kaiser Permanente; Craig Lundberg, Cornell University; Barry Macy, Texas Tech University; Newton Margulies, UC - Irvine; Fred Massarik, UCLA; Marion McCollom, Boston University; Michael McCuddy, Valparaiso University; Gary McMahan, Texas A&M University; Chris Meek, Brigham Young University; Monty Mohrman, University of Southern California; Walter Nord, University of South Florida; Anthony Raia, UCLA; Lee Robbins, Philadelphia School of Textiles & Science; Peter Robertson, University of Southern California; Ronald Sims, College of William and Mary; Robert Steele, Air Force Institute of Technology; Daniel Swantek, University of Akron; Glenn Varney, Bowling Green State University; Frances Viggiani, Cornell University; Gordon Walter, University of British Columbia; Don Warrick, University of Colorado; Kennard Wing, Interact; Robert Zawacki, University of Colorado

SOME THOUGHTS ON ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT IN TRANSITION

by Susan Albers Mohrman

I consider it as good fortune to have joined the Executive Committee of the Organization Behavior Division three years ago at a time when it was recognizing the need to reexamine the mission and condition of the division. We were concerned that at a time when organizations and their environments were undergoing fundamental change, and the need for development of organizational capabilities was approaching emergency proportions, our division was showing sign of stagnation. Submissions to the annual meeting were down, presence in research journals was

arguably low, and very few Ph.D. candidates identified themselves as being concerned with Organization Development. Rumblings could be heard: The division was losing the excitement of the early days of the field; it needed intellectual stimulation; it wasn't dealing with relevant pressing issues; and it was losing sight of its roots. A great deal of the academic work being done to understand organizational change was being conducted, presented and discussed in other divisions, much of it not finding its way into O.D. despite obvious or potential applicability to the development of organizations.

Perhaps this questioning was in part the routine intellectual exercise regimen of a field that delights in introspection and self-criticism, and that truly believes its own strictures concerning growth and development. As the executive committee set out on a series of small developmental steps, using business meeting time to discuss future directions, one had a bit of a sense of patient indulgence from our more experienced colleagues--those who may have led the division through similar self-examination activities in years past. The dialogue may not have changed: Are we selling our soul in search of rigor? Are we relevant? Are we rigorous enough? Are we sticking to the principles that were the foundation of our field? Is this a field? Do we still have a common foundation? As we look around the room, do we see any of the diversity that constitutes the landscape of today's organizations? Perhaps these same questions still echo in meeting rooms of years past.

Some changes are occurring, and it would warm the cockles of my heart to believe that they are developmental and adaptive and not superficial and cosmetic. For I have come to believe that Organization Development is in transition, reflecting that undeniable reality that the world which we study and in which we operate is posing new challenges, old challenges in new contexts, and challenges with an urgency that is truly alarming. I don't know if any of the changes that have been advocated will make a difference in the capability of the division to contribute to our ability to deal with these forces, but I'm personally energized by these directions.

Two years ago we became the Organization Development and Change division, reflecting the recognition that planned change and development is but one aspect of the relevant change domain. Powerful forces had been unleashed by the development of the global economy, the giant advances in the capabilities of telecommunications and cybernetic technologies, and the changing demographics and values of the work force and society. The processes and techniques of O.D. have constituted the methods of a field trying to help organizations more effectively achieve their mission in a manner that facilitates the growth, development and fulfillment of organizational

members and the ongoing development and adaptation of the organization. The use of these tools was increasingly intertwined with the tidal wave of forces emanating from the environmental changes and including changes to structure, systems, composition and ownership. These could overnight remove from people's consciousness all vestiges of the good will, collaborative orientation and sense of commitment to development that stemmed from even the best and most comprehensive utilization of team building, inter-group and third party conflict resolution, work redesign, and other O.D. techniques.

Other groups, particularly the Organization Theory Division, were busy examining these contextual change issues, and dealing with the theory and tools of strategic change and organizational design. The challenge of relevance for the Organization Development and Change Division is to meld these focuses. Yesterday's issues of human development, alignment, collaboration, and planned change are also today's and tomorrow's issues--but they are now wrapped more ominously. Psychological contracts and the tenuous social balance have been shattered, as organizations respond to threats to their own survival by downsizing, flattening, reorganizing and greatly increasing the expectations they place on employees--measures that have the potential to collide with concurrent emphases on growth and development of capability. Organizations are trying to transform themselves, creating an exciting and challenging time for practitioners and students of change, and a time of high stakes for organizations and the people who populate them.

The division has emphasized increasing the infusion of other disciplines into our programs and thinking. The change domain described above is beyond full comprehension by any one discipline or school of thought. The effective purposeful development of organizations in today's world will require increasing partnership of people with multiple perspectives and knowledge bases. Scholars and practitioners of O.D. can and must scan the academic horizon for perspectives and knowledge that can inform organizational development. In the past years, we've seen the application of such perspectives as social cognition theory, chaos theory, a revisiting of general systems theory in support of the development of the learning organization, an extension of socio-technical theory to accommodate knowledge work and information technology, and the exploration and application of the competing values framework as a way of understanding and developing organizations. An emergent focus on spiritual issues reflects the deep and often painful human manifestations of changes in the underpinnings of communities and organizations. These are examples of the intellectual advances that can enrich our frameworks to better grasp the complexity of the domain.

The division is making strides toward adapting to the reality of the global economy and global organizations. A divisional network of international members has been nurtured through pre-conference workshops and built on the personal networks of division members. Multi-cultural and international applications of organizational development are increasingly represented in division submissions. We need much more progress in this area. The challenges of globalization provide ideal arenas for the further development of theory and practice of development and change. Among other things, a truly integrated worldwide economy will provide the ultimate test ground for what it means to effectively "manage" diversity -- can it be nurtured or will a gradual homogenization occur? Can it be productively blended or is conflict and miscommunication inevitable?

As a division we are moving toward a greater melding of our O.D. heritage with complementary ways of understanding and introducing change. We have seen ongoing and perhaps increasing division member concerns with strategy and strategic change; an expansion in focus on organization design; and a renewal of focus on the merging of technological change with all of the above. Scholars concerned with the development of organizations can no longer afford to be concerned solely with process. As we become more comfortable operating in the domain of macro change, our tools must reflect the complexity of the macro system.

Certainly the techniques and knowledge bases that are our historical underpinnings are still relevant. The post World War II concerns that underlay early work are still with us: Concern for creating communities of people who can work together despite differences, and where the individual is valued at the same time that the community thrives. The wrenching changes that we are experiencing make these issues more, not less, important. One need only look to the challenges being faced in Eastern Europe, South Africa, the erstwhile Russian republics, and the third world to find confirmation of their importance.

In fact, the need for our tools and knowledge is so broad and deep that the challenge for the field is to diffuse them broadly. To deal with the bigger change context, these skills must be pervasive. The job of the manager of the next decade will be to develop organizations--to design and develop capabilities of diverse populations in a rapidly changing context. The mandate of our field must include the education of organizations to apply our frameworks and tools--to find the effective educational approaches to move the system away from dependence on "O.D. experts" and toward the capability to self-design and self-develop.

I don't know whether the small steps taken by our division in the last three years to examine our mission and attempt to adapt to today's context will have a lasting impact. Personally, however, being part of a process of thinking about these issues has resulted in a new understanding of the transitional issues we are facing and a challenge to my own personal development. I carry away several lessons which are compelling to me, given my interest in the design and development of knowledge work settings. I also believe these lessons apply more generally to the mission of our division. Thus, I suggest the following:

1. We must search for new allies who can complement and expand our own capabilities to address the development needs of organizations. These partners must extend beyond the specialties currently housed in the Academy. The design of our organizations, for example, is inextricably linked to economic and financial frameworks, to accounting practices, labor relations laws and practices, and to sociological and political economic realities. Human development in organizations does not occur independently of the larger community; design solutions can be informed by fields such as community and urban development that have frameworks and methodologies for inter-organizational systems. The field of O.D. may need to start thinking of itself as an integrator of knowledge bases--not different from the increasing cross functional integration that is becoming the life blood of organizations.

2. We must keep looking for new concepts, theories and frameworks to enrich our understanding of development and change in today's increasingly interconnected world. In my own work, I owe a debt for borrowed concepts that have given me leverage on the phenomena I seek to understand. For example, Cal Pava's notion of "deliberation" has helped me grasp the essence of knowledge work. Charles Savage's concept of the "virtual organization" has provided a way to think about the issues of organization teams in which interdependent contributors span continents and yet operate in an organized manner. The total quality movement has made salient the extremely powerful notion of "process management"--a concept that is enabling some organizations to consider quite radical shifts in the way they are organized. We need to be on the lookout for and actively embrace concepts that can provide us leverage in developing theory and practice of organizational development and change.

3. We must place a high priority on finding new modes of delivery that can make organization development tools and techniques part of the everyday life of organizations that are besieged with the need for development. Work on developing the learning organization fits this category. My work with Tom Cummings on self-designing organizations has had this intent. But we need to go much further in distilling our understanding of organizational change and

development to its essence and packaging this knowledge in a way that is useful and usable by organizational members in designing and developing their own organizational units. Individuals need help to design their own careers, given the constantly shifting landscape of organizations. With no signs in sight that the environment is approaching a new stability, the key development task of organizations and its members is to develop the capability to change themselves in anticipation of and response to their context.

I do believe that our field is in the midst of a developmental transition. We are in the process of assimilating and accommodating deeper and more expansive understandings of organizations that are themselves becoming increasingly embedded in a complex interconnected global political economy. The work of the division is to become a forum in which that development can occur and that transition can be facilitated.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Grant, R., Krishnan, R., Shani, A.B. & Baer, R. (in press). In Praise of Appropriate Technology. Sloan Management Review.

McCormick, Donald W. (1992). Assessing Learning and Practice in Prior Learning: The Issues. Council for Adult and Experiential Learning News, 151, p. 11.

McCormick, Donald W. (1991). Issues in Assessing Theory and Practice in Prior Learning. Adult Assessment Forum, 1(3), 8.

McCormick, Donald W. (1990). The Painful Emotions of Prior Experiential Learning Assessment. Adult Learning, 2(2), 26-28.

Shareef, Reginald. (1990). Training: QWL Programs Facilitate Change. Personnel Journal, 69(9), 58-61.

Shareef, Reginald. (1991). Ecovision: A Leadership Theory for Innovative Organizations. Organizational Dynamics, 29(1), 50-62.

Shareef, Reginald. (in press). Understanding Strategic Transformations in Public Organizations. In James L. Perry (Ed.), Research Issues in Public Administration. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Smith, Kenneth E. & McCormick, Donald W. (1992). Translating Experience Into Learning: Facilitating the Process for Adult Students. *Adult Learning*, 3(5), 22-25.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Cooper, Cary L. & Cartwright, Susan. (1992). *Mergers and Acquisitions: The Human Factor*. Oxford, England: Butterworth Heinemann Books.

Davidson, Marilyn & Cooper, Cary L. (1992). *Shattering the Glass Ceiling: Women into Management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishers.

Hemphill, P.D. & McCormick, Donald W. (1991). *Business Communications*, 4th Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lan, J. & Shani, A.B.(Rami). (1992). *Behavior in Organizations: An Experiential Approach*, 5th Ed. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Pestoff, Victor A. (1991). *Between Markets and Politics, Co-operatives in Sweden*. 7, New York: Westview.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Abraham B. (Rami) Shani has been invited to spend a year as "Visiting Research Professor" at the Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm, Sweden. (July, 1991-July, 1992).

ANNOUNCEMENT

Submissions for the Richard D. Irwin/Procter & Gamble Outstanding Paper award are due June 1, 1992. A plaque and \$1,000 accompany the honor and prestige of this award. The procedures for submitting a paper related to health, safety and environmental risk management can be obtained by contacting either: (a) Mark C. Butler, College of Business Administration, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 92182 (619/594-1573) or (b) Donna E. Ledgerwood, College of Business Administration, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203 (214/306-2345 or Fax 214/306-6789).

The International Journal of Organizational Analysis will publish a 1994 Symposium on World-Wide OD, under the editorship of Robert T. Golembiewski. Feel free at any time to discuss potential contributions with the editor: Robert T. Golembiewski, Department of Political Science, Baldwin Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, (404) 542-2970. The closing date for the first submission of all manuscripts is October 1993. Share your work about the world--conceptual, empirical research, or experiential, or all three--with the world!

CALL FOR PAPERS: JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, JET-M

JET-M is an international refereed quarterly outlet for scholarly research at the cutting edge of the interdisciplinary field of technology and innovation management. Published contributions range from conceptual, theoretical, empirical work, and field research-based reports to case studies, research notes and book reviews. The journal covers a broad spectrum of topics ranging from R&D management, project management, product technology management to process technology management, information technology management, technological entrepreneurship, and technological forecasting. Significant features include: a short lead time of 4-6 weeks, a double-blind review process, and a maximum distribution and impact through Elsevier's extensive world-wide network. JET-M is abstracted/indexed in ABI/INFORM, CAD/CAM Abstracts, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, Consultants' Report, Current Contents, Engineering Index, INSPEC, Management Contents, Social Science Citation Index, Technical Education Abstracts. Four copies of manuscripts should be submitted to: Dr. Michael K. Badawy, Editor-in-Chief, JET-M Graduate School of Business, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2990 Telestar Court, Falls Church, VA 22042 USA, (703) 698-6092.

CALL FOR PAPERS: JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT INQUIRY

The Journal of Management Inquiry is a new refereed journal that will provide a forum for creative publication within the fields of Management and Organization.

Each quarterly issue will present provocative, exploratory and inquisitive scholarship on a range of non-traditional research and practice. Contributions are encouraged for all of the following sections:

Essays articles that carefully explore, clarify and assess potentially significant managerial ideas, issues and practices.

Reflections from Experience cases that inquire into and provide learning from the many facets of organizational experience.

Reviews critiques of fiction and nonfiction expression--books, movies and speeches--with insights for managing and theorizing.

Non-Traditional Research new ideas, and examples of new thinking, about the discovery and extension of knowledge for improving management and organization.

Meet the Person interviews with diverse individuals whose personal stories and exciting thinking contribute to our field.

Dialogue active conversation between two or more persons concerning differing points of view, practices, theory and modes of inquiry.

The Journal of Management Inquiry will be informative and stimulating to those dedicated to exploring ideas and building knowledge in management and organization.

Contributors are encouraged to contact the editor-in-chief for a copy of the Manuscript Specifications. Manuscripts should be sent in quadruplicate and conform to the style manual of the American Psychological Association (third edition). Contributions can vary in length, depending on the section submitted to. The title page should indicate the appropriate section, and all identifying information should be restricted to this page. Submission to the Journal of

Management Inquiry implies that it hasn't been published elsewhere, nor is it under consideration by another journal. Send manuscripts to: Thomas G. Cummings, Journal of Management Inquiry, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089-1421.

THE INTERNAL PRACTICE OF OD: AN INVESTIGATION OF LARGE INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

by Gary C. McMahan

The purpose of this article is to share information recently gathered from a survey of the Fortune 500 industrials with regard to the practice of OD within their firms (McMahan & Woodman, in press, June 1992). We begin by presenting some rationale for conducting the study.

There are two major groupings for what we call the practice of OD. The first group is what is referred to as the external practice. Here, the practice of OD is lead by a change agent/consultant who is not a direct member of the client organization. External consultants are entrepreneurs of OD services and operate from a contract to provide these services. The second group is the internal practice of OD. This practice is lead by a change agent/consultant inside, and under the direct employ of, the client organization. This role dichotomy appears frequently in the OD literature (e.g. Burke, 1982; Case, Vandenberg, & Meredith; Cummings & Huse, 1989). However, as an area of inquiry, we probably know more about the practice of external OD and than we do about the internal practice. Upon reflection, this is not surprising since much of the literature (certainly not all) is written by external consultants, academic researchers, and other writers who are outside the direct employ of the client organizations.

Few studies have explored the world of internal change agents. Case et al. (1990) included 50 internal change agents in a survey that examined differences in values and intervention use between external and internal change agents. As part of their study on the marginal orientations of the change agent role, Browne, Cotton, and Golembiewski (1977) obtained data from 246 internal OD practitioners. Some of the 65 OD experts used by Shepard and Raia (1981) as a Delphi panel to predict the future of the OD profession were internal practitioners. Most recently, Fagenson & Burke (1990) reported on the predictions of OD practitioners. A sample of primarily internal practitioners generated lists of activities they thought they would engage in at the turn of the century. While other examples could be cited, respondents to survey research published in the change and development area seem more likely to be external rather than internal OD practitioners. In addition, scholarly reviews of the field (e.g.,

Beer & Walton; Porras & Silvers, 1991; Sashkin & Burke, 1987; Woodman, 1989) that serve to identify cutting edge issues, document developments in theory and practice, and summarize empirical research, may well have an "external practice bias." That is, typically neither the review authors nor the researchers and consultants whose change efforts are reviewed are internal practitioners.

Thus, a basic premise underlying this study is that it would be valuable to begin to develop a data base regarding the internal practice of OD. What are firms currently doing when they think they are doing OD? Does the literature, which would seem to provide an external practice lens through which to view the field, accurately portray the internal practice of OD? These are the types of questions which prompted us to survey the Fortune 500 with regard to their OD activities.

Based on completed questionnaires from 110 (22%) of the Fortune 500 industrials (including 61 of the top 200 firms), this study suggests that the internal practice of OD may be somewhat different than the more commonly understood external OD practice. The internal practice of OD, as represented by 110 large industrials, can be described as an activity at the corporate level of the organization which is located within the Human Resources group. Typically, the director or manager of corporate OD reports to the VP of Human Resources. This lead OD professional, who operates in a dual role of supervisor and active consultant, has a relatively small staff of less than 10 full-time consultants or professionals. The ideal OD consultant or professional would have an advanced degree in addition to significant consulting and/or business experience.

The 110 industrials described 34.5% of their OD services as human processual interventions. The remaining OD activities and services provided include system-wide interventions (28.7%), technostructural interventions (16.9%), and strategic planning interventions (15.7%). There seems to be a significant amount of time dedicated to individual and group level interventions in what could be called traditional OD services. However, when compared to past research (e.g. Golembiewski, Proell & Sink, 1982), we conclude that there has been a gradual shift toward increased whole system change activities during the past decade. Also, the categorization scheme developed to group the various types of interventions was quite successful based on participant responses.

The internal OD function provides 74% of all OD services to the organization. External consultants are used for the remaining 26% of OD services. The external professional provides a wide range of services from one-shot

interventions to complex system-wide change processes.

The internal practice of OD is further characterized by a lack of involvement in operations outside of the United States and Canada. Although approximately 80% of the 110 large industrials had facilities outside of the U.S. and Canada, only 43% of internal OD functions provide services to international operations.

A content analysis of critical issues facing the internal practice of OD yielded seven clear items that deserve research attention. These critical issues include managing change (speed, complexity and acceptance), culture and diversity, outcome measurement, strategy and planning, leadership development, work group development, and quality improvement.

On balance, the state of internal OD practice seems to be well established and reasonably effective in these 110 large industrial organizations. Over 80% of the responding firms classified their internal OD function as being effective contributors to their respective organization. Therefore, the practice of OD inside these large industrials is alive and well and worthy of further exploration.

REFERENCES

Beer, M. & Walton, A.E. (1987). Organization change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 339-367.

Browne, P.J., Cotton, C.C., & Golembiewski, R.T. (1977). Marginality and the OD practitioner. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 13, 493-506.

Burke, W.W. (1982). *Organization development: Principles and practices*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Case, T.L., Vandenberg, R.J., and Meredith, P.H. (1990). Internal and external change agents. *Leadership & Organization Development*, 11, (1), 4-15.

Cummings, T.G. & Huse, E.F. (1989). *Organization development and change*, 4th ed.. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Fagenson, E.A. & Burke, W.W. (1990). The activities of organization development practitioners at the turn of the decade of the 1990's: A study of their predictions. *Group & Organization Studies*, 15, 366-380.

Golembiewski, R.T., Proell, C.W., & Sink, D. (1982). Estimating the success of OD applications. *Training and Development Journal*, April, 86-95.

McMahan, G.C. & Woodman, R.W. (in press, June 1992). The current practice of organization development within the firm: A survey of large industrial corporations. *Group & Organization Management* (formerly *Group & Organization Studies*).

Porras, J. & Silvers, R. (1991). Organization development and transformation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 42, 51-78.

Sashkin, M. & Burke, W.W. (1987). Organization development in the 1980's. *Journal of Management*, 13, 393-417.

Shepard, K. & Raia, A. (1981). The OD training challenge. *Training and Development Journal*, 35, (4), 90-96.

Woodman, R.W. (1989). Organizational change and development: New arenas for inquiry and action. *Journal of Management*, 15, 205-228.