

Contents

[Call for Papers: Embracing Diversity by Luke Novelli](#)

[Books By Members](#)

[News About Members](#)

[The Purpose and Vision of OD by William Gellerman](#)

[Positive-Findings Bias in OD Research by Darryl R. Roberts and Peter J. Robertson](#)

[What is Total Quality Management and How Does It Relate To OD? by Marshall Sashkin and Kenneth J. Kiser](#)

CALL FOR PAPERS: EMBRACING DIVERSITY

by Luke Novelli, Jr.

Recent division calls for papers expounded "a larger perspective" and "expanding horizons." As a division, we sought broader viewpoints and approaches that could enhance our understanding of the variety of changes, both planned and unplanned, that occur within organizations. This broadened conception of the division's domain generated considerable energy among members who attended a "future directions" session at the last Academy meeting. Our challenge is to create a division program that contains multiple perspectives, and provides opportunities for generating creative and innovative ideas that move the field forward. This challenge is especially appropriate to the overall conference theme, "Management of Diversity."

The diversity concept goes well beyond the typical topics of gender and race since there can be many sources of differences within and across organizations (e.g., nationality, organizational levels, organizational culture, individual, industry, etc.). Moving beyond "managing" to appreciating and capitalizing on diversity is an arena where those involved with organizational development and change should be able to play a leading conceptual and application role. The diversity theme also provides a special opportunity for joint efforts with other divisions.

Beyond the diversity theme, we strongly encourage submissions that broadly define development and change. This includes but is not limited to multilevel and multidisciplinary inquiry. Reviewers will be asked to broaden their criteria

beyond statistical sophistication to include interest and rigorous nonquantitative work. We will continue our "special category" for papers containing ideas that may not be fully developed, but provoke rethinking current practices and theories prevalent within the field. These papers will be reviewed separately, so please indicate submission to this special category. The primary criteria for reviewing these papers will be clear presentation and sufficient development to convince reviewers that the topic will provoke interesting interchange.

We are pleased to announce that the best paper submitted to the division, as judged by reviewers, will receive a \$500 award provided by the Journal of Organizational Change Management.

Successful Symposia.

The division has earned a reputation for presenting some of the more innovative and interesting symposia within the Academy. So what does it take to have a symposium accepted? A number of executive committee members, who have both reviewed and organized symposia, shared their thoughts on this question. This information is intended to aid those who are considering submitting a symposium proposal.

A symposium's purpose is to focus inquiry on a clearly defined topic in a way that takes advantage of an interactive forum. Clearly, they are intended to have more synergy than a paper session. So then, what makes an appropriate symposium topic? First reviewers want to see a clear description of the symposium's focus and how each of the participants will contribute to that focus. Often, it is left to the reviewers to make the connections rather than the organizer making the links explicit. Second, reviewers want to see a case made--why the symposium's topic or issue is important. Therefore, topics that deal with questions of current, wide interest are viewed favorably. This doesn't exclude narrower topics, but the burden is on the organizer to convince the reviewers of the proposal's value. Finally, reviewers want to be assured that the symposium will deliver what is promised. Raising an interesting question and then promising that answers will be provided is not enough.

How will the symposia be conducted? Reviewers want a description of the symposium's format. They are uneasy when they do not know what the presenters are going to do. A high value is placed on audience involvement. Clear descriptions of how this will be accomplished is important. The session design must be realistic for a 1 1/2 hour time slot (although there are a limited number of 2 hour slots).

What does it take to put together a successful symposium? Experienced organizers emphasize the time and effort required. Finding people who have an interest in the topic, and preferably a track record, is a key. The most important question for the organizer is "Can I get them to do something meaningful, in an integrated way?" This generally requires significant lead time and coordination.

What other factors play a role in selecting symposia? The program committee is primarily concerned with creating a balanced program that represents the broad interests of the division members within the limited program time that is available. The first criteria for symposium acceptance is quality. However, we often receive more quality proposals than can be accommodated. This is when other factors come into play. For example, it is not unusual for two or three symposia to deal with the same general theme. Normally, only one would be accepted. Symposia that are likely to generate a larger audience would be favored. Following the submission rules, which frequently change from year to year, is important. Fairness requires disqualifying those proposals that do not.

Should I make a joint submission to another division? Current Academy policy allows acceptance of 1/3 of submitted symposium papers. A jointly sponsored symposium counts as 1/2 of a time slot for both divisions. From a program point of view, jointly sponsored symposia allow us to include more people on the program. From the submitter's point of view, joint sponsorship requires acceptance by two divisions. A joint submission decision should be based on the degree that the proposal can meet both division's criteria. If the fit is tenuous, the proposal can meet both division's criteria. If the fit is tenuous, the proposal should probably focus on meeting the requirements of one division.

In summary, successful symposia proposals share some characteristics: Clear Focus, Important Topic, Member Interest, Integrated Presentation, Developed Session Design, and Audience Involvement. Remember, a large number of high quality symposia proposals is one way to help ensure a stimulating division program next year.

Call for Papers

Please follow the specific rules and guidelines for manuscript preparation (note especially length limits) that are outlined in the general Academy Newsletter. If for some reason you do not receive it, contact Greg Oldham, general program chair, at the University of Illinois (217-333-4240).

Manuscripts must be received by January 6 1992 and should be sent to: Luke Novelli, Jr., Center for Creative Leadership, P.O. Box 26300, Greensboro, NC 27438-6300. (Express deliveries: 5000 Laurinda Dr., Greensboro, NC 27410).

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Backer, Thomas E. & O'Hara, Kirk B. (1991). *Organizational Change and Drug-Free Workplaces Templates for Success*. Quorum Books.

Cole, Donald W. *Organization Development: A Straightforward Reference Guide of Executive Seeking to Improve Their Organizations*. Chesterfield, Ohio: The O.D. Institute.

Jamieson, David W. & O'Mara, Julie. (1991). *Managing Workforce 2000: Gaining the Diversity Advantage*. Jossey-Bass.

Mirvis, Philip & Mitchell, Lee Marks. (1991) *Managing the Merger*. Prentice Hall.

Sashkin, Marshall & Kiser, Kenneth J. *Total Quality Management*. Seabrook, MD: Docochon Press.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Mitchell Lee Marks has been appointed chair of the Human Resources Management Practice Group for William M. Mercer, Incorporated.

Jerry I. Porras was recently appointed Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at Stanford University.

THE PURPOSE AND VISION OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

by William Gellermann

Several years ago, Peter Drucker responded to a question about managing by objectives (MBO) by clarifying that he was not the author of MBO, but rather of MBO and self control. The notion of people managing themselves (self control) in relation to objectives they had a part in setting was particularly clarifying for me, since, in my view, self control is at the heart of what OD is all about. It is a value that guides our research and practice in relation to others and, more importantly for our purpose here, it can also guide us in our relationships with one another and with our profession as a whole. This article's central thesis is that we OD professionals -- teachers, researchers, and practitioners (internal and external) -- can increase our individual and collective effectiveness by achieving substantial consensus on our common purpose and vision. By so doing we can increase our abilities to be self controlling as individuals and, simultaneously, to coordinate our collective energy into achieving goals and objectives whose combined effect will be of much greater significance than the sum of our individual achievements.

Since 1981, the OD profession has been involved in articulating "A Statement of Values and Ethics by Professionals in Organization and Human Systems Development" (hereafter called "the Statement"). The process has involved sending out a draft of the Statement, receiving responses, revising the draft, sending it out again, and so on. We have done that more than twenty times, with input from more than 500 professionals and more than 20 different countries. The results to date include a 1-page Credo, a Statement, and a more extensive Annotated Statement.

In the latest version, the Statement describes our profession, its purpose, and its vision in the following words:

Organization and Human Systems Development (OD-HSD) is a profession whose practice is based on the applied behavioral sciences, a human systems perspective, and human as well as organizational values. As OD-HSD professionals we seek to promote and facilitate the process by which human beings and human systems live and work together for their mutual well-being. Our purpose as a profession is to promote a widely shared learning and discovery process dedicated to the vision of people living meaningful, productive, good lives in ways that simultaneously serve them, their organizations, their societies, and the world. (Gellermann, Frankel, and Ladenson, 1990, p. 111, emphasis added) (Stop Indentation here)

Before focussing on the purpose and vision elements in that statement, we need to examine the reason for expanding the field beyond OD to encompass all of Human Systems Development. As the Annotated Statement says;

The field we call Organization and Human Systems Development (OD-HSD) is most generally recognized by the name Organization Development (OD). An increasing number of OD-HSD professionals now conclude that Human Systems Development (HSD) is the most appropriate designation for our field, since our potential clients range from individuals to the whole world. With that expanded focus, the profession can, and some professionals would say must, be oriented to whether or not what we do is good for the global system as well as for our specific clients. For most practitioners, especially those in OD and HRD, this may not mean a change in the focus of their practice, but only a change in the context within which they view their practice. With such a perspective, the profession has the potential for becoming a global professional community whose collective action will have global significance based on cooperative, collective action. (Gellermann, Frankel, and Ladenson, 1990, p. 112, emphasis added)

Given that perspective, we can then focus on the statement of purpose and vision. The words about "a shared learning and discovery process" in the purpose element of the statement came from Herb Shepard, one of the founders of the OD profession. The thing that appeals to me in that idea is its emphasis on OD-HSD as something we do with our clients more than something we do to or for our clients. It emphasizes that our work is based on collaboration more than on expertise (in which we give and the client takes). Of course, there are times when we must function as experts to serve our clients, but even then we do so in the context of a purpose that emphasizes shared learning and discovery.

The vision element is based on a concept many of us apply in our work with clients. Helping clients articulate their vision enables them to clarify the results they are trying to realize -- and, for the same reason, articulating a vision for our profession can help us realize the results we are trying to accomplish. Interestingly the word "realize," as it is used here, means both "to become aware" and "to bring into being." At its best, a vision is literally a visual image of the results sought and, for that reason, it is important to use image-evoking words in statements about vision. For example, Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech and John F. Kennedy's speech in which he said "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country" are both good examples of how words can be used to evoke vision. In thinking about vision, it is important to remember that vision exists only in the mind's eye. Words or symbols or pictures about visions are not visions; rather, they are means of evoking a vision in the mind's eye of the people who will be guided or, more precisely, will guide themselves by reference to that vision.

With the preceding discussion as background, we can then focus on the vision of "people living meaningful,

productive, good lives in ways that simultaneously serve them, their organizations, their societies, and the world." For me, those words evoke a vision of a global, human system which I symbolize in my mind with the widely familiar image of Earth photographed from space. More specifically that vision encompasses a rich diversity of interdependent systems, sub-systems, and macro-systems, including

- o families (including couples, families with children or aging parents, and extended families)

- o organizations (including plants, Divisions, and other sub-systems)

- o labor unions (and all their sub-systems and interdependencies with the organizational systems within which their members work)

- o communities (and all their sub-systems, including families, neighborhoods, schools, churches, stores, shopping centers, and other businesses)

- o governments (Federal, State, and Local and all their interdependencies with one another and the communities to which they are related)

- o societies (and all their interdependent sub-systems as just identified)

- o transnational systems (including such systems as the European Community and the Pacific Rim and all of their component sub-systems)

- o global systems (such as the United Nations and other systems whose existence is global in scope, such as the "global scientific community")

Ultimately those sub-systems comprise a global human system whose health is a function of how well all of its interdependent sub-systems are able to live together. In fact, the metaphors of personal and organizational health and well-being are helpful in evoking images of health and well-being at all of the other system levels.

But how do we combine all of this into a meaningful image? In a discussion of frontier issues in the evolution of the

OD-HSD profession, the question was asked, "To what extent, if any, is 'beauty' among the most important of our OD-HSD values?" In discussing that question, the relationship of current reality and realization of a vision was described in a diagram that showed a line of "next steps" taken one at a time joining reality and vision. For individuals, those lines can be conceived as "life paths" and those paths can be used metaphorically in evoking an image of a vision for the OD-HSD profession. If the life paths of individuals, from current reality to the realization of their visions, are conceived of as multicolored threads, then to the extent that those threads come together in the creation of the lives of organizations and other human systems, they can be conceived collectively as a tapestry. Continuing the metaphor, ". . . we can conceive of human beings as the weavers of their own lives and we can conceive of ourselves [the OD-HSD professional community] as meta-weavers who help people learn to weave together in a way that creates a beautiful whole. . . . And if that tapestry is esthetically satisfying, we can say that those lives are 'beautiful' (as well as 'meaningful, productive, and good')." (Gellermann, Frankel, and Ladenson, 1990, p. 358) In brief, we can describe the role of the OD-HSD profession as facilitating the creation of a beautiful tapestry, woven from the lives of all the people on Earth, including our own lives. And with such a vision, I can imagine OD-HSD professionals being self-controlling individually, and collectively accomplishing results that none of us could conceive of alone. (For references and additional information, please contact the author at: 372 Central Park West, Apt. 16C, New York, NY, 10025.)

POSITIVE-FINDINGS BIAS IN OD RESEARCH

by Darryl R. Roberts & Peter J. Robertson

Possible biases in OD evaluation research are worrisome to both researchers and practitioners. One potentially important bias that has recently been discussed is a positive-findings bias. According to the positive-findings bias hypothesis, there is an inverse relationship between the methodological rigor of OD intervention evaluations, and the reported success of interventions. The idea is that evaluators unconsciously let their desire to find positive outcomes bias their evaluations, and that this is particularly likely with less rigorous designs.

Since Terpstra (1981) proposed a positive-findings bias, and reported empirical results consistent with it for a sample of process intervention evaluations, a number of studies have examined the issue. Bullock and Svyantek (1983) examined process interventions, Woodman and Wayne (1985) analyzed a wide variety of interventions, and other studies examined specific intervention techniques (e.g., quality circles) or outcomes (e.g., satisfaction). Results

have been mixed. We decided to take another look, with three analyses that we hoped could shed more light on the issue. Our work is reported more fully in Roberts and Robertson (1991).

Like the previous researchers, we looked at the relationship between methodological rigor and reported outcomes for a set of OD evaluations; in our study, this set consisted of 47 published evaluations, covering a wide range of interventions. We measured methodological rigor using Woodman and Wayne's (1985) scale, which consists of nine criteria. Four criteria (sampling strategy, sample size, use of control/comparison group, use of random assignment) concern sampling; five criteria (measurement strategy, reliability/validity of measures, use of some objective criteria for dependent variables, statistical significance level used, use of multivariate analysis) concern measurement and analysis. Each evaluation was coded 1 (more rigorous) or 0 (less rigorous) on each criterion; scores on the nine criteria were added together to obtain the evaluation's total rigor score. For reported outcomes, we calculated effect sizes (Hunter, Schmidt, & Jackson, 1982) from the statistics reported in the studies. We also coded interventions and outcome variables into categories drawn from an organizational model proposed by Porras (1987). Below, we'll discuss each of our three analyses in turn.

1. Does rigor vary across intervention categories?

Previous researchers have speculated that rigor of evaluation is likely to differ across types of interventions. For example, Woodman and Wayne (1985) suggested that process interventions may be less rigorously evaluated than technostructural interventions. While this is relevant to the general issue of methodological rigor in evaluation, this analysis does not directly address the existence of a positive-findings bias. There could be differences in rigor across categories, yet no inverse relationship between rigor and reported success, or vice versa.

We performed an Analysis of Variance, with total rigor score as the dependent variable, and intervention category as the independent variable. The results provided no evidence of differences in total rigor score across intervention categories.

2. Is there evidence for positive-findings bias, overall and by intervention and outcome categories?

One reason for the previous mixed findings may be that a positive-findings bias exists for some types of

interventions and/or outcomes but not for others. Except for Woodman and Wayne (1985), previous studies limited their samples to particular types of interventions or outcomes.

We calculated correlations between total rigor scores and effect sizes, for the overall sample and for each intervention and outcome category. Negative correlations would be consistent with a positive-findings bias. For the overall sample, the correlation was very small (.02) and nonsignificant. The only significant correlations - for two intervention categories and one outcome category - were positive. In short, these results are inconsistent with a positive-findings bias.

3. Is the typical total rigor score a good measure?

Like our first two analyses, previous studies used a total rigor score as the measure of rigor. It has been assumed that it is valid to add equally-weighted scores on various criteria to form a total rigor score, but there is no empirical evidence that this is a reasonable assumption. It is quite possible that different methodological criteria are differentially related to evaluation research outcomes. So, we decided to examine each of the nine criteria separately.

Our method was a multiple regression, with effect size as the dependent variable, and the nine methodological criteria as independent dummy variables. As above, negative coefficients would be consistent with a positive-findings bias. The results were mixed, with two significant positive, three significant negative, and four non-significant coefficients. We discuss various interpretations of these results in our paper. For example, all three of the negative coefficients were for sampling criteria (sampling strategy, sample size, and use of control/comparison group). One explanation is a positive-findings bias along these dimensions. Another explanation is that, as others have argued (e.g., Blumberg & Pringle, 1983), "more rigorous" designs along these dimensions can actually interfere with change efforts.

Probably most important, though, is to compare these results to the very small overall correlation found in the second analysis. Although the regression indicated that the nine criteria had diverse relationships with effect size, the process of adding the criteria together into the total rigor score yielded a measure that had no significant overall relationship with effect size. This calls into question the appropriateness of this type of total rigor score. To the extent

this score is inappropriate, the validity of previous positive-findings bias research, as well as our first two analyses, is reduced.

Conclusion

Any future research on a positive-findings bias will need to carefully consider how to measure rigor. At least three issues need to be considered. One issue is the specific methodological criteria that make up the scales. Possibly, some criteria should be added and others deleted. For example, there are arguments in the literature that control groups and random assignment are incompatible with the OD process; if we accept these arguments, these criteria should be deleted. A second issue is how to aggregate the various criteria, since our data indicate that the equally-weighted sum is problematic. Differential weights, and/or non-additive aggregation rules, are possible alternatives. A third issue is whether it is possible to develop one rigor scale that can be fairly used across the evaluations of various (and disparate) OD interventions. For example, one previous study used a scale based on the same nine criteria, but deleted two; the authors argued that these two criteria were not applicable for their sample.

Many different arguments could be made for excluding and including various criteria, for using various aggregation schemes, and for using different scales for different types of interventions and/or outcomes. Unfortunately, it is not clear that empirical analysis will allow us to choose between competing arguments. Suppose two studies, using different rigor scales, examined the same set of evaluations. If the two studies found opposite results, which should we believe?

Thus, we are not optimistic about the development of "new and improved" quantitative scales for assessing the methodological rigor of OD evaluations or, consequently, about the empirical resolution of the positive-findings bias issue. At the same time, a positive-findings bias is theoretically plausible. Evaluators do need to be sensitive to the issue when designing and conducting evaluation research. Notwithstanding the ambiguities we have discussed, methodological rigor scales, by providing a list of criteria for evaluators to consider, can be quite useful. (For References and additional information, contact: Darryl R. Roberts, Stanford University).

WHAT IS TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND HOW DOES IT RELATE TO OD?

by Marshall Sashkin & Kenneth J. Kiser

Management fads and fashions change so often these days that it is always wise to study a new concept or approach carefully before getting involved. Otherwise, one runs the risk of blundering into either a dead end or just another label for management by objectives or some other fashion, either relatively long-lasting, like MBO, or relatively short-lived, like T-groups.

One new term that is rapidly becoming common is "total quality management," or TQM. Is it an important new approach to management, or is TQM this year's version of zero-based budgeting? We propose to answer this question and to explain briefly just why CEOs and senior managers should pay special attention to TQM.

The first issue is easy to resolve. TQM is, in our view, an important concept for managers and organizations. It is not a fad or a temporary management fashion but a long-term approach for improving management and organizations. We are even hesitant to call TQM "new." After all, it has been used since the 1950s in many Japanese organizations and from the mid-1970s in some U.S. firms.

But what is TQM? There's the problem. Many managers think that TQM is something it is not. That sort of assumption is guaranteed to lead to disaster, if it is the basis for trying to apply TQM in one's own organization.

Tools

TQM is most commonly identified with statistical "tools" used to measure products and processes and thus serve as the basis for identifying problems and figuring out how to solve them. Some of these tools are familiar to most managers: Gantt (project time-line) charts, for example. Others, some just as old as Gantt charts (which were invented in the early 1920s), are less well-known.

The list includes "control charts," "fishbone diagrams," "Pareto charts," and many more. Often the entire set of tools is lumped under the label "statistical process control," since the purpose of tools is applying simple statistics (counting and displaying tallies) to help control task activities, especially (but not solely) in production or manufacturing settings. The point of such control, of course, is to ensure fewer errors or problems and better overall quality of product or service (the same concepts apply to service just as well as to production operations).

But our aim in this article is not to "educate" the reader about these (or other, more advanced) tools. Our intent is, in

fact, to make sure that those reading this article do not think of TQM as tools. We are concerned about this because that is exactly what many firms have done. Employees are trained to use one or another tool, or a technique, like "quality control circles," with the expectation that this will lead directly to substantial improvements in quality. It may, in the very short run, but we can guarantee that such an approach will not last and will, usually within a year or two, be forgotten as just another fad. That would be very unfortunate, since TQM has the potential for truly revitalizing American organizations.

We don't mean to say that statistical tools are irrelevant or play no part in TQM; in fact, they are an important aspect of TQM. But the finest tools and the best training in their use will not make an architect out of a carpenter, yet that seems exactly the hope of managers who think TQM is a set of tools.

Commitment

TQM is an intense and long-term commitment to quality; that much is pretty obvious. And implementing such a commitment requires the use of tools and techniques. But it is not the tools and techniques that are important, it is the commitment.

Thus, we now see many organizations that stress commitment to quality for the customer. This is good, it represents a significant advance over the "tools and techniques" approach. But it, too, is inadequate for long-term success. This is not because such a commitment is misplaced or unimportant. Rather, it is because such a commitment cannot be sustained indefinitely without some basic changes in the way management works in an organization.

Culture

The required changes in management action are most clearly reflected in the organizational culture. While difficult to define, culture is generally agreed to consist of the set of shared values and beliefs that guide the behaviors of managers and employees and that define what sorts of actions are desirable or undesirable, good or bad, and right or wrong. And this, at last, leads us to the heart of TQM: TQM is about creating and developing a set of values and beliefs that let everyone know that quality for the customer is the most basic organizational aim, and that the ways of working together in the organization, as well as the ways people are expected to deal with problems and changes,

are determined by what will support and sustain this basic aim.

TQM

All of this will surprise managers who think that TQM is quality circles and statistical process control. It is, but it is much more; tools and techniques are an important but relatively superficial aspect of this "thing" called TQM. Tools are merely the first, surface-level aspect of TQM.

At a second and deeper level, TQM is an absolute commitment to quality for the customer. TQM is the conviction that (as many firms have demonstrated) when the desires of the customer come first profits often follow as a by-product. In contrast, when profit itself is the central concern of management it is most often an elusive and unsustainable goal, sort of like thinking that life is about the pursuit of happiness rather than the joy of living. And, finally, at the third and deepest level, TQM is the culture of the organization, the set of values and beliefs that are held in common by just about everyone in the firm and that define and support the concept of quality for the customer.

It may, then, seem that TQM is, itself, an elusive and perhaps unattainable goal. That is not the case. It is not easy; it requires far more work than just training employees to use a few statistical tools. One of the fathers of TQM, the quality improvement giant Dr. W. Edwards Deming, has observed that training in tools and techniques such as quality circles is "management's lazy way out." That is, it is the route used by managers who do not want to accept the charge and exert the very real effort needed to shape their organization's culture. The internationally-renowned quality expert Dr. Joseph M. Juran says, "A good way to lose time in improving quality is to focus on tools and try to apply them."

Deming is equally critical of efforts to exhort and motivate employees to believe in and improve customer service. Only by building concern about quality for the customer into every stage of the quality management process will such quality be supported and attained over the long run. And that only happens when top executives exercise the leadership needed to construct the sort of organizational culture that values customers and quality " as well as every person in the organization. One respected organizational psychologist has observed that it just may be that constructing the organization's culture is really the only important thing that leaders do.

And it is the leadership role that we ultimately find at the core of TQM, for only through leadership can the culture be created in which a concern for quality can be sustained and implemented.

TQM and OD

At this point it should be obvious that TQM is intimately related to OD. Most basically, TQM, like OD, aims to create or change an organization's culture. But this is not the only connection. Sashkin and Morris (1984) pointed out that three basic foundation elements of OD are action research, the collection and use of data, and the involvement of groups and teams as the source and target of change (Cartwright, 1968). These same three factors are foundations of TQM. TQM is based on an experimental action research approach, with those in the organization being the experimenters, not outside researchers. It relies on the collection and use of valid data, with "hard" data receiving more emphasis in TQM than is generally true in OD. And TQM, like OD, typically involves teams. As in OD, the use of teams is not just a matter of setting up temporary task force groups but is most often the basis for redesign of the work itself.

Beckhard's dictum that OD is managed from the top receives new meaning when we realize that TQM, like OD, is really a process requiring top-level leadership but working from the bottom of the organization up. This apparent paradox is in part explained by the new paradigm of transformational leadership (Hunt, 1991; Sashkin & Burke, 1990). Transformational leaders create (or recreate) cultures by developing shared visions based on values and beliefs that are held in common by members of the organization who rely on those values and beliefs to guide them in implementing a shared vision.

A TQM culture is just one specific culture. OD probably can be undertaken using a variety of cultural frames. Thus, TQM is, in reality, just one specific type of OD, when applied using OD tools, techniques, and principles. But even though OD is a broad field compared to the relatively narrowly-defined type of change we call TQM, TQM can be an extremely useful lever for OD applications. Considerably more work is needed in explicitly tying together TQM and OD, especially in terms of practice. TQM can be either another consultant-hyped fad or, just possibly, a powerful new approach by which the practice of OD can benefit organizations and the people that are their most important element. (For References and additional information, contact: Marshall Sashkin, 8706 Nightingale Dr., Seabrook, MD

