Contents

LEARNING FROM UNUSUAL EVENTS: THE OD&C PROGRAM IN CINCINATTI
by William R. Torbert

This year's overall national program promises to be far more integrated than usual. National Program Chair Bill Starbuck has organized a number of composite tracks, bringing together papers from multiple divisions in single sessions and creating sequences of sessions on the same topic, such as four sessions on Leadership and eight (!) sessions on Teams (heaven for a team junkie). I have tried to play into this sequencing by creating 2 sessions on 'Leading Organizational Transformation' on Tuesday, following the composite Leadership sequence on Monday. I have also constructed a rough sequence among our own paper sessions, as the following session titles suggest: "If Only Turbulence Were Unusual," "Entering the Transformational Present," "Doing What Is To Be Done: Globally and Locally," followed by the two sessions on leading organizational transformation. Paper authors may have to stretch a bit to see the connection between their own topic and the session title, and I hope that will be interesting for you and the audience. Speaking of which, I appeal to all presenters and chairs to cooperate in inventing new ways to make those sessions as interactive as possible.

I spoke in my call last fall about how the ability to learn from unusual events requires an aesthetic sense, and we will be honored this year to host Suresh Srivastva, the longtime guiding spirit of the Case Western Reserve program, as our division's Distinguished Speaker, addressing us at 2pm Tuesday afternoon on the provocative subject of "Organizational Beauty: The Art of Human Relationships."

Immediately, following this session, we will host our Best Paper session, where, for the first time, our three Best Papers will be presented. This year and henceforth we offer three awards - for Best Paper, Best Practice-Related

Paper, and Best Graduate Student Paper. Although one paper could hypothetically win all three awards, the Executive Committee, after their own blind review and with the program chair having recused himself, this year made three separate awards to the three papers ranked highest and most often nominated for such an award by the original blind reviewers. With Ella Bell of MIT as chair, the three papers are "Identity Maintenance and Adaptation" by Steven Freeman of MIT, which offers a fascinating analogy between individual and organizational experiences of loss; "Participation, Complexity of Understanding, and Assessment of Organizational Change" by Jean Bartunek, Barbara Davidson, Danna Greenberg, and Margaret Humphries of Boston College, which shows what a longitudinal change process looks like from the inside; and "Branch Rickey's Method for Facilitating Controversial Social Change in Organizations" by John Austin of Boston College, which looks at the decade-long process of generating managerial, organizational, and social readiness for Jackie Robinson's debut with the Brooklyn Dodgers.

These highlight sessions are followed by our Business Meeting and Social Hour, which this year moves from Monday to Tuesday, so as to conflict with fewer other divisions (particularly OB). We invite all of you to become OD&C Division insiders, if you don't already feel so, by joining us for those occasions.

Our symposia this year have, if possible, an even stronger focus on managerial practice and on bridging theory and practice than usual. Two have been chosen as all-Academy Showcases: one features Chris Argyris and Michael Beer of Harvard, along with Richard Mason of SMU and Ian Mitroff of USC on "Producing Management Knowledge that is Implementable: A Rare Event"; the other, on "The Common Good as an Outgrowth of Social Reflection," features Don Schon of MIT, Peter Vaill of George Washington U., Ian Mitroff of USC (is this over-exposure, Ian?), and Joe Raelin and Sandra Waddock of Boston College. In addition, we host "Engaging Higher Level Systems for Change II," a return (but not a repeat) engagement, by popular and reviewer demand, of a symposium from last year, convened by Rupe Chisholm of Penn State-Harrisburg, with an excellent panel. Check our program listings for times and places, for the other fine and useful symposia, and for the Interactive Paper Sessions (a much better name for what used to be called Poster sessions).

You will also find that there is a burgeoning of all-Academy pre-conference activity this year (much of which is incorrectly presented in the current Academy newsletter by the way, so be sure to check the program carefully when you receive that). Our division, however, is very conservatively only sponsoring the one long-term, high quality, highly participatory, internationally oriented session that Rupe Chisholm, Max Elden, and Thoralf Qvale annually host on

"Emerging Concepts of Empowering Work and Action Research." Contact Rupe Chisholm at 717-948-6052 for more information and for pre-registration, which is required. A great opportunity to join an ongoing, active network.

In addition, there is one other pre-conference session on Sunday morning from 9 to noon to which I want to draw your attention: this is a session called "Practitioner Involvement in the Academy: A Dialogue" which is being sponsored by the caucus for Scholarship and Practice to explore how to make the Academy more engaging of, and accessible to, practitioners. This is a critical issue for members of our division, I believe, and any of you who wish to join that session are invited to contribute. For more information, contact Dan Twomey at 419-372-2366.

As Program Chair this year, what has struck me most strongly, other than my own capacity to go crazy, is (1) the degree to which our field is beginning to get really serious about defining and documenting what transformation means; (2) how - when we begin to participate in transformation - our current views of good theory, good research, and effective action all, necessarily, transform; and (3) how many of you contribute to making each of these programs possible.

I offer heartfelt thanks to this year's reviewers: Jean Bartunek, Ella Bell, Wayne Boss, Don Bowen, Cliff Cheng, Allan Church, David Cooperrider, Barbara Davidson, Evelyn Dravecky, Dal Fisher, Gary Frank, Bob Golembiewski, Danna Greenberg, Bruce Hanson, Mary Ann Hazen, Karen Jansen, Joan Kofodimos, Miriam Lacey, Gery Ledford, Benyamin Lichtenstein, Ivan Manev, Michael McCuddy, Gary McMahan, Ananda Mukherji, Ken Murrell, Luke Novelli, Joanne Preston, Gaylord Reagan, Peter Robertson, Jenny Rudolph, Caren Siehl, Peter Sorensen, Gretchen Spreitzer, Rami Shani, Robert Steel, Daniel Svyantek, Kit Tennis, Mary Tucker Glenn Varney, Frances Viggiani, Karen Whelan, and Dick Woodman. Look forward to seeing you at Cincinatti!

THE "CHILD" AS AGENT OF INQUIRY
by David L. Cooperrider

"The sense of wonder, that is our sixth sense. And it is the natural..." -- D.H.Lawrence

What is the role of wonder in OD? What creates a sense of wonder as we inquire into organizational life, and what spoils it? What are the varieties of wonder? What is the connection of wonder to knowledge? To the imagination? To

the flowering of relationships? What happens to the storyteller, for example, when the room is filled by people sitting forward, listening, even smiling, with a sense of wonder? Why is uninhibited wonder something we generally restrict to children? If doing good inquiry is at the heart of OD why then so little talk of things like awe, curiosity, veneration, surprise, delight, amazement, wonderin short, everything that serves to infuse what OD has traditionally referred to as the "spirit of inquiry".

Presented here is a thesis, a proposition, regarding the future of OD. It is a stand which I take with some hesitation, even with some tentativeness. It is a proposition I will illustrate with an "N" of one, hardly a proof. But it has, I think, some wisdom in it; one might even argue the idea was modeled in the lives of early pioneers like Kurt Lewin, Mary Parker Follett, Herb Shepard and others. The thesis emerges from years of experimenting with what my colleagues and I have termed "appreciative inquiry". It goes something like this: We have reached "the end of problem solving" as a mode of inquiry capable of inspiring, mobilizing, and sustaining human system change, and that the future of OD belongs to methods that affirm, compel, and accelerate anticipatory learning involving larger and larger levels of collectivity. The new methods will be distinguished by the art and the science of asking powerful, positive questions (soon there will be an "encyclopedia of questions" that brings together classic formulations like Maslow's interview protocols on peak human experience and Vereena Kast's exceptional studies of joy, inspiration, and hope). The new methods will view realities as socially constructed and will therefore become more radically relational, widening the circles of dialogue to groups of 100s, 1000s, and perhaps morewith cyberspace relationships into the millions. The arduous task of intervention will give way to the speed of imagination and innovation; and instead of negation, criticism, and spiraling diagnosis, there will be discovery, dream, and design. Social construction will mean constructive constructing. And the metaphor speaking best to our primary task and role--"the child as the agent of inquiry" is one where wonder, learning, and the dialogical imagination will be modus operandi.

Let's Illustrate: Imagine OD With A Whole City.

I want to tell you about a successful business woman, a corporate banking executive for 16 years at First Chicago, who one day decided to leave it all to devote her next 10 years to transforming the city's future. Trained in OD, savvy in action-research methodologies, and a visionary in her own right, Bliss Browne asked the question: "What might happen if all of Chicago's citizens were mobilized to give public expression, continuously, to their imagination about a healthy future for the city as a whole, and were invited to claim their role in bringing that vision to life!" Could it be,

she paused, "...we human beings create our own realities through imagination and conversational processes, and that the creation of positive images on a collective basis in our 3 million person city might well be the most prolific activity that individuals and organizations can engage in if their aim is to help bring to fruition a positive and humanly significant future?"

Preposterous? "Perhaps," commented a Chicago Tribune journalist: "But Browne is the sort who thinks big and takes unorthodox action... She's used to challenges. Browne was in the first class of 125 women who graduated from Yale University in 1971, and she was among the first women ordained into the priesthood of the Episcopal Church in 1977 [and then her career as corporate executive]" (Wilson, 1995).

It began, then, with a conference where community and business leaders met to discuss how imagination, economics, and faith could make the city a better place. But there were major concerns: surveys, for example, showing 85% of Americans loosing faith in both the future of our cities as well as the institutions that govern them; images of cities as hellholes (just look at the demonized picture of urban America in our movies and the nightly news); and the malaise of our young where the negative images have been correlated with apathy, cynicism, fear, discrimination and other damaging behavior. Ways are needed, agreed the participants, to rebuild essential connections, to renew hope, and to reinvigorate human creativity and leadership at all levels. "How one conceives of the city shapes how one lives in the city" argued Browne. Even more, " Cities echo creation. They are a living symbol of our ability to imagine and create, to turn our visions into tangible products. They are an inventory of the possible, and incarnation of human capacity and diversity. Cities concentrate forces of darkness and light, and hold the world in miniature."

IMAGINE CHICAGO, now a four-year-old 501C-3 located at 35 E. Wacker Drive, was born out of that and subsequent meetings. IMAGINE CHICAGO is a catalyst for civic innovation, working to bring people who live and work in Chicago to the realization that they are the owners and creators of Chicago's future (Browne, 1996). The MacArthur Foundation funded the first several years' pilot. And when theories and practices of change were sought out, Appreciative Inquiry (AI) was selected as the approach most likely to help serve as "a catalyst for civic innovation" (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987).

The outcomes have been dramatic. The "pilot" included more than 800 individuals in more than 40 neighborhoods

with involvement of more than 100 community organizations and schools. For example, IMAGINE CHICAGO, in collaboration with Barbara Radner, the Director of the Center For Urban Education at DePaul University, developed a citizenship curriculum now being used by 4000 Chicago public school students (more on these exciting results later). Though only a young organization, IMAGINE CHICAGO has already attracted broad recognition: a national award in 1995 from Eureka Communities in Washington D.C. for its "exemplary work on behalf of children and their families"; citation by the Mayor's Youth Development Task Force in 1994; and perhaps the most profound recognition, that of being emulatedthere is now an IMAGINE DALLAS organization, as well as plans in other cities and in other parts of the world, namely an initiative called IMAGINE AFRICA.

A Most Extraordinary Learning

One of the important logistical questions for IMAGINE CHICAGO had to do with scale: How to create an appreciative "action research" cycle with such a large system. When I first met with the design team they asked about "mass mobilization" methods for each of the phases in appreciative inquiry: Discovery, Dream, Design, and Destiny (Cooperrider, et.al., 1996).

There was talk, very early on, of wanting to conduct appreciative interviews with one million people, at least one interview for every household in the city. Now it appears, as the whole thing is blossoming, that many more than that will happen as new requests, programs, opportunities, and technologies are multiplying. But more important than scale was the other key question: Who should do the interviews? Should data collection be done by professors? OD consultants? Doctoral students from University of Chicago?

This is where the remarkable learning happened. It is one that continues to leave me breathless. The pilot's very best interviewsresulting in the most inspiring stories, the most passion filled data, the most textured and well illustrated examples, the most daring images of possibilitywere all conducted by children of Chicago. The most powerful interviews were when children of all races and cultures did interviews with the city's "elders," priests, CEOs, school principles, parents, entertainers, artists, activists, mystics, scientists. It was the intergenerational dynamic of the dialogue that made the data collection stage soar; one is reminded of Margaret Mead's hypothesis that the best societal learning has always occurred when three generations come together in contexts of discovery and valuing the child, the elder, and the middle adult. Lets look further (Barrett, 1995)

Appreciation and Wonder

An observer described the chemistry in the interviews as a "magical". One 72 year old respondent said at the conclusion of his interview: "I really thank you for this conversation. You got all of me. That hasn't happened too often in my life. You forced me to share my visions, and crystallize them into clear images. This has given me tremendous hope. Now that I can articulate clearly, I know they are do-able"

In the classic interview, for example, a 13 year old requests a time to meet with his principal. As interviewer he raises many questions: "As you reflect on your entire career with all it ups and downs, can you tell me the story of a high-point; a time you felt most alive, most impactful, most successful in terms of contribution to this school and community?" The principle scratches her head, even starts a bit slowly, but soon is in full voice. The youngster, listening to the drama, gets so excited with the story of courage and conviction that he cannot sit quiet. He interrupts the flow and blurts out, "So what was it about you that made it a high point... what are your best qualities... can you tell me what you value most about yourself?" A little later the topic switches to more volatile topics, like race relations. Again the positive query: "Thinking about your school's contributions to building a community with higher quality multiracial and/or multicultural relationships what one thing have you done in this area that has made the biggest difference? What one thing, whether it was a momentary contribution or a lasting one, are you most proud about?" The stories are told, one after the other. The interview lasts an hour longer than planned.

Later, an evaluation team follows up with the school principle to get feedback on the dynamic of the interview. Typical comments included:

"I've never been asked these types of questions by youth in this school; when I do converse with the students it is usually for disciplinary reasons.

"That night, after the interview, I laid wide awake. I could not sleep. I kept replaying the conversation. I got back in touch with a lot of things important to me..."

"You know, during that interview I really felt like I was on the pulpit. I got animated. I was literally looking into the face of the future, exploring the essential elements of the good society. This conversation mattered."

Barbara Radner's studies are now showing that when the appreciative civic inquiry methods are brought into the curriculum (in 13 Chicago Public Schools) children's achievement in all areas including math, reading, writing, etc., rises significantly in comparison to controls. In doing the interviews children are hearing stories they would never hear on the news, on TV, or even in the more common cynical discourse of society at large. They are developing their own images of possibility and hearing experiences where change has happened for the better. One young person, Willie J. Hempel, was so excited and moved by his experiences he started volunteering his time to IMAGINE CHICAGO every day after school: "It was during my interview with Ed Brennen CEO of Sears that my dreams and hopes were ignited. You find you have so much in common in terms of hopes for our City. And you find out people like Ed really care, not just about money but social justice causes, about me as a young person and about our future...my ideas about people like Ed and the politicians I interviewed all changed, and so has my life. That is why I want to volunteer my time now, it is all about making change happen." Where appreciation is alive and generations are re-connected through inquiry, hope grows and community expands (Ludema, 1996).

Today IMAGINE CHICAGO is taking the lessons of its pilot into five major project initiatives: The Urban Imagination Network, City Dialogues, Creating Chicago: A Citizens Guide, City Connections, Citizen Leaders, and Sacred Places. In all of these the spirit, if not the actual process, of the intergenerational inquiry and change methodology will guide the way.

Dag Hammarskjold once said, "But we die on the day when our lives cease to be illuminated by the steady radiance, renewed daily, of a wonder, the source of which is beyond all reason." The child as the agent of inquiry is something I think all of us in OD need to reclaim and aspire to: openness, availability, epistemological humility, the ability to admire, to be surprised, to be inspired, to inquire into our valued and possible worlds, to wonder. In my own work in OD I have found that it does not help, in the long run, to begin my inquiries from the standpoint of the world as a problem to be solved. I am more effective, quite simply, as long as I can retain the spirit of inquiry of the everlasting beginner. The only thing I do that I think makes the difference is to craft, in better and more catalytic ways, the unconditional positive question (Wilmot, 1996).

Unfortunately, and this is true of myself, it is not often that I begin a new OD inquiry feeling a profound state of wonder-- what William James so aptly called the state of "ontologic wonder". For me the doorway into wonder is more matter-of-fact. Pragmatically, it is not so much a process of trying romantically to go back to the state of being

a child; nor is it the same path as taken by the person in spiritual retreat. It begins in ordinary circumstances of discovery, conversation, and the deepening relationship-- all endowed by the positive question. Inquiry creates wonder.

IMAGINE CHICAGO, as a nascent example of one, is hardly enough to say that it provides answers for the future of OD. But there are clues, insists Browne: "My job, our job, is to be a home to the mysteries of city and its future...it is not about having answers." Albert Einstein put the option best, she continues : "There are only two ways to live your life. One is as though nothing is a miracle. The other is as though everything is a miracle."

REFERENCES

1. Wilson, T. (1995, June 13). Imagine shaping a better Chicago. Chicago Tribune, Section 2, p. 2.

2. Browne, B. (1996). Imagine Chicago: Executive summary. (For more information call 312-444-9113) .

3. Cooperrider D.L. and Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative nquiry into organizational life. In R.W. Woodman & W.A. Pasmore (eds). Research in organization change and development: Vol. 1 (pp. 129-169). Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

4. Cooperrider, D. et. al. (1996). Appreciative inquiry manual.Unpublished Notes. Case Western Reserve University.

5. Barrett, F. (1995). Creating appreciative learning cultures. Organizational Dynamics, 24, pp.36.

6. Ludema, J. (1996). Narrative inquiry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland.

7. Wilmot, T. (1996). Inquiry, hope, and change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland.

1996 DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM
by Gerald Ledford

The OB-ODC-OMT doctoral consortium, a two-day program of seminars, discussions, and activities designed to help doctoral students as they wrap up their dissertations ad begin thinking about their future as assistant professors, will be held August 9 through 11 in Cincinnati. This year's Consortium is being organized by Sue Ashford (Organization Behavior Division), Gerry Ledford (Organization Development and Change Division), and Alan Meyer (Organization and Management Theory Division).

A terrific group of faculty have agreed to participate. In addition to the organizers, core faculty will include Joel Brockner (Columbia), David Krackhardt (Carnegie-Mellon), Debra Meyerson (Stanford), Christine Oliver (York University), Sim Sitkin (Duke), Dick Woodman (Texas A&M), and Ray Zammuto (University of Colorado, Denver). We also have over 20 guest faculty who will spend one or two hours with us on special topics. Several of these sessions are specifically oriented toward organizational change and will include panelists from the ODC Division.

We encourage schools to nominate students who could benefit from this experience. However, the consortium has been so popular in the past that we must now limit the number of participants in order to keep the faculty-participant ratio to a workable size.

In order to attend, a student must be nominated by his or her university or school. No university can nominate more than two students. Each doctoral program will be limited to only one nomination. Thus, universities with multiple departments seeking to send students to this event need to coordinate their nominations.

In accepting students, preference will be given to those who have made the most progress toward completing their doctoral programs. Having said this, we have had problems in the past with students attending who have actually completed their Ph.D. degree. Therefore, we want to be sure that we have students and not graduates attending this summer's event.

Applicants should be sent by the department that nominates the student and should include: (1) nominee's name, address, e-mail address, phone and fax numbers, nominating university, and school; (2) statement by school certifying student's completion of doctoral course work and comprehensive exams by August 1, 1996; and (3) letter from faculty providing a general appraisal of the nominee, including his or her progress toward a dissertation defense, expected defense date, and subject of dissertation.

The application should also include: (4) a one-page description of the dissertation (topic and method) prepared by the student; and (5) the student's vitae.

All nominations should be submitted to: Alan D. Meyer, Department of Management, Lundquist College of Business, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1208 Please be sure to submit all of your material to Alan Meyer by May 6, 1996. We are really looking forward to this year's consortium. It promises to be the best ever!

A QUICK LOOK AT OD'S LIFE-LINE
by Robert T. Golembiewski

The 1995 Distinguished Speaker Presentation

Care for a selective sense of the 1995 Invited Lecture to the OD Division of the Academy of Management? Three themes get summary attention: What things in OD are going tolerably well?; What requires substantial fine-tuning?; What matters require revisionism?

Steady As She Goes

Overall, matters to quite well in a central particular. Three points develop the theme.

1. Attractive Success Rates. Estimates usually have been substantial--early in the game as well as recently--e.g., Peggy Morrison, Newt Margulies, Larry Pate, John Nicholas, and Jerry Porras and his collaborators. In addition, success rates are not much different in public vs. business sectors, despite the general expectation. Moreover, OD approaches seem to be broadly applicable: success rates do differ noticeably between (for example) the U.S. and less-developed nations, but are attractive in both sub-samples (Golembiewski, 1990, pp. 1-58). Finally, success rates seem similar for conventional OD applications, direct "family members" such QWL, and "kissing cousins" that cover a broad technostructural range of designs from autonomous groups to flexible work hours (e.g., Golembiewski and Sun, 1990A).

2. Different Degrees of "Getting It." Some prominent ODers were among early deniers of the message. Thus, few

cases were involved in some evaluative studies; concerns about inadequate methodological rigor often got voiced; and others simply doubted the high estimates.

The leverage of the success rate estimates was clear to many. The OD tent began to bulge, in part by the migration toward it of persons, themes, or theories with distal association-to-OD values and perspectives, or even stark opposition to them.

Nowadays, high success rates find a place at the main table (French, Bell, and Zawacki, 1994). This reflects multiple motivators, including a nuanced understanding of "methodological rigor" (e.g., Golembiewski and Sun, 1990A).

3. Avoiding Success ---> Failure. Success can lead to failure, of course, so OD must do more and better. For example, the common wisdom seems unspecific, if not seriously flawed, concerning the situational contributors to success/failure (e.g., Golembiewski and Sun, 1990B).

Consider three personal choices about "putting something back in the pot." First, OD contracts might include 5-10 percent for research to advance knowledge about theory or application. Second, a Fund for Displaced ODers could support those unfortunate colleagues who can establish that they have been coerced toward ethical violations by various practical urgencies. Other mature professions have done so. Third, OD has dealt only sporadically and unsatisfactorily with registration, certification, and accreditation, about which more will appear later.

Substantial Re-Tuning

Major re-tuning is absolutely necessary if Church and Burke (1995, p. 25) are correct in observing "there has been, and will continue to be, a weakening of the traditional values of OD." Several questions, and my operating biases, help frame the issue.

1. Is the Alleged Shrinkage Consequential? You bet. My favorite brief definition of OD proposes that it "increases responsible freedom in organizations," which obviously requires normative tethering. Any technique or tool can be put to multiple uses--good, bad, or indifferent.

2. Is the Shrinkage Merely Alleged? Most literati propose the shrinkage is quite advanced, and should be. My

personal experience yields mixed results, however; and survey data are not easily interpretable (e.g., Church & Burke, 1995).

3. Are Accommodations Possible? Can the Old Guard and New Practitioners mutually accommodate? Well, Yes, conventional OD values can and should be informed or updated by such prescriptions as "organization justice" (? Cobb, 1995). But more basically, No, the prescriptive base cannot erode very much without changing OD into something else.

4. Does "organization Change" = "Organization Change? To me, the answer is clearly: No. For example, some propose that conditions may require directive or even coercive change rather than the participative one associated with OD (Dunphy & Stace, 1993). This situationalist view deserves close attention, but it does not justify a bloated OD to encompass all change.

What should ODers do, in my opinion? First, OD requires reinvigorated attention to the "Statement of Values and Ethics by Professionals in Organization and Human Systems Development" (Gellermann and Associates, 1990). Broadly, that work has gone through two stages: developing the consensual Statement over almost two decades; and educating people about that Statement. the third stage now requires a full-court-press--developing norms and procedures concerning enforcement.

Second, I see "OD" as a label for a technology-with-values that deserves preserving and protecting.

Third, OD involved a full spectrum of designs for interventions, and I see a pronounced shift in the last decade or so from A to B on that spectrum. As a rough approximation, A can be viewed as rooted in team-building and B as associated with "culture." Graphically:

A -------> B

limited-purpose <---------------> comprehensive

contracts social

contracts

This shift is OK in some senses--indeed, it is both predictable and desirable. But it has a substantial not-OKness when extended very far, very fast, as has happened. Thus, the limited-purpose contracts (LPC) are useful for building mutual skills and confidence--for both ODers and clients. In addition, LPC can be rooted in quite-specific values and goals, and progress/regress can be tested while developing a specific picture of associated dynamics. This value-rootedness is much more elusive in comprehensive social contracts (CSC). Moreover, while "waiting for the big one," ODers risk decoupling from important goings-on, as in the lack of an OD presence in Total Quality Management and Flexi-place. Finally, the CSC orientation runs the risk of merely providing an OD locus for intellectual or philosophic issues that remain open, if not still contentious on their natal turfs. Hence, most "action research" in the public management literature amounts to learned interpellations about "critical theory" with little attention to applications.

Major Corrections In Course

OD also faces fundamental issues requiring attention, in my view, and here's my short list.

1. Circumscribing the OD Tent. Historically, OD presented an open door to prospective entrants, and that made sense. Determinedly, attention now must turn to registration, certification, and accreditation. This will require a balanced exercise, deeply informed by OD values as well as mindful of the decline of "the professions" due to their awkward balance of protectionism/performance.

An overseas perspective provides motivation to attempt to the difficult. Following the several "velvet revolutions" in eastern Europe, OD's North American credibility emboldened new legions of both consultants and clients. However, who did OD and what OD was got underwhelming attention, and the expected effects followed. As one close observer noted in an English-as-second-language letter:

.lm .50"

...Of course, four or five years ago there were many "OD activities" focused on changing organizational structure. But I have to say that main goal of consultant was to earn quick money. For example, "OD consultant" designed a new

organizational structure in three months even for company of ten thousand employees. In one or two meetings they tried to sell it to employees and managers. Usually, no real change in structure, communication, etc., occurred. And when clients wanted explanation why things went wrong, "consultants" said "Sorry, but we are responsible only for giving advice, not for its implementation." As a result of this experience, there is almost no chance to "sell" OD consultancy [in my country].

.lm .00"

Only hope remains. As the observed concludes: "... when privatization is over, managers and new owners will realise importance of OD. Our strategy is to be prepared for this situation."

In short, the choice seems clear. More of the above; or more attention to circumscribing the OD tent and to who is inside/outside; and also more concern with certification of individuals as well as accreditation of OD academic programs.

2. Complementing the "O" in "OD." Granted, "the 'O' in 'OD' is for organization" but, as useful as that was to move beyond small group or individual learning, that prescription now inhibits.

The ideal individual <---> organization balance certainly will include two emphases. Thus, the role of the CEO will have to be re-emphasized, not only as political champion but also in sustaining OD effects (e.g., Boss and Golembiewski, 1995). Moreover, accumulating evidence urges that a knowledge of individual features is useful, even necessary, for anticipating organization dynamics and interpreting OD effect (Robertson, Roberts, & Porras, 1993, esp. pp. 28-29; Golembiewski & Boss, 1992).

3. Beyond the Ever-Present Present. OD is rooted in the present. Indeed, perhaps the dominant perspective OD-- the social constructionist viewpoint--proposes dually that: we continually and continuously enact what exists; and, if to varying degrees among different proponents, only that exists which we enact.

However, one can overdo the ever-present present, and related constructs. For example, an elite's social construction can become a solid reality for others.

Consider also "appreciative inquiry," or AI, which uses shared positive experiences to shape early institution-building. Now, AI attracts. Thus, positive experiences are usefully emphasized, and especially at start-up of new groups.

Whatever else, AI poorly takes into account OD's past: basically, AI ideation proposes that OD requires a "problem" as the prime mover for change. Well, only in part: conventional OD often proposes Now ---> Ideal movement, as with the Likert (1961) Profile. Even more so, the AI spirit may encourage a too-appreciative posture toward AI! In any case, AI seems easy on itself (Srivastva & Cooperrider, 1990 esp., pp. 353-380), and empirical research on AI is both sparse and mixed, (E.g., Bushe & Coetzer, 1995). (References are omitted to conserve space. Bob Golembiewski can provide them, on request, at the following address: Department Political Science, Baldwin Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601).

References

Bushe, G.R., & Coetzer, G. (1995). "Appreciative Inquiry as Team-Development Intervention," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 31:13-30.

Church, A.H., & Burke, W.W. (1995). "Practitioner Attitudes About the Field of Organization Development." Pp. 1-45, in Pasmore and Woodman, eds., Research in Organizational Change and Development, Vol. 8.

Cobb, A.T., Folger, R., & Wooten, K. (1995). "The Role Justice Plays in Organizational Change," Public Administration Quarterly, 19:135-151.

Dunphy D.C., & Stace, D.A. (1993). "Strategies for Organizational Transition." Pp. 191-204, in R.T. Golembiewski, ed., Handbook of Organizational Consultation. New York: Marcel Dekker.

French, W.L., Bell, C.H., Jr., & Zawacki, R.A. (1994). Organization Development and Transformation. Bur Ridge, IL.: IRWIN.

Gellermann, W., Frankel M.S., & Ladenson, R.F. (19890). Values and Ethics in Organization and Human Systems Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Are you a developer? Try out the HTML to PDF API

Golembiewski, R.T. (1990). Ironies in Organizational Development. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Golembiewski, R.T., & Boss, R.W. (1992). "Phases of Burnout in Diagnosis and Intervention: Individual Level of Analysis in Organization Development and Change." Pp. 115-151, in Pasmore & Woodman, eds., Research in Organizational Change and Development, Vol. 6.

Golembiewski, R.T., & Sun, B-C. (1990A). "Positive Findings Bias in QWL Studies," Journal of Management, 16: 665-674.

Golembiewski, R.T., & Sun, B-C. (1990B). "Situational Features and QWL Outcomes," Consultation, 9: 99-128.

Likert, R. (1961). New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pasmore, W.A., & Woodman, R.W. eds. (1992, 1995). Research in Organizational Change and Development, Vols. 6 and 8. Greenwich, CN.: JAI Press, Inc.

Robertson, P.J., Roberts, D.R., & Porras, J.I. (1993). "An Evaluation of A Model of Planned Organizational Change." Pp. 1-39, in Woodman and Pasmore, eds., Research in Organizational Change and Development, Vol. 7.

Srivastva, S., & Cooperrider, D.L. (1990). Appreciative Management and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, W. (1987). "Study of Administration," Political Science Quarterly, 2: 197-222.

Woodman, R.W., and Pasmore, W.A., eds. (1993) Research in Organizational Change and Development, Vol. 7. Greenwich, CN.: JAI Press, Inc.

CHALLENGES FACING OD RESEARCHERS
by Caren Siehl

During a recent meeting of the Executive Board of the ODC Division, we discussed some of the changes and challenges which researchers are facing today. We agreed to individually respond to the following two questions and

to share our reflections. Our hope is that these thoughts might generate further discussion among the ODC membership of these, and other, pressing issues.

Questions for reflection:

1. What do you consider the most important failures or blind spots of organizational studies and leadership research?

2. What do you consider the most critical unanswered questions for future research?

Important Failures or Blind Spots

Reflections on this question centered on our focus on "old" models and images of organizations which fail to capture the richness and variety of organizational issues. Thoughts include:

"We need to challenge our profession to create significantly new models, mental constructs, and rich description of organizational relationships that truly transcend the realities most of us keep going on about."

"...the continuing failure to take seriously the implications that all social knowledge is meant to improve the awareness, understanding, and timely action of human beings who are themselves in the midst of action."

"Action research is often endorsed and rarely used in organizational studies. There are still only a handful of good action research studies. Why?"

"In our research, there is a tendency to strip people from their non-work related identities. The interrelationships between the private and public sector and our public and personal lives is murky to say the least."

Other Failures or Blind Spots Also Noted

"We assume that you can develop theory and practice in the U.S. and that it will be applicable everywhere in the world with little, if any, modification."

"In particular, our leadership literature is firmly grounded in individualistic behavior and avoids the collective."

"The related failure of most transformational leadership research to recognize that truly transformational leadership opens the possibility of transformation by the leader as well as the followers."

"Our most blinding blind spot is that we have focused so much of our attention on helping organizations product things, while avoiding more serious attention to how organization's produce people."

"I'm constantly amazed that the topic of reward systems which is of such obvious importance in organizational life, is often ignored by ODC researchers."

Critical Unanswered Questions for Future Research

The key unanswered questions that were suggested focused on responding to the critical blind spots. We linked our thoughts on areas for future research to our perceptions of areas of weakness. For example,

"What kinds of knowledge help each of us, in concert with others in our daily lives, to move towards integrating truth, meaningfulness, and efficacy while becoming increasingly willing to test and potential transform our assumptions."

"What are the implication of organizations being relationship-based communities?"

"How do we organize ourselves in order to build the worlds we want to live in?"

"What does it take for the leaders in corporations and communities to move our societies into they ear 2,000 and beyond?"

"How do we manage in culturally diverse, global organizations?"

"Does leadership really matter?"

We offer these reflections on the questions of research blind spots and unanswered questions in the hope of

generating discussion and ongoing debate. As you consider these questions, what do you perceive to be the blind spots? What critical questions are going unanswered? What are our roles in transforming our research?

Members of the ODC Executive Board: David L. Cooperrider, Gerald Ledford, Bill Torbert, Caren Siehl, Kenneth L. Murrell, Joanne Preston, Ella L. J. Edmonson Bell, Maurice "Mo" Cayer, R. Wayne Boss.

CONSULTATION FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: CALL FOR PAPERS

A forthcoming special issue of the Journal of Organizational Change Management will be devoted to the topic "Consultation for Organizational Change." We are seeking papers that will help to advance the theory, research, and practice of organizational consulting. We want to highlight the concepts, methods, processes, and impact of consultation. Among the wide range of possible types of papers which could be submitted are:

* Conceptual or empirical articles which provide insight into the theory and/or practice of consulting.

* Critical analysis of consulting processes or methods.

* Case studies of field research, using qualitative or quantitative methods which are descriptive of organizational consultations.

* Review articles that integrate what is known about consulting or identify critical unanswered questions.

Send three copies of your manuscript to the guest editor by October 15, 1996:

David W. Jamieson, Jamieson Consulting Group, 2265 Westwood Blvd., Suite 310, Los Angeles, CA 90064--(310) 397-8502 (Voice) (310) 397-0229 (Fax).

Articles submitted may vary between 15-25 pages in length. All manuscripts will be subject to a peer review process. Publication of this special issues is planned for Spring, 1997.