

Contents

[The 1997 OCD Program by Caren J. Siehl](#)

[Brave New World: The Social Alchemy of Transforming OD&C Into The 21st Century by Bill Torbert](#)

[ODC Division Pre-Conference Workshops by Ken Murrell](#)

[1997 Doctoral Consortium](#)

[When The End Of A Journey Is Just The Beginning by Ella L.J. Edmundson Bell](#)

[Branch Rickey and the Brooklyn Dodgers: Facilitating Controversial Social Change In Organizations by John R. Austin](#)

THE 1997 ODC PROGRAM

By Caren Siehl

Our 1997 ODC program offers a variety of views on "Current Issues" as well as other issues of concern to our members. We had an excellent response to our call for papers and received over fifty papers and twenty-one symposia proposals from researchers and practitioners throughout the world.

Four symposia were selected as Academy Showcase Symposia: "Beyond Downsizing: A Call for Action for Revitalizing Organizations" chaired by Gretchen Spreitzer and Aneil Mishra, including a paper by Aaron Feuerstein, CEO of Malden Mills Industries, Inc; "The Call to Bridge Knowledge and Action: New Institutions, Paradigms and Methods" chaired by George Roth; "Beyond Armchair Feminism II: The Challenges of Holding onto Gender in Organizational Intervention" chaired by Robin Ely and Debra Meyerson with Anita Roddick, CEO of The Body Shop, as one of the discussants; and "Capacity Building & Institutional Development as a Means for Systematic Change in Economies in Transition" chaired by L. David Brown, Raymond Sauer, and Lichia Yiu, with a multicultural set of researchers presenting their work.

In addition to the Showcase Symposia, we have ten symposia on the program which are being co-sponsored by at least one other division. Our co-sponsors include Organizational Behavior, Organization and Management Theory,

Managerial Consultation, Management History, Research Methods, Women in Management, Management Education and Development, Organizations and the Natural Environment, and Technology and Innovation Management. This diverse set of co-sponsors should ensure wide visibility for the work of our members.

We will be honored this year to host Jerry Porras, Stanford University, as our division's Distinguished Speaker. He will address us at 2:00 pm on Tuesday afternoon. Jerry's recent work includes the best-selling book, *Built to Last*.

Immediately following this session, we will once again host a Best Papers session, but this year, the session has been expanded to include an invited address by one of the most provocative thinkers in ODC, Peter Reason. This session will take place from 3:40 - 5:00 pm. This ODC Executive Committee, after a thorough review of the most highly ranked papers, has awarded the Best Doctoral Student Paper to "Sanding Down the Edges: Paradoxical Impediments to Organizational Change" by Andrew L. Molinsky, of Harvard University, and the Best Practice Related Paper to "Action Learning, Fragmentation, and the Interaction of Single, Double and Triple Loop Change: A Case of Gay and Lesbian Advocacy" by Erica Foldy and W. E. Douglass Creed of Boston College. The Best Paper presentations will be followed by Peter Reason of the University of Bath discussing his paper "Revisioning Inquiry for Action: A Participatory View". This session will include time for a spirited discussion and interaction around issues raised by the researchers. Our Tuesday program will then conclude with the ODC Business meeting and Social Hour beginning at 6:20 pm.

National Program Chair, Anne Huff, has continued last year's innovation of bringing together papers from a number of divisions which focus on a common topic. These Shared Interest Track sessions provide the opportunity for different perspectives to enlighten the same issue or topic. Eight of our papers were selected to be part of different Shared Interest Tracks, such as "Community", "Quality over Time", and "Team Effectiveness".

Our program also includes four competitive paper sessions of four papers each. These sessions offer research and thinking on programs of planned change, the individual as part of change, and large-scale strategic change, among other topics. In addition, we selected four papers to be part of an interactive paper session. This session is intended to create an environment for informal discussion and an open exchange of research ideas and suggestions.

As we hope is evident from the above, our 1997 ODC program is rich, full, and varied. Be sure to check the

Academy Program listings for times and places of our sessions. We have asked paper presenters, discussants, and chairs to be as creative as possible in inventing new ways to increase interaction. But, of course, such interaction will not be possible without your participation in as many of our sessions as possible.

As you leaf through your academy program, you will find that pre and post conference activities continue to grow. ODC will, again, cosponsor the OB/OMT/ODC doctoral student consortium. We are also involved in several significant pre-conference sessions.

On behalf of our division, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the reviewers listed below who selected the symposia and papers for the 1997 program: Achilles Armenakis, Jean Bartunek, David Bednar, Ella Bell, Wayne Boss, Jan Bouwen, James Bowditch, Donald Bowen, Tony Buono, Cliff Cheng, Lisa Cheraskin, Susan Cohen, David Cooperrider, Thomas Cummings, Barbara Davidson, Anne Davis, Peter Diplock, Ellen Dravecky, John Drexler, Amy Edmondson, Rob Goffee, Robert Golembowski, Mary Ann Hazen, Joan Kofidimos, Miriam Lacey, Craig Lundberg, Barry Macy, Newton Margulies, Alicia McCareins, Michael McCuddy, Gary McMahan, Yoram Mitki, Ananda Mukherji, Kenneth Murrell, Ashish Nanda, Mitchell Neubert, Luke Novelli, Anthony Raia, Gaylord Reagan, Peter Reason, Lee Robbins, Peter Robertson, A. B. Shani, Peter Sorensen, Gretchen Spreitzer, Robert Steel, Daniel Syantek, Kit Tennis, William Torbert, Mary Tucker, Bobbie Turniansky, Glenn Varney, William Verdi, Janine Waclawski, Don Warwick, Rod Westerlund, and Richard Woodman.

BRAVE, NEW WORLD: THE SOCIAL ALCHEMY OF TRANSFORMING OD&C INTO THE 21ST CENTURY *by Bill Torbert*

Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, a not-for-profit and the largest HMO in New England, is currently developing 50/50 partnerships with some of its subsidiaries, creating a whole new form of cooperative confederacy among organizations. In such cases, neither side has the power to force resolution; the relationship becomes structurally primary; and an ability to engage in mutual, transformational influence becomes strategically primary. In a similar spirit, the Society for Organizational Learning (SOL) is currently being formed from the former Senge/MIT Organizational Learning Center as a not-for-profit governed by a 'trilateral' council on which member corporations, member consultants, and member researchers are equally represented.

Such are just two of the postmodern, multi-vocal, market-responsive, mission-called, collaborative designs that attempt to integrate ongoing research, capacity-building, and action in huge inter-organizational networks in real time (and both of these particular cases will be discussed at our Academy sessions this summer). Our OD&C division of the Academy of Management is itself a very large (1,700 members) confederacy of executives (282 [100 more than belong to any other division) and scholars (1,400) all of whom share a deep commitment to learning more about how to facilitate profound, constructive change through research, practice, and the development of theory.

Your Executive Board (on which I am joined not only by my successor, Thunderbird's Caren Siehl, but also by Ken Murrell, retiring ecological social alchemist extraordinaire, Ella Bell, our soul sister, Wayne, the Boss, Peter Never-saw-a-participative-inquiry-I-didn't-like Reason, the affable, unflappable, Cal-Poly-Technicolor Rami Shani, the X-[Chair]man David Cooperrider, and our executive member, Lilly's Lisa Cheraskin) has been asking itself how the OD&C Division can become a little more like these new partnership inter-organizations. What is our distinctive concern, competence, and mission?

You and we know, as well as anyone in our society, that we are now beyond the cusp of transformation from the patriarchal, hierarchical, unilateral organizing of the past three millenia toward: what? An unrooted maelstrom of change, competition, scams, regressive fundamentalisms, the disappearance of the university in the next twenty years (as Peter Drucker is predicting), and temporary survival of the temporarily fittest? Or to new adult, societal, and scientific capacities for partnership and mutuality? Some of both, no doubt; but what can we contribute to making the transformation constructive? Can we transform from OD practitioners, researchers, and theorists to something like ecological social alchemists?

You and we know, as well as anyone in our society, that our very assumptions about how research and action relate to one another must transform and are transforming. The very notion that research and action are, properly, separated - that research is to be pursued off-line in a separate, 'ivory tower' institution by researchers who are somehow not actors, while those researched muck about in a 'real world' where there is no time for reflection - this very notion of the separation of research and action must be, and is being, transformed (Abram, 1996; Argyris et al, 1985; Bernstein, 1985; Heron, 1996; Reason, 1994; Torbert, 1991).

As members of the Academy of Management, our division has sometimes represented the world of practice back to

the world of scholarship, and we have made room for skepticism about the degree to which scholarly studies to date have reflected and encouraged living organizational change. But today we have the opportunity to be far more proactive than this. We can share the lead in re-presenting new paradigms of research that integrate observation and participation, research and practice - that integrate awareness, theory, action, and outcome assessment - that integrate quantitative, qualitative, and action research in real-time settings, with all participants playing both research and practice roles.

Although qualitative methods such as ethnography have introduced us to strange Others whom we could not before have imagined, and although quantitative methods associated with empirical positivism have taught us the rigor with which we must work if we are to establish any descriptive empirical proposition with near certainty, neither of these broad approaches by itself teaches us anything about how to act effectively at unique historical moments in collaborative, transformational processes (because they teach us nothing about the action awareness, [normative] action theory, action skills, or timing required). Nor does either of these broad approaches to research teach us anything about how to create real-time learning environments in the midst of transformation, so that inferences can be tested, alternative interpretations shared, and the transformation re-visioned, re-strategized, re-ennacted, and re-assessed. Nor does either of these broad approaches teach us how to conduct a study so as to invite challenges to, and transformations of, the very assumptions of the study itself and of the researchers as they are doing the study. We now share the opportunity to lead in the development of three versions of integrated research/practice - first-person, second-person, and third-person research/practice. These are three scales of ecological social alchemy.

First-, Second-, and Third-Person Research/Practice

All of us - whether we be primarily academics or primarily practitioners - engage in some sort of flawed action/inquiry - some sort of flawed research/practice - some sort of psycho-social alchemy - on a first-person scale. For example, physically, our first-person research/practice may be about how to exercise or how to eat; emotionally, it may concern how to do work one is passionate about, or how to make intimate relationships more nourishing; intellectually, it may concern how to prioritize one's values, or how to learn more clearly what one does value. Usually, we conduct these first-person research/practices with little discipline. Or, we may be extremely disciplined for a time in one narrow area (e.g. diet). Or we may seek therapeutic or ministerial or 12-step guidance for a time. But, astonishingly, except for esoteric spiritual practices that survive from before the modern era, we have no overall

sense of how to conduct a lifetime first-person research/practice - how to continually return to the play of dividing and otherwise stretching our attention, so that the harmonies and incongruities of our own visioning, strategizing, acting, and effectuating come into view as they occur - so that we can see, in the moment, what Clowns we are, what Witches, what Sirens.

Members of our division can take the lead in defining, practicing, teaching, and documenting first-person research/practice (see Fisher & Torbert, 1995; Harrison, 1995; Torbert & Fisher, 1992). A self-exploratory autobiographical essay is required as part of doctoral dissertations in management from the Centre for Action Research in Professional Practice at the University of Bath in England. Even without clear standards of rigor, is it not perhaps an ethical responsibility to include such self-inquiry in professions where each practitioner can wield significant power through his or her ideas, pedagogy, publications, and/or consultancies? (For examples of this kind of work, see <http://www2.bc.edu/~torbert>)

All of us also engage in some sort of flawed second-person research/practice with the significant others in our work lives and our home lives. The work of Argyris (e.g. 1985) and others from the Tavistock, Bethel, and Esalen schools of interpersonal and group self-study represent early efforts to chart the territory of valid, effective, transformational second-person research/practice. But we have a long way to go. Even though the innovative Journal of Management Inquiry has a Dialog section, for example, it has in fact published no dialogs that exemplify second-person research/practice. Moreover, the Tavistock, Bethel, and Esalen schools all shared a feature of universities that ultimately undercuts the generalizability of the learning and research they have supported - namely, they too operate off-line. Can you name a single, long-term "Community of Inquiry" where persons critical of one another's theories (or faiths) work together? Freud's circle broke apart as soon as the "sons" began to challenge the "father." Thus, there is also a vast territory of second-person research/practice that members of our division can share the lead in defining, practicing, teaching, and documenting.

Finally, there must also be an arena of third-person research/practice or social alchemy that is virtually undefined at present. Third-person research/practice can be of two very different sorts. The first sort, which is by far the most common, does not really qualify as research/practice at all because it conceptually and operationally segregates research from practice. Whether as research or as practice, this third-person mode develops impersonal structures to which subordinate/participants (whether research subjects or employees) are expected to conform. Furthermore,

this third-person mode (whether in positivist sciencing or in bureaucratic organizing) does not, in aim or in act, encourage ongoing first-person or second-person research/practice among participants, does not encourage challenge and transformation of the pre-determined structures, and does not encourage transformation of the hierarchical power relationships at the outset toward more peer-like relationships.

The second, much more rare kind of third-person research/practice also begins by developing impersonal structures for persons initially unknown to the initiators of the organizing process (e.g. this essay). In all other respects, however, the aims of "true" third-person research/practice differ from bureaucratic organizing and positivist research. First and foremost, the actual tasks defined by true third-person research/practice structures require that participants engage in first- and second-person research/practice (expanding their awareness and exercising increasing creativity and choice), in order to accomplish the goals. Moreover, even though subordinate/participants are initially expected to conform to the pre-defined structures, they are simultaneously encouraged and educated to confront them, if they appear to be incongruous with the organizational mission (which is itself held open to inquiry). Indeed, the aim of such third-person research/practices is to cultivate peer cultures of mutual influence that encourage personal, organizational, and epistemological transformations when called for (as is the aim of this essay).

The Harvard Pilgrim Health Care 50/50 partnerships and the trilateral partnership of the Society for Organizational Learning mentioned at the outset of this piece are third-person research/practice structures that call for the first-person, second-person, and third-person processes of research/practice outlined here (see Torbert, 1997, for more detail).

The awareness, skills, and values of our ODC division membership make it feasible for us to become leaders in developing an Ecological Action Inquiry paradigm of research/practice for the 21st century. If you would like to join in this social alchemy via an ongoing internet conversation about what this means, please e-mail me at torbert@bc.edu and I will create a group. For more immediate information about what I mean by these sketchy ideas, please visit my website - <http://www2.bc.edu/~torbert> . The OD&C Executive Board hopes this can constitute the beginning of a more vivifying conversation among us. And, we hope to see you in person in August in Boston!

References

Abram, David. (1996). *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-Than Human World*. New York: Vintage.

Argyris, C., Putnam, R., and Smith, D. (1985). *Action Science: Concepts, Methods and Skills for Research and Intervention*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bernstein, R. (1985). *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fisher, D., & Torbert, W. (1995). *Personal and Organizational Transformations: The True Challenge of Continual Quality Improvement*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Harrison, R. (1995). *Consultant's Journey: A Dance of Work and Spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Heron, J. (1996). *Cooperative Inquiry: Research into the Human Condition*. London: Sage.

Reason, P. (1994). *Participation in Human Inquiry*. London: Sage.

Torbert, W. (1991). *The Power of Balance: Transforming Self, Society, and Scientific Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Torbert, W. (1997). Developing courage and wisdom in organizing and in sciencing. In S. Srivastva (Ed.), *Executive Wisdom and Organizational Change*. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.

Torbert, W., & Fisher, D. (1992). Autobiographical awareness as a catalyst for managerial and organizational development. *Management Education and Development Journal*, 23(3), 184-198.

ODC DIVISION PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS

by Ken Murrell

The ODC Division is sponsoring two great pre-conference events in Boston. Celebrating its tenth year as one of the

original pre-conference offerings, Rupe Chisholm, Max Elden and Thoralf Ovale facilitate a session both Saturday and Sunday on "Emerging Concepts of Empowering Work and Action Research." This session is participant designed and attracts an international audience with much stimulating conversation.

On Friday, Glenn Varney is conducting "Search for a Common Body of Knowledge in Master's Level Programs in OD and Change." this is a most important subject area and will cover a wide range of issues directly related to what we should be doing in our campus-based programs and where the field of OD is moving.

1997 DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM

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 and begin thinking about their future as assistant professors, will be held August 8 through 10, 1997 in Boston. This year's Consortium is being organized by David Cooperrider (Case Western University), Kathleen Eisenhardt (Stanford University) and Marilyn Gist (University of Washington).

A terrific group of faculty have agreed to participate. In addition to the organizers, core faculty will include Richard D'Aveni (Dartmouth College), L. David Brown (Boston University), Taylor Cox (University of Michigan), Kim Elsbach (Emory University), Carrie Leana (University of Pittsburgh), William Ocasio (Northwestern University), Greg Oldham (University of Illinois-Champaign), Christine Oliver (York University), Joanne Preston (Pepperdine University), Sim Sitkin (Duke University), Peter Sorenson (Illinois Benedictine College), and Michael Tushman (Columbia University). 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.

If you have questions, please contact Marilyn E. Gist at the University of Washington (megist@u.washington.edu.)

WHEN THE END OF A JOURNEY IS JUST THE BEGINNING

by Ella L.J. Edmondson Bell

In 1988, I began my second journey into a line of inquiry on the life stories of women managers. Along with my colleague, Stella Nkomo we set out on what has turned out to be a very long journey to chart the stories of successful women who walked, talked, performed and fought their ways up the corporate ladder of some of the most prestigious companies in America. Our goal was to learn the ways in which these women interpreted their lives, the ebbs and flows, the significant people and the events that gave their lives definition. More importantly, we wanted for once and for all, to put to rest the myth that all professional women in corporate American followed similar paths, regardless of their race, ethnicity and class backgrounds.

Thus, our goal was to demonstrate the separate paths Black and White women took in reaching their success, and the ways their lives diverged and converged. Why did we select this particular goal? Because in the literature on

women managers, stories of Black women stood in the shadow of the experiences of White women. We wanted to make explicit the effects of race on women's lives. Not simply race being an obstacle for Black women or race being a privilege for White women. We wanted to move beyond the fixation of race being only perceived as a source of oppression.

During our investigative odyssey, our cross race research team conducted intensive life history interviews 120 Black and White woman managers, which we supplemented with an in-depth survey of 776 women managers from across the country. Throughout the process of conducting the interviews, the analysis of the life histories and the eventual writing of a book on what we learned, one fact has continually loomed over us like a bright star that illuminated the women's stories and guided our work. Race mattered in the women's life in their lives, but race alone certainly did not explain fully the rich distinctions between the paths of their lives. Nor, did race account for the distinctions we discovered among the stories of women of the same race. Many of the assumptions we held about race, lack of education, sexual prejudice and poverty were shattered like a broken glass because of what the women's stories told us.

For example, White women growing up in insular middle-class families frequently have to work hard in the corporate world to learn to network effectively. These women were groomed for success early in their lives by their parents, and they perceived themselves fitting comfortably into corporate life. They did not feel a need to network among themselves or to place a high value on developing relationships with other women in their companies. In the long run, this behavior works against White women as they advance through the ranks of their companies' hierarchies. Black women on the other hand, who are more likely to have a large community of people who play significant roles in their lives, are often better able to thrive in the workplace because of their networking skills. They are radicals simply by their mere presence as minority women in the Corporate world, insofar as they represent a contradiction to the status quo. Black women are committed in thought and action in the struggle to eliminate oppression where they work, but they are tempered by working within the confines of corporate life. Unlike White women, Black women were taught by their parents the value of giving back to the community and maintaining supportive bonds with other Blacks, especially Black women. In the long run, this value enabled Black women get nurturance and support, in spite of experiencing racial discrimination. In addition, their networks enabled them to leverage their power for career advancement within the companies.

I could go on to tell you other ways Black and White women's paths diverged, occasionally crossed and in some instances came together. I prefer instead to discuss one of the unintentional outcomes of this inquiry. This is the point of departure of my new voyage, only this time the data point is me. As I mentioned earlier in this essay, this was my second journey exploring women's lives. My maiden voyage was my dissertation, where I explored the bicultural life structures of Black women. Once again, my genre was life history. As a graduate student, I spent hours with my interviewees hungrily devouring their every word, and savoring all the bits and pieces of their stories. Yet, after finishing the dissertation I was still not full, a feeling of emptiness remained. So, at the first opportunity I embarked on another exploration of women's lives, this time focusing on Black and White women, but in many ways still asking the same questions. Now, I do believe that one must have passion in their work as researchers. However, I had to face the fact in my research that I had either crossed the fine line between passion and obsession, or else something much deeper was going on between my research and me.

I told myself at first, my need to explore women's lives again was grounded in my strong desire to make the places where we work and the communities where we live inclusive. As a Black feminist, educator and researcher, I have passionately defined my life work as a race woman: one who identifies and helps eliminate discriminatory barriers of any kind. Researching Black and White women managers surely fit into my political agenda and my role as a change agent. I went along for quite some time believing my research was more political than personal.

But then came the signs that pointed to a very different path. The first sign was when I was doing the actual interviews in the second study. My energy was consumed when conducting an early life section of an interview with a woman. I frequently took longer to talk with women about their earlier years, their childhoods, their parents and families and the communities where they lived. Compared to my colleagues' interview transcripts, my interview transcripts were always longer by a number of pages and more detailed. It was also harder for me to maintain my boundaries with the women in this part of the interviews. Our interviews were more like exchanges about our early lives.

A major sign occurred when I interviewed one woman told a story concerning her mother. She had been raped as a young woman which resulted in her having a child. This child, a boy, was given up for adoption. Her mother never shared her story with anyone because of her shame and pain. The child she gave away, found her some forty years later causing her much distress, but also revealing what she had buried in her past. The woman I interviewed was so

upset by her mother's distress, she seemed to have no interest or empathy for a child trying to connect to his biological mother. Throughout listening to her tell me this story, I became numb and her voice became physically distant. I stopped taking notes, only the tape recorder was present to capture her words because emotionally I was in another place. That night I went over my research notes and thought hard about what had happened during the interview and my relationship with the participant. I was worried about what my body and behavior had conveyed to her. And, I had to face up to what my behavior and body was trying to tell me.

I am an adopted child, a person who was without ancestral roots. I was adopted when I was six weeks old by James and Geneva Bell. The story I was told regarding my adoption was that my mother who was in college became pregnant by my father who was attending medical school. Both came from upper middle class families, where there was a strong value against keeping children born out wedlock. My maternal grandfather found a family who would take me and then legally made arrangements for my adoption. Although I was given away, he took on a different status as my "Godfather." However, I did not discover his true identity until I was twenty years old. When I made this discovery, my response was to turn away from the people who gave me away. I never attempted to find out my own story, my ancestry or the story of my clan from my biological family.

In retrospect, what has become clear to me is that my desire to research women's lives, particularly successful Black women, was my unconscious attempt to mend my broken story. Now, I think perhaps I was engaging in subterfuge -- seeking to understand my own biography, but keeping what I thought to be a safe distance by objectively researching other Black women's lives. I only fooled myself. Even writing this essay has been a difficult process. So, the next phase of my journey is to write my own personal narrative, my testimonio or what anthropologists call a self-ethnography.¹ I think of this new voyage as my search and re-search, where I search for the missing parts of my identity and delicately weave the pieces together, as any good researcher would do.

Notes

1. Some examples of this genre in both anthropology and psychotherapy include: Ruth Behar's, *Translated Woman* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993) and *The Vulnerable Observer* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996); Annie G. Rogers, *A Shining Affliction: A Story of Harm and Healing in Psychotherapy* (Viking Press, New York, 1996); Kay Redfield Jamison, *An Unquiet Mind* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995).

BRANCH RICKEY AND THE BROOKLYN DODGERS: FACILITATING CONTROVERSIAL SOCIAL CHANGE IN ORGANIZATIONS

by John R. Austin

1996 Best Graduate Student Paper

In April 1947, Jackie Robinson took the field as the starting second baseman for the Brooklyn Dodgers, breaking major league baseball's color barrier. That day was the culmination of a carefully managed change process orchestrated by Dodger general manager, Branch Rickey. The actions taken by Branch Rickey enabled the Brooklyn Dodgers to overcome opposing organizational and social norms and successfully implement a highly controversial social change that spread to other ball clubs. The sequencing of different strategies throughout the change process played a significant part in breaking down the organizational and public resistance to the change. Branch Rickey's method could be useful as a guide for future attempts at social change within organizations.

Controversial social change is change that challenges organizational norms and broader social norms.

Controversial social change in an organization directly challenges widely accepted organizational norms, and, to be successful, it must change not only the members' behavior but also the members' interpretations of societal norms.

Controversial Social Change in Action

Through his actions, Branch Rickey successfully challenged major league baseball's color barrier. Subsequent history has shown the lasting impact these events have had. Rickey managed to reduce organizational and personal resistance to desegregation at a time when desegregation was an accepted part of American business and life. A closer examination at Rickey's method provides a seven step guide for future attempts at controversial social change within organization.

1. An individual or group considers the appropriateness of a controversial organizational and social change.

The initiating individual or group begins with a strong sense of the ethical need for change. This sense of need establishes the goals of the change process and guides action. The change is also guided by a clear understanding

of the interplay between social traditions and action. This understanding drives the decision to attempt a controversial social change. For the change to be successful, the ethical and social underpinnings of the desired change is clear, well thought through, and feasible. Rickey's dialogs with historians and sociologists combined with his personal reflection to generate a clear goal (desegregation of the Dodgers) and a potential path to attain the goal (convincing stakeholders that desegregation would make the Dodgers more successful). While Rickey's personal experience generated the passion and strength of his convictions, his understanding of race relations and desegregation methods provided him with the knowledge necessary to make the change feasible.

At this point in the method, there is no dialog between the change agent(s) and the organization. The change agent develops an understanding of the social embeddedness of the organizational action, then he sets out to change not just the organizational action but the traditions that mold it. The traditions are openly questioned within the change group or off-line with experts in order to understand the problem. This internal dialog leads to the goal of controversial social change within the organization. Rickey did not attempt to desegregate the Dodgers only to change an organizational norm of segregation. His goal was to initiate a dialog that challenged the social norms of segregation in all baseball clubs.

2. The individual or group decides to engage in a change effort and makes a recommendation to top management using organizational goals as the justification.

Social change challenges the status-quo and the accompanying power structure of the organization. In the case of controversial social change, the social change also challenges the power structure of the society. This clash often leads to a scenario in which the social change is framed in win-lose terms. In a such a situation, the social change will be successful if the change advocates have more power then the defenders of the status-quo. However, the accompanying bad feelings on the part of the 'losers' reduces the possibility of wide spread learning and value change.

In step two, to reduce the likelihood of such a derailment, the initiator translates the controversial social change into the current goals of the organization. The change is framed as a win-win situation in which neither side loses credibility. The initiator masks the tradition challenging intent of the social change by advocating for the change within the current goal structure of the organization. The proposal is described as a strategic change, rather than a

social change. This win-win single-loop description of the desired change avoids a direct confrontation with the organizational and broader social governing values. At this step, the focus of the change is behavior, not values. For example, Rickey focused on the economic competitive advantage of desegregation during his 1943 meeting with Dodger board members.

3. The recommendation is accepted by top management and other important groups on basis of current, goal-based justification.

It is generally accepted that any significant organizational change must have the support of the organization leaders. Top management support is particularly necessary for controversial change. Top management provides resources and credibility to the change effort. Top management approval also signifies that the change is congruent with long-term organizational goals. The top management group recognizes the strategic benefits of the change and accepts it based on this justification. The Dodger owners made it clear to Rickey that they approved of his plan as a strategic change but not as a social change. The owners accepted desegregation as compatible with their goal of profit maximization. The social and ethical aspects of segregation were never addressed.

4. The change agent builds a small advocacy group within the organization to advance the change.

The selection of a qualified advocacy group is crucial. The members of the group should have the motivation and skills necessary to carry out the change and then communicate the rationale for the change to stakeholders inside and outside the organization. Since the social change has been reframed as a strategic change, the members of the advocacy group form a united coalition that demonstrates the strategic advantages of the social change.

Members of the group must modify their individual governing values to accept the congruence between the social change and the strategic justification for the change. In the Dodgers case, members of this group tended to support the idea of desegregation, but they did not believe it was compatible with the current goals of the Dodgers. Through one-on-one dialog, Rickey linked the personal values of key members of the organization and community with the idea of desegregation. Using this process, a core advocacy group within the Dodgers emerged which included Jackie Robinson, Branch Rickey, Jr., Leo Durocher, Harold Mann, and Red Barber. While each of these had different personal reasons for supporting the change, they all publicly agreed on the strategic purpose of the change.

5. The support group defends and explains the change to organization members and others based on goal based justification.

The advocacy group carries out the behavioral change. The group justifies the change using current organization goals. Rickey's attacks on the Negro league focused on its corruption. These attacks had the effect of highlighting the economic side of the Robinson signing while distancing Rickey from the vocal proponents of segregation. The signing of Jackie Robinson was justified as furthering the Dodgers goal of winning the pennant. The advocacy group repeatedly described the change as a business decision. Discussions of the change focused on Robinson's athletic prowess and expansion of the Dodgers fan base to include the black community. Durocher and Rickey asked the Dodger players to accept Robinson for his ball playing skills.

6. After change is initiated, the change group reframes the justification for the change using broad generally accepted social ideals.

The power of storytelling as a means for understanding past events is important in a controversial social change. It is through stories that we assign meaning to our past and it is through stories that we are able to understand the motive of others' past actions. By avoiding a direct challenge to the traditions surrounding segregation, Rickey and his supporters enabled the behavioral change to become reality. The organizational change had been successful but there had been no lasting change in traditions. In order for such a change to occur the organizational change has to be understood within the context of social traditions. The first five steps of the method outlined here led to a behavioral change. To this point, the focus of the advocacy group was on reducing the barriers to Jackie Robinson's signing with the Dodgers. The public justification for this change was limited to the legitimate business and competitive interests of the Dodgers. After Robinson began playing for the Dodgers, there was a significant shift in how the signing was justified. Participants in the change begin explaining their past actions in moral rather than business terms. The focus of the signing shifted from its economic motives towards its social motives. It was at this point that Rickey emphasized his belief in social justice and equality. Rickey's actions and interviews during this time supported his new social justice explanation for the Robinson signing. During the late 40's Rickey farmed out some of his best black prospects to other teams, effectively speeding up the process of desegregation. The release of the threatening letters further highlighted the ethical implications of the Robinson signing by generating public outrage based on a sense of decency.

7. The social justification for the change is gradually accepted by others as the reason for the change.

The reframing of the motives by the advocacy group gradually shifts public perception of the change. The evidence in the Dodgers case suggests that an acceptance of the social justification of Robinson's signing did occur. Starting in late 1947, there was a noticeable shift in public discussions of the Robinson signing. Speeches by prominent community and baseball leaders made references to ideas of equality and social justice. Newspaper editorials frequently applauded the positive social effects of baseball desegregation. Most historical books and documentaries on the Dodgers highlight Rickey's passion for social change and deep sense of moral duty.

Observations From The Dodgers Case

Controversial social change within an organization often can not be accomplished in one step. Social change is the result of a linked sequence of strategies. Each step in the process determines and informs the following steps. This process highlights the importance of Rickey's initial tradition challenging goal, formulated at the start of the process (step one). This goal of controversial social change drives each successive stage of the process and serves as the primary impetus for steps six and seven. The process converges in step seven when the organization recognizes the tradition challenging implications of the change.

The challenge to tradition occurs through retrospective interpretation of the change event that connects the change to widely accepted social values. By postponing this interpretation until after the behavioral change, this process does not require organization members to reconsider their tradition until after their behavior is consistent with the new social change argument. It is difficult to generate change that is inconsistent with social norms, and it may be nearly impossible if the individuals involved must simultaneously attempt to change their behavior and their beliefs. A risk of this method is that the change may stall after the behavioral change is complete. By postponing reflection until after the behavioral change, the change agent runs the risk of having the strategic justification for the change accepted. This may actually reduce the need to recognize the social implications of the change. For this reason it is important that the change agent maintain a goal of controversial social change throughout the process.

The method used to implement controversial social change within an organization builds from an intimate understanding of the learning style of the organization. Since learning styles within organizations evolve over time,

this method calls for a high level of awareness throughout the process. The change agent must be able to understand and anticipate the perspectives of the other people involved in the change. This level of awareness may be difficult to achieve and maintain, but controversial social change demands it.

Conclusion

The desegregation of the Brooklyn Dodgers illustrates a successful example of a controversial social change. This case suggests that it is not necessary to publicly vocalize a new vision when attempting a change that directly challenges societal norms. This is not to say that an underlying motive driving social change is not necessary, but that it may be useful to keep the motive private in the early steps of the change process. In such situations it may be appropriate to work within the goal structure of the organization to generate a behavioral change. This initial strategy lowers organizational resistance to a subsequent discussion about biases in the tradition system. Rather than asking organization members to change both their behavior and tradition system, this method breaks down the change into more manageable parts, reducing the risk of generating defensive routines and a backlash to the change. Organization leaders and researchers alike must seek ways of understanding and managing social change in their organizations. This paper has provided one interpretation of a successful, highly risky social change that may be useful as a model for future organizational social change efforts.

Notes

1. The case in this paper is built from a combination of three sources. (1) Biographies of participants, (2) historical articles and documents and, (3) academic research on the events. The biographies provided rich, introspective accounts from most of the major participants. The danger of using retrospective and possibly biased accounts was offset through the use of historical documents to verify the accounts. The inclusion of academic research helped clarify how historians have combined the various perspectives into a coherent story and helped in tracking down the essential historical documents. For a good summary of the events described in this case, I recommend *Wait Till Next Year: The Life Story of Jackie Robinson*, by Carl Rowan (1960) or *Baseball's Great Experiment*, by Jules Tygiel (1983).