Contents

CALL FOR PAPERS

by Caren J. Siehl

The 1997 Academy of Management Annual Meetings will be held August 10-13, 1997 in Boston, Massachusetts with pre-conference activities taking place from August 8-10. The Meeting's theme is "Current Issues that Call for Action." This theme should be of interest to most of our members because of the linkages among innovative practices, organizational change, and issues that lead to action.

Theme

As described in the Academy Call for Papers, "current issues" can, and should, be broadly defined. What currently intrigues you and your colleagues? What are the issues that are challenging the companies with whom you are working on research? Such issues could focus on the interplay between organizations and the physical environment, between organizations and diverse cultures, between organizations and emerging economies. Current issues could also focus on the challenges which individuals face in being part of increasingly complex and demanding organizations.

The explicit highlighting of a call for action is the perfect opportunity for our members to discuss their current research which is action-focused and action-based. This is one of the greatest strengths of our division. We can maximize the exposure for our research by working closely with members of other divisions and interest groups as we propose symposia of interest to a broad set of academy members. Symposia which are submitted to more than one division can increase our audience and reinforce our interdisciplinary linkages. Finally, given the theme of the meetings and the focus of our division, I would encourage you to involve practitioners as participants in symposia, as co-authors on papers, as panels of discussants or in other creative ways! The link between issues and action would seem to encourage such involvement.

Submission Requirements

Please consult the Academy Call for Papers which appears in the Academy Newsletter for a detailed list of submission rules. I would like to call your attention to a few of the more crucial rules as you are preparing your papers and symposium proposals.

To be considered, your submission must adhere to the following:

1. Submissions must not have been previously presented at a professional meeting nor be under concurrent consideration or scheduled for presentation at another professional meeting.

2. Participants can be included as an author or other participant or in any other role as presenter, session chair, discussant, etc. in up to three (3) submissions or sessions for the regular program, but no more. This rule does not apply to preconvention activities, nor to program listings resulting from officer roles.

3. There are no specific length restrictions on papers. However, authors should use a 30 page guideline common for major journals (e.g., AMG, AMR).

4. Papers to be presented will be selected by a blind review process. Please ensure that only the title page reveals the authors complete professional names and affiliations. The title page should also show complete address, telephone, FAX numbers, and e-mail addresses of all authors and specify who will be presenting the paper. The intended divisions or interest groups should be listed at the bottom of the title page.

5. A separate abstract page should include the title and an abstract of no more than 50 words but not the authors' names as well as three (3) key words indicating the major subject of the submission.

6. Symposium and other proposals are not blind reviewed. They should include a title page, abstract page, and up to three (3) key words, a 3-5 page overview statement, a 2-5 page synopsis of each presentation, and a signed statement from each intended participant showing agreement to participate.

7. Proposals for innovative program presentations are encouraged. These proposals should be prepared in the same manner as symposium proposals and will be reviewed in a similar fashion.

8. Four copies of the submission, plus one additional copy of the title page and the abstract page are needed. A completed and signed submission checklist form should also accompany each submission.

9. THE DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF SUBMISSIONS IS JANUARY 7, 1997. Manuscripts should be sent to: Dr. Caren Siehl, Department of World Business, Thunderbird - The American Graduate School of International Management, 15249

PARTICIPATION, COMPLEXITY OF UNDERSTANDING, AND THE ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

by Jean M. Bartunek, Barbara Davidson, Danna N. Greenberg & Margaret Humphries

Change agents often develop complex, well articulated "visions" for change. They are often overly optimistic in their predictions about the success of their change initiatives, in part because they implicitly expect that other organizational members will share and agree with their understandings of the change efforts (e.g. Griffin & Ross, 1991).

Much scholarly and practitioner writing that addresses understandings of change focuses primarily on change agents' understandings. Researchers rarely focus on how level of participation in an organizational change initiative (change agent, participant, non-participant) affects interpretation of change. It is reasonable to assume, however, that change agents who are deeply involved in developing a particular change will have a more complex and differentiated understanding of the change than organizational members who only participate in it or who are only tangentially involved or uninvolved with it. Moreover, varying levels of complexity of understanding of change initiatives may hinder the success of these initiatives. Many change initiatives are introduced in a superficial manner that reduces their effectiveness simply because those involved in their implementation do not understand them in depth.

Relatedly, organizational members' criteria for assessing change have rarely been a primary focus of research attention. Organizational researchers frequently administer surveys asking organizational members to evaluate the effectiveness of a particular change, but these surveys do not explore the more or less complex criteria different individuals and/ or organizational groups use to assess the change. Assessment criteria are good indicators of complexity of understanding.

In this study we explore the complexity of criteria organizational members used to assess an organizational change and the relationship between complexity of the criteria used and ratings of change. We also explore the relationship between level of participation in the change attempt and criteria and ratings. Research addressing these issues can provide important information to scholars of change and to change agents about impacts of differences between change agents' and other organizational members' cognitions regarding organizational change initiatives.

We explored these issues through a study of the impacts of a Faculty Development Committee (FDC), a group composed primarily of teachers, whose mission was to empower teachers in a loosely knit Network of 19 independent schools dispersed across the United States. The FDC's approach to empowerment is based on its founders' premise that teachers and their experiences provide crucial and valuable knowledge for educational inquiry, and that improvement of education hinges on providing forums for teachers to articulate and communicate their practical knowledge to each other and to the public realm (Bartunek, Lacey, & Wood, 1992).

The FDC has implemented this philosophy in the Network through multiple mechanisms, especially a series of Faculty institutes that bring together teachers from the different Network schools and an annual journal of teacher writing to which all faculty members in the Network can submit articles. Additionally, in order to communicate effectively with the various Network teachers, the FDC appoints contact people in each of the schools.

While the FDC increased the number of people involved in its activities over the six years of its existence up to the time of this study, the majority of personnel in the different schools have not been directly involved with the change initiative. Consequently, school personnel vary widely in the degree to which they have participated in it.

Conceptual Rationale and Hypotheses

Our conceptual rationale is based on social cognition as it relates to organizational change. In any organizational change attempt, organizational members should differ in the complexity of their understandings of the change, and these differences should relate systematically to both their level of participation in the change and to their ratings of change.

Specifically, as individuals' participation in a change initiative increases, they should develop more complex, differentiated understandings of the change. Greater levels of participation enable deeper and broader awareness of what the change is intended to be, how others are responding to it, and what impacts have occurred as a result.

Because change agents are the most involved in a change initiative, they should develop the most complex understanding of the change. Participants in change initiatives should develop less complex understandings of the change than change agents do, but certainly should develop more complex understandings than members who are uninvolved or who are only marginally involved.

H1 - Organizational members who have higher levels of participation in a change initiative will use more complex criteria to assess the change than will organizational members who have lower levels of participation.

Organizational members with more complex understandings will have a greater appreciation for the complex nuances and multiple sides from which to describe and evaluate the phenomena (Bartunek, Gordon, & Weathersby, 1983). This greater understanding will result in a more positive evaluation of the change.

H2 - The more complex the criteria used to assess the change initiative the higher the ratings of its effectiveness.

Organizational members whose participation in a change project is high should rate the change more positively than those organizational members whose participation is low. This is consistent with research that shows that participation in decision-making typically increases acceptance of decisions (e.g. Locke & Schweiger, 1979).

H3 - Organizational members with higher levels of participation in the change initiative will rate it higher than organizational members with lower levels of participation.

Finally, although participation in the change initiative is expected to directly influence a respondent's rating of the program's effectiveness, this relationship should also be mediated by complex understanding. Complex understanding has been identified as a mediator of the impact of participation in decision making (Locke & Schweiger, 1979).

H4 - The relationship between level of participation in a change initiative and ratings of its effectiveness is mediated by the complexity of understanding of the change.

Method

Both survey and archival data were used to test these hypotheses. During the sixth year of the change initiative, we administered a questionnaire to all faculty, administration and staff in each Network school (51% response rate). The questionnaire data were supplemented with archival records that identified who had participated in the various FDC activities during its first six years. This included information on who had applied for, attended or helped plan the Faculty Institutes, who had submitted an article, published an article, served as a peer reviewer or editor for the Network Journal; who had served as a local FDC contact person; and who had served on the FDC.

Participation Measures

From the archival data we identified four levels of participation. Non-participants did not apply for or participate in any of the FDC activities (n=689). Applicants applied for but did not participate in any FDC sponsored activities (n=19). Participants participated in at least one of the four types of FDC activities (n=101). Lastly, sponsors had been members of the FDC (n=10).

Effectiveness Measures

Three different effectiveness measures were created to assess respondents' evaluations of the change initiative. Each measure was a composite of five questions that asked about the impact of the FDC on the Network, the individual school, or the individual respondents.

Complexity of Understanding

Following each set of questions regarding the change initiative's effectiveness, respondents were asked in open-ended questions to provide the criteria they had used for their evaluations. Responses to these questions were content analyzed, and measures of complex understanding were created based upon the number of different criteria respondents indicated using to assess the impact of the FDC on the Network, school or individual respondent. This approach is an index of the differentiation of criteria, one index of complex understanding (Bartunek et. al., 1983).

Results and Discussion

The results from the analyses support most of the hypotheses. Results from one-way analyses of variance indicate that higher levels of participation were associated both with the use of more complex criteria and higher assessment ratings of the change initiative (H1 and H2). In addition, results from simple regression analyses indicate that the complexity of the criteria used was associated with higher assessment ratings (H3). Lastly, the results from the hierarchical regression analysis suggest that participation affected evaluation ratings in small part because it fostered more complex understanding; however participation had a very strong direct effect as well (H4). These results support the importance of both participation and complex understanding as factors affecting how organizational members assess an organizational change initiative.

These findings suggest that the implicit optimism change agents often have that their complex understanding of a change initiative will be shared by other organizational members is not well-founded. The FDC founders' vision of the change was multifaceted and complex; however this vision was not understood as intricately by the other organizational members involved with the change.

By asking organizational members to simply align with a change agent's vision, one is assuming that organizational members are passive recipients of the change agent's understanding. This assumption underrates the active interpretation process of organizational members. In the setting studied here, as in other settings, organizational members are likely to develop their own ways of understanding a change that are likely less complex than that of the change agent. Such differentiated understanding may hinder the implementation and ultimate success of the change initiative.

With this knowledge in hand, we suggest that change agents need to focus on involving organizational members in change initiatives in ways that will match and, hopefully, increase the complexity of their understanding of the change. Methods for doing this include enabling organizational members to actively participate in the change, increasing opportunities for non-participants to interact with and learn from participants about the change, and increasing opportunities for two-way communication with the change agents. These methods are quite different from traditional approaches to the introduction of organizational change (such as written reports, large meetings, change mascots, etc.) that increase passive absorption of information but do not enable organizational members to develop a complex understanding of the change. Increasing opportunities for both active participation and the development of complex understanding will increase the likelihood that a change initiative will be appreciated and accepted.

References

Bartunek, J. M., Gordon, J. R., & Weathersby, R. P. (1983). Developing "complicated" understanding in administrators. Academy of Management Review, 8, 273-284.

Bartunek, J. M., Lacey, C.A., & Wood, D. R. 1992. Social cognition in organizational change: An insider-outsider approach. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 28(2), 204-223.

Griffin, D., & Ross, L. 1991. Subjective construal, social inference, and human misunderstanding. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 24, 319-359. New York: Academic Press.

Locke, E. A., & Schweiger, D. M. Participation in decision-making: One more look. In B. Staw (Ed.) Research in Organizational Behavior, 1, 265-340. Greenwich: JAI Press.

(Recipient of the Best Practice-Related paper award from the ODC Division, Cincinnati, August, 1996.)

CRISIS AS THE BASIS FOR CHANGE: WHEN EVEN BANKRUPTCY IS NOT ENOUGH

by Maurice "Mo" Cayer

During the mid- to late-1980's ownership of many organizations changed hands, and increased their debt burden through leveraged buyouts (LBO's). Macy's, the $6+ billion department store retailer (i.e., featured in "The Miracle On 34th Street" and its well-known Thanksgiving Day Parade), was one of them.

To raise cash to help cover its heavy debts, Macy's sold its valuable credit card receivables in 1990 to GE Capital (a major financial services unit within General Electric). The then-Chairman of R.H. Macy & Company, Ed Finklestein, visited the new credit card operation that GE Capital management had opened with the aim of creating a high-involvement work team structure and culture. During a visit to that facility, Macy's Finklestein was blown away by the apparent team- and customer-oriented work force. That visit triggered a rare pilgrimage of Macy's executives to look first-hand at this mecca of teamwork and empowerment.

Soon after, I joined Macy's as the V. P. of Organizational Development, with immediate marching orders to implement "empowered teams" in Macy's (and Bullocks) 110 department stores. But priorities quickly changed; four weeks later, the Company had plunged into Chapter 11 bankruptcy. For several months my focus shifted to provide internal communications on timely bankruptcy information and whatever reassurance that could realistically be offered to the 50,000 anxious employees and managers.

Changing Leaders

After three months in bankruptcy, Ed Finklestein was removed as CEO/Chairman. Though widely regarded in the retail industry as a merchandising genius (the way Chrysler's Lee Iaccoca was seen as a talented automobile marketer), he also had a few faults that left an imprint on the Macy's culture. For example, he tightly controlled even routine decision-making; was seen as arrogant; he allowed vital information systems to become archaic; was known for rewarding those with a "please-the-boss" style; and was fatally attracted to nepotism (his two sons leap-frogged into more senior positions than was warranted).

The Board of Directors replaced Finklestein with Co-CEO's & Co-Chairmen (referred to internally as "Co-Co's"): Mark Handler, a life-long Macy merchandising executive, and Mike Ullman, with Macy's only 3 years, though regarded as a strong leader, with financial expertise and a champion of organizational change. The intent of this rare leadership arrangement was to provide complementary skill sets and speed Macy's emergence from bankruptcy.

The duo-at-the-helm lasted only about 6 months. Macy-veteran Mark Handler decided to retire and Mike Ullman, the change champion, was given sole control. Unlike Handler, Mike Ullman saw few sacred cows that shouldn't be examined as a candidate for change. Ullman is a bright(a former White House Fellow), values-based leader, with high integrity and candor, enormously hard working, respecting of others, both demanding but empowering, etc. [Trivia: In the early-1970's, Warren Bennis hired Mike Ullman as his CFO of the University of Cincinnati while Bennis was its president.]

Our first customer research project was powerful. It showed Macy's merchandise had strong acceptance among target customers, contributing to sales/sq. ft. results second only to Nordstrom among department stores. Nevertheless, that survey and other data also showed that Ullman was faced with an organization that needed a lot of change. Over twenty specific change initiatives were planned and implemented -- many aimed at Macy's quickly becoming more productive, increasing profitability, as well as creating more involvement and innovation.

Leading Change

Bankruptcy provided a concrete, hard-to-dispute justification to make major changes fast. We all felt that the survival of the business and the jobs of its employees were clearly at risk. This "advantage" is lacking in many other non-bankrupt organizations desiring to make major changes to increase their competitiveness. But without also having effective change leaders to help people take action, Macy's would have limped along until it was beyond rehabilitation.

Ullman excelled at communicating a shared need for both broad and specific changes. He helped raise the organization's sense of urgency for change (Kotter, 1996). For example, his messages showed customer survey and benchmark data to bolster the case, and that the work force's own interests, not just Ullman's, were linked to successfully making changes work (O'Toole, 1995). He used various media to describe change initiatives, bankruptcy proceedings, his compelling vision of Macy's after emergence, and to debunk rumors and candidly answer questions from employees. Even though attitudes about job security dropped sharply, our employee survey research confirmed that Ullman was able to generate wide-spread confidence in his leadership and in the necessity for the change initiatives, as painful as they might be (e.g., reducing health care benefits, closing unprofitable stores, delayering levels of management). He succeeded in delivering a call to action and in enrolling followers.

Results

There were many successful results; after 2 1/2 years, some costs were significantly reduced (e.g., employee health care, payroll and advertising expenses), while revenues slipped only a little, mostly due to closing some stores; market strategies were refined (no really big changes here); organization values and several operating & management practices became more adaptive to the competitive environment (e.g., open communications; surveys and feedback; candor was better accepted; extensive use of bonuses tied to goal accomplishment). The market value of the enterprise grew much higher than expected; from under $3 billion to more than $4 billion. A mighty feat, but....

More Than a Vision

Even more fundamental, innovative changes could have been made, I believe, to major business strategies and processes (e.g., how merchandise was acquired and distributed, pricing & advertising, service to customers, etc.). Two main reasons for missed opportunities were:

Being in bankruptcy, time is the number one enemy, since there is way too much to do and not enough time for long-term change initiatives (creditors have the power and are often impatient to get repaid what money they can).

Not using available tactical change tools. Many times we saw executives demand that their managers make cuts to budgets Ä the "gun to the head" approach. The usual response was to drop programs/activities and lop heads, and then cynically call it "reengineering." What was needed were innovation-boosting activities aimed at changing both what and how things were done (for example, tactical tools to find ways to both reduce costs and improve the quality of a process).

An example that I witnessed. . . . A high-level executive below the CEO told a group of top HR managers that they had to make deep cuts to their budgets. The predicted response rang-out; "We've already cut down to the bone." Which was then followed by the predicted rebuttal; "You don't have a choice." The HR executives dug in. As I watched, I could almost see cartoon-like thought bubbles over their heads -- "What are you crazy? You'll regret this robbery!" Not surprisingly, that new demand was not perceived as a challenging but attainable goal (Locke & Latham, 1990). Some of the budget cuts were eventually made, but only about one-third of them involved true reengineering of HR work processes. The rest simply created problems elsewhere in the company.

More innovative change could have happened if Macy's (myself included) had made sure these senior HR managers:

Knew how to innovate (e.g., challenge assumptions; apply systems thinking; reengineer complex business processes). For example, Michael Hammer, of reenginering-fame, was brought in for a one day overview of reengineering. The result was a lot of interest but participants still didn't know how to reengineer. Sufficient education didn't occur.

Were offered frequent and relevant examples of successful innovation Ä enhancing their expectations of success and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) Ä and reframing the demand for change as an opportunity to find better ways, just as others have successfully done.

Lesson

Our field seems to be finding a receptive audience for some change management approaches like creating a shared need for change and communicating a compelling vision of what the future could be -- increasing both the what to do, and to some extent, the want to do. But in Macy's case, while having made sizable progress, it could have also used a selective infusion of tactical, how-to-do-it, change tools (cognitive and motivational) that weren't valued under the prior CEO's reign. For example, basic training in using cross-functional project teams, process mapping, total quality and reengineering; seeking and learning from external best practices; efficacy belief-enhancing practices to respond to inevitable setbacks (e.g., Wood & Bandura, 1989; Jawahar, Stone & Cooper, 1992) and using facilitated, innovation-boosting problem-solving activities (Fox, 1990, Higgins, 1995; Ashkenas & Jick, 1992). Though you'll find these commonly occurring within many business organizations, they are definitely not common enough (Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford, 1995).

[Before it could emerge from bankruptcy, Macy's was acquired by its arch-rival, Federated Department Stores, at the end of 1994 because the latter offered creditors, in whose power it was to decide, more money than Macy's could offer.]

References

Ashkenas, R. & Jick, (1992). From dialogue to action in GE work-out. In W. Pasmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), Research in Organizational Change and Development (Vol. 6, pp 267-287). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Fox, W.M., (1990). Effective Group Problem Solving: How to Broaden Participation, Improve Decision Making, and Increase Commitment to Action. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Higgins, J.M. (1995) Innovate or Evaporate: Test & Improve Your Organization's I.Q.(It's Innovation Quotient). Winter Park, FL: New Management Publishing Co.

Jawahar, I.M., Stone, T., & Cooper, W.(1992). Activating resources in organizations. In W. Pasmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), Research in Organizational Change and Development (Vol. 6, pp 153-196). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Kotter, J.P. (1996) Leading Change. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Lawler, E.E., Mohrman, S.A., & Ledford, G.E., Jr. (1995). Creating high performance organizations; Practices and results of employee involvement and total quality management in Fortune 1000 companies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (1990). A theory of goal setting. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

O'Toole, J. (1995). Leading change: overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A.(1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. Academy of Management Review, 14(3), 361-384.

ORGANIZATIONAL BEAUTY, THE ART OF HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS
by Suresh Srivastva & Carla Carten

(1996 ODC Distinguished Speaker Presentation)

Whether you were in the audience on August 13, 1996 or are just joining us now, let's take this space in time to reflect on what was shared during the presentation: "Organizational Beauty, The Art of Human Relationships."

If a primary motivational factor of human beings is self expression, then it is important to be able to express one's self by celebrating one's self and celebrating the many people that, by their presence, help us to fashion who we are. This is part of the essence and the art of being in human relationship. A key to our celebration of self and other is the ability to learn from each other; to be able to transfer knowledge and draw upon our own threads of wisdom while weaving a carpet of knowledge and wisdom with others. Indeed, in celebrating others we weave connections between us and in doing so give unto each other the gift of self and human relationship.

Knowledge encased in itself, static, may smolder but never ignites. In order for knowledge to be kinetic, knowledge needs to be cultivated, grown and shared with others. In order for knowledge to spark, ignite, and grow into a warm, glowing, inspiring light, humans have to be open to learn. Learning is what makes the development and transference of knowledge possible. In this light, one can see that the need to learn burns with more intensity than the need for teach. Although the need to teach is very necessary for facilitating learning, "the teacher's art is to connect, in real time, the living bodies of the students with the living body of knowledge" (Nachmanovictch 1990).

In learning and sharing knowledge with others we must engage in the process of dialogue. People are not self contained units that learn and develop knowledge independently of one another. In order to engage in the process of learning, etceteras, one must engage in the process of dialogue"...we gain a self in and through a process of social interaction, dialogue, and conversation with others in our social world; that only knowledge we can have of ourselves appears in and through social forms - namely, others' responses." (Sampson 1993).

Being in relationship is a process that requires talking, speaking and listening thus, engaging in discourse with others. Through the art of dialogue we are in relationship with others, and being in relationship with others, we are continuously creating ourselves. In this creation process, we must look for, recognize, and celebrate by bringing to a heighten state of awareness, the goodness that is in, and of, all of us. Humans are fashioned by their relationships. In relationships, in order to be our best, our most fulfilled, our most enabling, we must be in search of the good, the true, and the beautiful. The good, the true, and the beautiful exist in each of us as well as, our relationships and thus, our organizations.

Organizations are social constructions, the result of agreement and shared imagery and held together by virtue of preconceptions communicated through language. In the social construction of organizations, we should search for the good, the true and the beautiful. In our search, there are two basic journeys that are often taken in the exploration and analysis of organizations. One journey leads us to the paradigm of Naturalistic Organizing; the natural process of being interconnected. The interconnectedness of nature...of life. This is a connectedness not dependent or caused by linear rational happenings. Naturalistic Organizing recognizes that life is a series of beginnings. This recognition and value is placed on each variable contributing to the whole as opposed to the concept of the variables being in competition, reminiscent of the philosophy of survival of the fittest. The other journey is the Technocratic Way of Organizing. This way of organizing focuses on the specialization on tasks. Primary attention is geared towards output, performance, productions, etc., and these outputs are viewed as isolated linear rational processes. Both journeys are valid and contribute greatly to our understanding of the ways in which we organize. We must not view these two ways as two different camps, seducing us to join one or the other. Instead, we must recognize that they both have merit and as human beings we are creative and can create new ways of organizing and approaching organizational analysis. In our creativity, we can combine these philosophies and, indeed, create other ways.

In order for us to create, we must explore. Our explorations must take us to a place where we can analyze our actions, our experiences. Our exploration must then evolve into an expedition, a journey into new reaches of our imagination. It is in our imaginations where we combine action, experience, what is and what has been, with that which is possible, that which can be. We do not start the creative process with the generation of ideas, we start with exploring our actions, for we are connected with our, and other peoples', actions. We then imagine various sequences and consequences based on those actions and our experiences, then we generate ideas. This process of idea creation is one of the approaches of merging the Naturalistic and Technocratic ways of organizing. We analyze the outputs, performances etc., and realize their interconnectedness with nature, ourselves and others.

Further, we understand that through the interconnectedness with nature, other people, as well as actions, outputs etc., we are transformed.

Human interaction is transformative. As soon as we interact with others we change. In the spaces in-between (each other), we each expand who we are, creating a new aspect of our self. For actually we are a living, breathing, walking collection of the various people (and forces) we interact with. Part of this transformation is expressed in the ideas generated by Edward Sampson (1993), "We address our own acts in anticipation of the responses of real others with whom we are currently involved; imagined others, including characters from our past as well as from cultural narratives; historical others; and the generalized other, typically carried in the language forms by which a given community organizes its perceptions and understandings of its members, which we have learned to employ in reflecting us back to us. In each case, we adjust our own emerging actions in anticipation of the responses of these various others. The process by which our selves are constituted, however, is ongoing, never over and done with...We move from one another, each shading into the next, and the next, and so on."

In our study of organizational life we need to be aware of the impact of inquiry on the process of human transformation and organizational transformation. Social theories do not reflect some objective reality, but are linguistic constructs that interpret the world. The practice of social inquiry changes the phenomena under study. Therefore, as social scientists we need to take our roles seriously as arbiters of action. Our work as creators of linguistic conventions has enormous consequences on organizational members. Therefore, we need to attend to the generative capacity of knowledge creation, and/by including ourselves in it (Barrett, Cooperrider, Srivastva 1995). As social scientists engaging in social inquiry,, we have the responsibility that the topics chosen for inquiry, the knowledge generated and the knowledge shared, must make a contribution to human beings and the planet at large.

Understanding of organizations and their/our practical transformation is a simple, undifferentiated act. The productive act of organizational inquiry is at one stroke the construction of self-and-world or subject-and-object as well as the historical context in which all living relation is embedded (Barrett, Cooperrider, Srivastva 1995). Having this in mind, we went through a history of organizational change from the 1940's through the 1980's. We, in the session and those of us reading this now, are on the foundation of history. Being on the foundation, we must remember that humans "flow" from one another and in order to get tacit knowledge to flow, as social scientist we must inspire hope in anticipating the future.

The audience members were given a 5-page document entitled, "IMPORTANT THEMES IN THE HISTORY OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT". The document covered eight topic areas; Social Contexts, Overriding Purpose and Strategy of OD (Organizational Development), Conceptual Orientation for Organizations, Role/View of Consultant, Technologies of Practice, Nature of Research and Theory, Driving Values, and Underlying Assumptions. As a part of the historical review, each of these eight categories was captured for the time periods of the 1940-1950's, 1960's, 1970's and 1980's. The last page of the document was for the 1990's and beyond. On this page we were to capture our imagination as to what our roles, contexts, and visions are currently and what we hope they will before the future. We generated our own ideas then gathered in small groups to discuss and create together some of our images of present state and the state of the future. Proceeding the small group discussion, each of the groups reported out to the large group what the visions and ideas are for the future of OD, social scientists, interventionist, and creators are. Some of the major themes are as follows:

1. Social Contexts: Globalization; market driven; recognizing and exploring the best of cultural traditions by engaging in cross cultural dialogues of race, religions and gender & going beyond effectiveness and efficiency.

2. Overriding Purpose and Strategy of OD: Enabling self expression and self discovery; spiritual connecting; bridging; enabling; building of relationships; innocent inquiry--innocents before action; enabling the lifting assumptions.

3. Conceptual Orientation for Organizations: relational, partnership, friendship; non-hierarchical.

4. Role/View of Consultant: appreciate versus critical; engaging in (more) inquiry; active facilitation; invisible facilitation; allowing for playful energy.

5. Technologies of Practice: conversation; relational inquiry (relaxed/informal); diverse electronic groups (versus shared ideas); experiential sharing; valuing emotions; friendliness versus being friends; analogies and metaphor.

6. Nature of Research and Theory: appreciative inquiry; human transformation (being in relationship); going with the flow; analogies and metaphor.

7. Driving Values: collective commitment to humanization; inclusion; the relationship of the wholes/integration; time is time versus time is money.

8. Underlying Assumptions: invite the questioning of assumptions; spirituality; allow for individuality in order to be wholestic.

Our collective quest is to keep in the forefront of our minds that organizations are center for celebrating others. That human beings are to be viewed as being gifts to each other. That we, as humans "flow" from one another and those connections between us is what creates us. As there is a flow between humans, there is, of course, a flow of human interaction within organizations. Thus, there is a flow in the way we can approach organizing and organizational analysis. We start with systems thinking followed by an holistic approach, proceeded by spirituality, which flows into the celebration of life. This concept/dynamic is not driven by the future. It is driven by valuing the moment. Identifying the best of what is right now. Analyzing it, playing with it and building upon it in relationship with others - this, in turn will order the future.

Another key concept we must recognize is love's role in creating a value system. we must overcome the value system rooted in the victim. The system is set up as such as there is a victim, a rescue (rescuer) and a perpetrator. All of which are set as a an end-point of an equilateral triangle. In order to overcome the triangle of victim, we must re-focus and look towards a frame which embraces the appreciation of creative tension. We must recognize one key factor as we value creative tension; the interplay that lies in the space in between the polar positions creating the tension. That is to say, we must recognize and value the dynamic taking place between poles as opposed to focusing on the poles themselves and assigning them as good, bad, indifferent or instigator. As social scientist and consultants, we must recognize and guard against the triangle-trap of victimization. In order to do so, we must continuously conduct our own inquiry by asking ourselves questions such as: Why are we interested in relationships, for organizations or for organizing? How do we get to a place where we are in full voice especially regarding the need for human transformation, knowledge generation and sharing by way of dialogue?

The closing question to all of us is what do we think our role should be in facilitating human transformation, knowledge generation and knowledge sharing within organizations? Those of us attending the Academy session responded as follows:

inquiry, asking of questions
searching for playgrounds
nuturance and care provider
searching for utopia
recognize all organizations as centers for relationships
creating new resting places (not just work places) within organizations
celebrating others

recognizing the life-cycle of entities within organizations and valuing each entity's stage and contribution to the whole (Analogy of a rose plant. The rose bush is planted, a rose grows with stem, leaves, pedals, thorns, aroma, each performing a value. As the rose matures it blooms, the pedals fall to the ground, as do the leaves, providing fertilizer to the ground. The fertilizer reaches the bush's roots, gives nourishment so new leaves, buds, and roses can grow.)

performing/performance grounded in the heart
valuing the high aesthetics and beauty of life

"Who comes into a person's life may be the single greatest factor of influence to what that life becomes. Who comes into a person's life is part luck, is part a matter of one's power to recruit others, but in large part a matter of other people's ability to be recruited."

"And yet however much we learn about the effort to be of help, we can never protect ourselves from the risks of caring, which separate real help from advice, reassurance, or consolation. In running these risks we preserve the connections between us. We enhance the life we share, or perhaps better put, we enhance the life that shares us" (Kegan 1982).

REFERENCES

Barrett, R., Cooperrider, D., Srivastva, S., (1995). Social Construction and Appreciative Inquiry: A Journal in Organizational Theory; D.M. Hosking, H. Parker Dachler, K.J. Gergen: Management and Organization: Relational Alternatives to Individualism, Alderschott, U.K., Avebury Publishers.

Kegan, R. (1982). The Evolving Self, Problem, and Process in Human Development, Harvard University Press, U.S.

Nachmanovitch, S. (1990). Free Play, The Power of Improvisation in Life and the Arts, G.P. Putman's Sons, New York.

Sampson, E. (1993). Celebrating the Other, West View Press, Boulder, Colorado.