ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT

AND

MANAGING CHANGE

(AN ANALYSIS)

BY

SURINDER SURI

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of Master of Science in Management and Organisational Development.

The United States International University,
June 1981.
APPROVED
BY

MR VIRGILL. BERGMAN
DIRECTOR

MR SAMUEL T HARMON
THESIS CO-ORDINATOR
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Samuel T. Harmon for all the assistance he gave me during the Thesis.

I would also like to thank my parents, for being so understanding and helpful during the period of the compilation of the Thesis.
ERRATA

1. Page 3, paragraph 3, lines 2 and 3: "Detailed explanation... for the T-Group and interview-method..."

2. Page 6, paragraph 5, line 2: "revolution throughout... corporation".

3. Page 6, paragraph 5, line 7: "revolutionary approach..."

4. Page 9, paragraph 2, line 14: "of other areas in psychology or psychology as a whole (27)"

5. Page 9, paragraph 3, line 4: "Argyris, ... Blake and Mouton, ...

6. Page 9, paragraph 3, line 5: "Burke, Gindes, ..."


8. Page 16, line 1: "Plan... behavioural..."

9. Page 33, paragraph 7, line 1: "The use..., or ad hoc activities..."

10. Page 34, paragraph 2, line 3: "less orderly..."
| (i) | Questionnaire feedback methods | 26 |
| (ii) | T-Group and sensitivity training | 27 |
| (iii) | Focused exercises on confrontation meetings | 29 |
| (iv) | Interview methods | 30 |

7. PRACTICE OF ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT/
SUCCESS AND FAILURE

| (i) | Some conditions for success | 32 |
| (ii) | Some conditions for failure | 35 |
| (iii) | Failure forms | 34 |

8. CONCLUSION

THE FUTURE OF OD

| (i) | The individual in the organisation | 35 |
| (ii) | The organisation | 35 |
| (iii) | The need for a systems approach | 36 |
| (iv) | The need for better theory and research | 37 |

9. BIBLIOGRAPHY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HISTORY OF ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Introduction of the Laboratory Training Programme</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) The survey research feedback stem</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Early stage of change on the industrial scene</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THEORY OF ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) What is OD</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Art of OD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Underlying assumptions about people</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) The concept of individual versus group</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Different values and forms of change agents</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Conditions for participation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Other variables in the social system</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii) Approaches to research design</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix) Model for OD</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) Conditions and techniques for successful OD programme</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. THE NEED FOR ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Environmental complexity and work specialisation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Exchanging commitment and loyalty for satisfaction of needs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Overcoming maladaptive attitudes from the past</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Management of conflict</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SOME APPROACHES TO ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. METHODS OF ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAGNOSIS OF ORGANISATION PROBLEMS/METHODS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Not too long ago, workers in an organisation were seen as mere 'hands' and nothing more. Subsequently, advocates of scientific management were quite explicit that planning could be done only by the elite, whereas the doing was reserved for the masses.

Now we know that there exist ways by which organisation can grow and become more adaptable and flexible. The individuals within the organisation can, when given opportunity, also grow, change and develop. These two ideas are regarded as mutually exclusive i.e. organisations must make a profit or perform a service at the expense of the individuals grow and develop inspite of organisational constraints rules and regulations, usually of the job. Hence it is possible for people working in an organisation to collaboratively manage and develop the climate of the organisation in order to both attain goals and purpose of the organisation and, simultaneously, further the needs of the individuals within the organisation.

This paper is on the knowledge related to those ideas. OD as a branch of the more general field of applied behavioural science did not emerge accidentally. It arose to knowledge explosion, changing composition of the labour force, growing concern about personal and social issues, rapid product obsolescence (shorter product life cycle), and rapid technological change.

The field of OD has expanded rapidly in the past few years and this relatively new term has many different meanings to many different people. For some, OD is a tough vigorous application of behavioural science. For others OD is indistinct-equate with permissiveness and/or anarchy with organisations that try "to make people happy with little regards to products developed or services rendered". For others, OD is a subtle means of manipulating employees. Most people believe OD is a particular technique e.g. sensitivity training, job enrichment or participative management.
The growth in OD has come primarily as a response to tremendously accelerated changes in Western Culture. As Lundberg (1) has pointed out: "In fact, the present has been characterised as a truly revolutionary period, with multiple revolutions occurring in the technological, communicational, political, scientific and institutional dimensions of our society".

The change that occurs is irreversible. Hence, OD appears to be one of the primary methods for helping organisations adjust to accelerated change. Benns (2) points out that OD rests on three basic propositions. The first is the hypothesis that each step adopts an organisational form which is most appropriate to the particular age and that changes taking place in that age make it necessary to "revitalise and rebuild our organisations". The second basic proposition is that only real way to change organisations lies in changing the "climate" of the organisation - the "way of life", a system of beliefs and values, an accepted form of interaction and relating. It is more important to change the climate of the organisation than the individual of the organisations are to develop. The third basic proposition is that social awareness is required by people in organisations", since social awareness is essential in our current world.

OD activities appear to have originated about 1957(3) as an attempt to apply some of the values and insights of laboratory training to total organisations. (4) Douglas McGregor, working with Union Carbide, is considered to have been one of the first behavioural scientists to talk systematically about and to implement an OD programme(5). Other names associated with such early efforts are Herbert Shepard and Robert Blake, who in collaboration with the employee Relations Department of the Esso Company, launched a programme of laboratory training (sensitivity training) in the Company's various refineries. This programme emerged in 1957 after a headquarters human relations research division began to view itself as an internal consulting group offering services to field managers rather than as a research group developing reports for top management. (6)
The three essential functions of OD are: processes of planned change, organisational learning and consultation. The fundamental purpose of the OD process and its technology is to encourage continuous growth in the effectiveness of individuals and groups, as well as to facilitate desirable or planned change. (7) Unfortunately, change is frequently dealt with as a separate and distinct process; that is; as being unrelated to other processes at work within the organisation system. Desirable change, however, is accomplished through understanding how that organisation functions and by learning new and better ways of operate.

Consultation is a process which attempts to facilitate learning and change in individual groups and organisations. The underlying values of OD, then are aimed at institutionalising the ways in which an organisation can examine its process, learn improved ways of behaving and incorporate the new behaviour into its culture. (8)

The approach to the organisation development analysis has been made by starting with a brief history. Kurt Lewin was responsible for laying the foundation. The theory of the OD in Chapter 3 begins by looking at the meaning of OD and closes at the thought of model for OD has been explained in Chapter 4.

Four basic methods for OD are explained under diagnosis of organisation problems in Chapter 6. Detailed explanation has been given for the 7-group and interviewed method techniques. Practice of OD in Chapter 7 only briefly looks at conditions for success and failure of OD.

Conclusions, briefly look at the future of OD and the need for a better theory. Throughout, references are adequately quoted for much detailed further explanation of organisation development.
HISTORY OF ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OD has emerged in the past twenty to twenty five years. It has borrowed from a number of disciplines including Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology, and Economics. Kurt Lewin was instrumental in the development of the early ideas of National Training Laboratories (N.T.L.) and the sensitivity training group and had encouraged the groups to process their own data.\(^9\)

(1) INTRODUCTION OF THE LABORATORY TRAINING PROGRAMME

The beginnings of N.T.L. emerged in the summer of 1946, when Kurt Lewin and his staff at the Research Centre for Group Dynamics at M.I.T. were asked by the Connecticut Inter-racial Commission and the Committee on Community Inter-relations of the American Jewish Congress for help in research and training for community leaders.

A workshop was developed, and the community leaders were brought together to discuss problems. Meanwhile, the observers discussed, privately, what they have observed. The community leaders asked permission to sit on the feedback meetings. At first the researchers were reluctant, but finally agreed. The first T-group was formed as people reacted to data about their own behaviour.\(^10\)

As a result the researchers were able to draw two conclusions about the experiment in the first T-group.

(1) Feedback of data about group interaction is a rich learning experience:

(2) The process of "group building" apparently has a great potential for learning that could be transferred to "back-home-situations", when the group participants returned to their own surroundings.

As a result of the original experience, financial backing was obtained from the office of Naval Research and the National Education Association. Gould Academy in Bethel, Maine, was selected as a site for further work, and since then Bethel has played an important part in N.T.L. The first basic skill groups were offered in the summer of 1947. The programme was sufficiently successful so that the Carnegie Foundation provided support for the programmes.../5...
in 1948 and 1949. This led to a permanent programme for N.T.L. within the National Education Association.

A new phenomenon arose in 1950. An attempt was made to have the T-groups in the morning sessions and the cognitive-skill groups (A groups) in the afternoon sessions. The staff found that the high level of carryover from the morning sessions turned the afternoon "A-groups" into T-groups, despite the resistance of the afternoon staff, who were committed to a more cognitive, skill-type of learning. As a result of this, great deal of learning experimentation and frustration took place in the next decade, especially in the attempt to transfer skills learned in the T-groups setting to the "back-home" situation.

In the 1950's, three trends emerged. The first was the emergence of regional laboratories. The second was the expansion of the programme sessions conducted only in the summer to sessions year-round. The third was the expansion of the T-group into business and industry, with National Training Laboratory members becoming increasingly involved with programmes in industry.\(^{(11)}\)

One such series of programmes took place at Esso in 1958 and 1959.\(^{(12)}\) The programmes involved several different refineries, at Baton Rouge, Bayonne and Bayway. The basic approach was the T-group. The sessions typically lasted two weeks, with both day and evening sessions. In each conference, the participants were divided into sub-groups of approximately 12 members who had been selected for the diversity of their knowledge and background. Each group met for a total of 12 to 14 sessions with each session lasting for about two hours. Between T-groups sessions, the participants met as a total group to listen to cognitive lectures or to discuss or organisational issues.

Since then, the T-group has been used widely in a number of different ways. The theory, process, and results of such groups will be described later.

\(^{(11)}\) THE SURVEY RESEARCH FEEDBACK STEM

Kurt Lewin, also involved in this second stem of OD, involving the use of attitude surveys and the feedback of the data to participants .../6...
founded the Research Centre for the Group Dynamics in 1945. After he died in 1947, his staff moved to Michigan to join with the Survey Research Centre, which became the Institute for Social Research.\(^{(13)}\)

In an early study, Mann reported the success of administering a company wide study of Management and Employee opinions and attitudes conducted at Detroit Edison, beginning in 1948.\(^{(14)}\) Over a two-period, three different sets of data were given back; (1) Data regarding the viewpoints of 8,000 non-supervisory employees towards their supervision, promotion opportunities, work satisfaction with fellow employees, etc.; (2) Similar reactions from first- and second- line employees; and (3) Information from higher levels of management.

The process that finally evolved was an "interlocking chain of conferences."\(^{(15)}\) The major findings of the survey were first reported to the top management and then progressed down through the organisation. The feedback sessions were conducted in task groups, with each supervisor and his immediate subordinates discussing the data together. However, there was little substantial research evidence.

In 1950 eight accounting departments asked for a repeat of the survey. This generated a new cycle of feedback meetings. In four departments, feedback approaches were used but the method was varied, with two of the remaining departments receiving feedback only at the departmental level. Because of changes in key personnel, nothing was done in two departments

A third follow-up indicated that more significant and positive changes had occurred in the "experimental" departments than in the two control departments. From these findings, Mann derived several major hypothesis for change.\(^{(16)}\)

(111) **EARLY STAGE OF CHANGE ON INDUSTRIAL SCENE.**

Business instutions are no exception. They have also been a target of social resolution throughout the history of the corporation. For several centuries, societies have wrestled with how human ...
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energies and physical resources should be harnessed in the service of nations. The social challenge spawned by Samuel Gompers and nurtured during the depression by John L. Lewis and others brought fundamental realignments between management and workers. The depression prompted a near-resolutionary approach to taxation which has produced significantly different concepts of ownership, even of wealth. The two decades of relative industrial stability after the depression brought further change but by evolutionary ways. Legislation resulted in a continuing redefinition of the role and responsibilities of business in society. (17)
(i) What is OD
There is no single definition of OD which all practitioners would agree. OD was defined by French and Bell as:

"A long-range effort to improve an organisation's problem-solving and renewal processes, particularly through a more effective and collaborative management of organisation culture ... with the assistance of a change agent, or catalyst, and the use of the theory and technology of applied behavioural science, including action research."[18]

Other leading practitioners in the field have defined OD as "The creation of a culture which supports the institutionalisation and use of social technologies to facilitate diagnosis and change of interpersonal group and intergroup behaviour, especially those behaviours related to organisational decision-making, planning and communications."[19] Lunberg[20] has pointed out that the most popular definition of OD is that given by Beckhard: "Organisational Development is an effort[1] planned [2] organisation wide, and managed from the top to[14] increase organisation effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organisation "processes" using behavioural science knowledge.[21]."

In defining OD the approach at what is is not is also useful. OD is not management development. Management Development is focused on a particular manager or group of managers in order to change individual managerial behaviour. OD is focused on the broader system of which the manager is a subsystem. OD is not a specific technique, such as sensitivity training, job enrichment, group team building, or management by objectives. OD may use specific techniques, but only after the relevance and utility of a specific technique has been clearly demonstrated after careful diagnosis. OD is concerned not only with "making people happy" Rather, OD is concerned with organisational competence, including both effectiveness and efficiency.

Lunberg[22] has suggested that perhaps the simplest way of describing
OD is to say that it "promotes the asking of two questions... "Where are we now?" "Where would we like to be?" and offers a variety of ways in which members can move their organisations towards the desired states. (23)

(ii) Art of OD
Although OD is based on "behavioural science knowledge", that knowledge is still incomplete. Barnes says, "Despite the common occurrence of organisational change, its dynamic and underlying processes are understood in only rough, ill-defined ways." (24) The process of organisational change involves multiple, complex sets of variables whose interaction, identity, and impact vary from one situation to another. Furthermore, although we can think about a systems model at this level of complexity, we lack the technology to accurately identify, isolate, and measure the variables that go into such a model. However, as Sashkin points out, there is a growing body of literature that has added to our knowledge of theory in the field. (25) Example, about a decade and half ago, Lippitt, Watson, and Westley published the first theoretical and applied approach to planned change. (26) Sashkin concludes, "While there is much more work needed, in both theory and practice, the state of the art of integration of this body of knowledge is not much, if at all, behind that of other areas in psychology or psychology as a whole. (27)

Burke points out that although the field of OD is in a fluid state and is continually changing and developing, at least 15 books on the theory of OD have been published in the last 15 years. (28) Amongst the most notable authors in this area are Irgyris, Beckhard, Bennis, Blake and Monton, Hornstein, Bunker, Burke, Giudes, and Lewicki, Lawrence and Lorsch, Likert, Lippitt, Marrow, Bowers and Seashore, Margulies and Raia, Schein, and Walton.

Systems approach is difficult to use in social systems, particularly with regard to the identification, measurement and interaction of the multiple variables involved.

.../10...
Other areas of the OD theory are:

(iii) Underlying assumptions about people
(iv) Concept of individual versus group
(v) Differing values and norms of change
(vi) Conditions for participation
(vii) Other variables in the social system
(viii) Approaches to research design

We will briefly discuss these areas:

(iii) Underlying assumptions about people

The state of art of current theories of individual motivations is mixed - there is no one acceptable theory of motivation to which everybody subscribes. The pages of professional journals are filed with attack and counter-attack regarding different theories. Without a good, well-understood, clear concise theory of individual motivation it is difficult to build a metatheory which takes into account individual motives, needs, wants, and desires although most OD practitioners believe that humans seek greater achievements and strive for more responsibility, challenge, and self-actualisation, not everybody agrees with this concept. Certainly the behavioural modification theorists would see humans as responding to conditioning rather than achieving growth through free choice.

(iv) The concept of Individual versus the Group

There is a basic disagreement here also. Most OD practitioners believe that the work Group, not the individual, is the primary focus for change. Indeed, we have a great deal of evidence that the work group does have an important influence on the individual members. However, some OD practitioners believe that the individual should be the primary target for change. Others believe that the main focus should be an overall organisational redesign. It seems necessary to do a better job of articulating the circumstances under which the individual, the group, and/or the total social system should be the primary focus for change. As of now, the best evidence is that the primary work group appears to be the best focus for planned change, but is probably not true for all cases in all situations.
( v ) Differing Values and Norms of change Agents

Every change agent has a normative conceptual model of the ideal organisation. Frequently, these conceptual models vary considerably from change agent to change agent. Further, the change agents model is frequently at variance with the model that the manager (or the worker) has. Tichy, et al, have developed a method to enable consultants and clients to make their models more explicit and, therefore, more available to open, honest, evaluation and comparison of the models.[41]

(vi) Conditions for participation

Many, but not all, OD practitioners value participation and stress the importance of participation under almost every conceivable circumstance. Although strong emphasis has been placed on the value of participation, there has also been a great of controversy about where, when, and how it is helpful. For example, in reviewing the literature of participation, White and Ruh cited the conflicting studies and failure to replicate results. They address themselves to a key issue. Do all employees desire participation, or does the personal value system of the individual have a moderating effect? Some research indicates that only workers with higher-order needs value participation and that many "alienated" workers or workers from particular subculture do not value participation. Their study of 2755 employees in six manufacturing organisation found that the employees had a consistently positive reaction between job attitudes and participation in decision making. They found no support "for the hypothesized moderating effect of values on the relationships between participation and job attitudes. Possible methodological weaknesses are discussed, as well as the implication of these and other negative findings.[42]

In spite of the research (pro & con) on participation and just as once the terms "OD" and "T-group" were almost synonymous, so now the terms "OD" and "participation" or "participative management" are almost synonymous in the minds of many people, including both OD practitioners and managers. However, as Sashkin and Frohman point out, participation involves at least two basic concepts:
participation as a method for bringing about change and participation as a goal of change. They indicate that although increased participation of all employees in bringing about change is basic laudable element of OD, it is not necessarily a part of OD theory or practice. After a lengthy review of the research studies, they concluded that perhaps the greatest research need is the more precise determination of when the participation should be the aim of OD, as well as the method. Sashkin has done a great deal of thinking about participation and has articulated some of the theoretical issues perhaps as clearly as anyone else. The following is a paraphrase of some of his thinking.

The various approaches to participation do not differentiate among participation in change, in goal setting, in problem solving, and in decision making. Although these activities are related they are quite different from one another. A second issue is that the effects of participation have not been clearly identified increased effectiveness of participation can result from; better information, which can increase the quality of problem solutions, goals and decisions; greater commitment, which means greater acceptance of the changes, solutions, goals, or decisions; and greater adaptiveness, since the participants learn to use the new processes in making changes, arriving at solutions, and determining goals or decisions.

A third issue mentioned by Sashkin is that we have not sufficiently traced through the results of different methods of participation which can involve individuals, groups or entire organisation; these methods seem to work in different ways for different needs, such as task completion, control over work behaviour, and/or improving co-worker relationships. Finally, he notes that the contingency relationship of the change method or approach and the change-goal congruence has not been worked on at all. To remedy this lack, Sashkin is developing a systematic contingency analysis which should prove valuable in guiding future research and application.

(vii) Other Variables in the Social System

With a few exceptions, e.g. the emphasis on sociotechnical systems and the current contingency theories, OD has concentrated heavily
on the group and the individual. Until recently, OD has had relatively little to say about the issues of power; of the organisation as a political system; of the effects of law, rules and regulations; of customers and markets or of product obsolescence. Similarly OD has had, again with a few exceptions, little to say about the problems of minorities or about the new, emerging role of women. As will be discussed in the later sections, OD has had little to say about the effects of inter-organisational competition, but has instead concentrated heavily on reducing competition within the organisation. Finally, OD has had little to say about the role of the unions and the part that the unions should play in OD. As a matter of fact, many unions are highly suspicious of OD and OD practitioners, seeing them as Management consultants.

Gillespie points out very clearly the importance of other variables in the social system. Since neither the individual nor the organisation is static, but rather dynamic, the individual, the work groups, and the organisation as a total open system all have goals, needs, objectives and are characterised by the pervasive aspect of continual change. He has subdivided the variables affecting the organisational system into three clusters - the first cluster contains those variables, with unknown and known, which cannot be controlled or influenced by the organisation, e.g. new technological developments, political and government policies, laws and regulations, cultural norms, and other environmental factors. (45)

Frequently, significant organisational change, is brought about by the influence of one or more of these variables. Our current theories about OD do not particularly help an organisation deal with these factors, except, perhaps, to enable it to develop better and faster sensing mechanisms, so that the organisation can adapt to the forces beyond its control.

The second cluster identified by Gillespie consists of those variables that at present are unknown, but which could be controlled or influenced by the organisation. Gillespie feels that this cluster comprises an area of discovery awaiting the exploration of such "semical theorists" as Maslow and Lewin. The absence of such theorists has delayed the discovery of more variables which, if known,
would be influenced or controlled by the organisation. The third
cluster contains those variables about which the organisation is
aware, can influence, and to some degree, can control. Many of
these variables are beyond the present scope of OD, such as the
development of management information systems, new developments in
data processing, break throughs in research and development; and
the like. Others are much more closely related to the current
realm of OD e.g. business and long range planning. Gillespie feels
that since many OD practitioners do not want to acknowledge their
lack of expertise in areas such as business planning, the result
may be frustration and disillusionment on the part of both the
client and the consultant when the team development or other work
in communications or problem solving methods do not culminate in
observable improvements. He strongly recommends that the consul-
tant refer problems to other specialists when the problem is
beyond the skills of the consultant. For example, a consultant
who is an expert in management by objectives may have little
knowledge of other aspects of behavioural science and should openly
admit this lack of knowledge should another problem arise beyond
the scope of his expertise. In this fashion, the consultant can
establish ongoing, collaborative relations with the specialists
in particular field such as compensation, labour relations, and
the like. In other words, the consultant must be prepared to work
collaboratively with a specialist in other areas so that together,
they can work toward diagnosing a problem accurately.

(viii) Approach to Research Design

A major problem in OD today lies in the establishment of good
research designs. The primary emphasis of any research is to
measure "what happens" when one or more variables are changed. Most
research designs specify the variables in advance, establish instru-
ments to measure the variables, and measure them at prescribed times.
Usually, there are both "experimental" and "control" groups. The
research is conducted only on the experimental group and then the
experimental and control groups are compared. In this way, the
experiments can be replicated to determine whether the results were
obtained by chance or through the application of a particular variable.

.../15...
In such a "classic" design, the researcher is "detached" and not part of the experiment itself.

On one hand, as Hellriegel and Alocum point out, there is the necessity to use a good, strong research design which includes control and experimental groups. On the other hand, finding control groups or comparative organisation is extremely difficult. In addition, since organisations are open systems, they are continually subject to unforeseen and unpredictable forces. For example, if a manager or management team is changed, the organisation may suffer the loss of a contract or suddenly obtain a new one. In addition, we do not have the ability to identify and quantify the variables for the total system. Nonetheless, this difficulty in establishing good research design does not preclude the necessity for working actively to do so.

Friedlander points up the necessity of moving away from single-case studies and developing methods to compare the effects of different processes on the resulting outcomes. Although he was talking primarily about sensitivity training, Friedlander's comments are applicable to all OD techniques or processes. Some studies have described processes, but with little or no evaluation of the outcomes of those processes. Other studies have focused almost completely on the outcomes, with little description or specification of the processes. As Friedlander puts it "we must at some point study comparative changes in the effectiveness of different work groups (or organisations) and then link these changes to the respective process interventions."

In these selective review of the literature, Frohman and Sashkin make the same point, concluding "in sum, it would seem that good research, in terms of design and evaluation is generally lacking; that good comparative research, involving similar or different OD programmes in different or similar organisations is practically non-existent; and there is little evaluation of OD and training programmes by the organisation involved."
In suggesting a design for research, Campbell, et al, stress the need to use a variety of different organisations, control groups, longitudinal studies, and combination of both statistical and clinical predictors. They suggest a greater complementary use of both field and laboratory studies. Similarly, Beer has suggested that some modification of the "classical" research design is necessary. Since OD is a cyclical process and since the data generated in one phase of programme may well determine the next step, new, modified approaches must be found. His primary thesis is that the evaluation process needs to be embedded in the change process itself and that the richness of the data requires the obtaining of information from a wide variety of sources, such as interviewing, observation, organisational records and similar means, as well as by more traditional pre- and post questionnaire methods.

Further since an outcome of an OD programme cannot be completely predicted in advance, the data gathered must be available to the change agents and to the organisation on a time line which is parallel with the change process itself. In other words, Beer feels that "there will be less destruction between researchers, change agents and participation".

(ix) Model for OD

The general model for OD effort is as follows:

1. Plan the change process (primarily by trained consultants behavioural scientists advising the client, top management, who approves the programme).

2. Change the attitudes and habits of individuals (the ways people treat one another).

3. Change the group climate or culture (the collective attitudes and habits of individuals).

4. Work out how structures, such as:
   (a) Subtoals (products types of patient care, allocation of budget money),
   (b) Who does what (a new specialisation pattern), and
   (c) Who has final authority over whom.

.../17...
5. Solve day-to-day problems, involving:
   (a) New demands from outside the organisation, and
   (b) New discoveries or demands from inside the organisation.

(x) Conditions and Techniques for successful OD programmes:

Theory and research, and experience to date suggest that successful OD programmes tend to resolve in the following way and that they have some of these characteristics (the statements to be considered highly tentative).

- There is a strong pressure for improvement from both outside the organisation and from within.
- An outside behavioural scientists consultant brought in for consultation with top executives and to diagnose organisational problems.
- A preliminary diagnosis suggests that OD efforts, designed in response to the expressed needs of the key executives, are warranted.
- A collaborative decision is made between the key client group and the consultant to try to change the culture of the organisation, at least at the top initially, the specific goals may be to improve communications, to secure more effective participation from schoolmates in problem solving and to move in the direction of more openness, more feedback, and support.
- Two or more top executives, including the chief executives go to the laboratory training sessions.
- Attendance in T-group programme is voluntary.
- Team holding sessions are held with the top executive group (or at the highest point where the programme is started.
- In a firm large enough to have personnel executive, the personnel industrial relations vice president becomes heavily involved at the outset.
- One of the two organisational forms emerges to coordinate OD efforts; a co-ordinator reporting to the personnel executive.
- Ultimately, it is essential that personnel industrial relation group (including people in salary administration), be an integral part of the OD programme.
- Team building labs, at the request of the various respective executives with laboratory designs based on careful data gathering and problem diagnosis are conducted at successively lower levels of the organisation with the help of outside consultants.

- Ideally as the programme matures, both members of the personnel staff and a few line executives are trained to do some OD work in conjunction with the external and internal professionally trained behavioural scientists.

- The outside consultant(s) and the internal co-ordinator work very carefully together and periodically check on fears, threats and anxieties which may be developing as the effort progresses.

- The OD consultants constantly work on their own effectiveness in interpersonal relationships and their diagnostic skills so that they are in a position of "do as I say, but not as I do".

- There needs to be continuous audit of the results both in terms of checking on the evolution of attitudes about what is going on and in terms of the extent of which problems were identified at the outset by the key clients are being solved through the programme.

- As implied above, the reward system and other personnel systems need to be readjusted to accommodate emerging changes in performance in the organisation.
THE NEED FOR ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT

The need for OD is summarised distinctly under the following headings:
- Environmental complexity and work specialisation
- Exchanging commitments and loyalty for satisfaction of needs
- Overcoming maladaptice attitudes from the past, and
- Management of conflict within the organisations.

( i ) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLEXITY AND WORK SPECIALISATION

Managers today are faced with a much more turbulent technical world in the external environment. The time when the customers, competitive products, distributive channels, production methods, and labour costs and skills were stable and orderly has changed to a time when product life cycles are short, new products must be developed to meet changing population patterns and tastes, and a host of other adjustments must be made. The same is true for other institutions in our society.

Size and complexity of organisations - of the number of specialists required, and the ability of these specialists to collectively guide the operations of the organisations has increased. This is the case in hospitals and schools.

No longer can a single Sales Manager be sufficiently acquainted in a specialised way with market research, inventory control techniques, advertising methods, or scientific product research to make wise decisions. Nor can a specialist in any one of these areas alone make decisions that are wise. No longer can hospital director, chief of internal medicine, chief of anesthesiology, financial controller, the head nurse or the director of the emergency ward alone make decisions. It is a price we pay for modern large scale organisations that everything depends on everything else-what the emergency ward does affects the finances of the hospital, the way the ones thesociologists deaden pain and the hours doctors work on internal medicine.

This complexity and interdependence has been researched by Burns and Stalker (1961). They found the organisations in the Scottish Electronics Industry which were organic, in that they
had more open and fluid relationships among people holding different internal functional positions, were the ones that were most successful in changing their production and marketing to meet the rapid developments in British and World Markets.

Systems concepts is another area of focus for OD need for management of this nature. The concept is that for all the changes taking place in a turbulent environment do (and must) reach directly the relevant specialists inside the organisation (e.g. customer information to the marketing specialist, new discovery in hydrocarbon chemistry to the research department, etc...). They cannot reach only the president - it would cause an overload in his decision making, nor would he be able to comprehend the detailed meaning as would a specialist.

The only answer is teamwork, with the president or the general manager the one who sets up the process and procedures for group decision making. In most of the OD literature showing how companies go about this kind of management, it is stressed that some general manager initially sees the need for this kind of approach and at some point becomes committed to it. He is the one who, with the change agent schedules the various meetings, attends himself, and otherwise lends official authority and procedure to its being carried out.

Another development is the environment in a rapid change in human culture, as contrasted with rapid technological changes. The top executives, middle managers and employees of any organisation are, after all, people who hold the beliefs, values, needs and demands of their times, culture and society. Warren Bennis had to say: "The environment now is busy, clogged and dense with opportunities and threats; it is turbulent, uncertain and dynamic. The people who work for organisations are more complicated than ever before. They have needs, motives, anxieties and to make matters even more complicated, they bring higher expectations than ever before to our institutions. The institutions themselves are changing, through the press of environmental changes and the internal demands of its people"
(ii) EXCHANGING COMMITMENT AND LOYALTY FOR SATISFACTION OF NEEDS

It is seen that an important kind of influence exists when an organisation satisfies the human needs of another person. If a doctor in a hospital finds that many of the things he wants in life are gained by working in this particular hospital, he is more likely to develop positive attitudes towards it, and to carry out the duties and responsibilities necessary for the success of the hospital as an institution. This is where there is co-existence of motivation and influence. In this sense, OD teamwork provides this doctor with much more opportunity for problem solving, for determining his own destiny through having a voice in the way the hospital operates, and for greater accomplishment than he could hope for if he worked in a single office by himself. It might, by increasing his social function in society, give him more self-esteem as well as more freedom and autonomy. This if one sees the logic of a man's relationship to his employing institution as a "psychological contract", involving the exchange by the man of his work and commitment for an offer by the institution of all these other things; he also sees that OD might well be a key to the elusive problem of commitment and loyalty. Economists, while stressing that "economic man" works for wages and money, have always recognised that people in certain jobs also work for what they called "psychic benefits".

(iii) OVERCOMING MALADAPTIVE ATTITUDES FROM THE PAST

Personality of participants when they join an organisation is another basic force. In the process of maturation and development, certain basic attitudes derived during one's growth are deep seated, quite sable and tend to affect one's present relations with the people. Of particular importance in organisational life are attitudes towards authority and attitude towards intimacy (Bennis and Shepard, 1965). An overly dependent person - who has a pronounced feeling of comfort of having others to be leaders, or in having rules and procedures to guide his life may be in for some trouble. This person may vacillate between submissiveness and rebelliousness.
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Conversely, an overly counterdependent person - one with pronounced feeling of discomfort towards people in authority or towards rules and regulations - may also be in for some trouble. As he moves through life (running into some "good" and some "bad" organisations), he does not always realistically recognise the situation around him. He may then be subjected to submissiveness and rebelliousness.

Another interpersonal attitude is towards intimacy. One person may have learnt to be overly personal - he cannot rest until he has stabilised a relatively high degree of intimacy with others. A counterperson avoids talks at all costs. Such persons clinging to the extremes, vacillate between both.

Although OD practitioners may differ in their terminology, and is how strongly they aim their efforts in changing their basic attitudes, all OD efforts try to get people to see the world as it is, here-and-now, and to see themselves and others as they are, not as some stereotype.

Another effort is made to get people to learn how to learn. This is an elusive objective. Those who practice OD assume that it takes skill to see one's self, other team members, and the job to be done in realistic terms. Such skill must be learnt. Everyday is a new learning experience. Anderson(58) showed how feedback not only can help another person to learn, but that one must learn how to give feedback which is constructive, rather than destructive.

Specialisation has tended to block a person's ability to understand another person's job or point of view. This is due to "trained incapacity". In a company the sales force thinks only about sales, while the finance department thinks only about costs or investments. In a hospital surgeons spend their lives operating, while the controller spends his life dealing with the patients who pay bills or vendors who sell beds and pharmaceuticals.

Sociologists who study bureaucracy, have pointed out that if a person lives in the same organisation for a long time, with the same policy rules and the same job descriptions, his mind is likely
to play strange tricks, to "displace" the original goal of serving the customer (or another part of the organisation). In some organisations, general managers have the right to decide policies and changes in the organisation, yet the ability to decide drifts more and more into the hands of specialists. As a result, managers engage in activities designed to maintain their prequisites and prestige, rather than in solving real operating problems. Hence, the organisation might become more interested in maintaining status, prestige and office than in solving up to date problems.

Overall practice is for managers to demonstrate loyalty and commitment to their immediate superiors than thinking about solving problems. This calls for the need to break the rigid bureaucratic practices. This was found by Burns and Stalker in their study.(59)

(iv) MANAGEMENT OF CONFLICT

A final reason often cited as to why OD is needed in modern organisations is that it is an effective way to manage conflict, rather than let conflict become persistent and destructive. According to this view, maladaptive interpersonal attitudes from the past, or departmental conflicts of interest, or both, tend to cause conflicts between various parties in the organisation - managers versus subordinates, specialists versus specialists, one department versus another. Belief of society is not to bring such conflict into open. A sales manager who shows some hostility toward the production department when orders are late and who says in a committee meeting, "you guys always seem unco-operative to me" is not playing by the rules. It is okay for him to feel hostile, or to make jokes behind the engineers' backs. "Those slide rule boys are really not as important to this company as the sales managers, who earn the engineers' salaries". But if he should seriously tell them he has never felt they are very important to the company's success, he is violating good manners and being disruptive. Someone in the meeting is very likely to change the subject by starting to talk "business", technical matters of production scheduling, or other "objective" matters..

According to this view, such minor hostilities, if constantly swept under the rug, can build up to polarised positions, wherein each side.../24...
is in a "win-lose" frame of mind. Instead of searching for creative solutions to the problems of selling and producing or working to get each of these specialities to help one another, the parties spend much time in what appears on the surface to be politely using technical reasoning statistical fact, or business arguments. Underneath, in reality, this kind of behaviour is often directed at proving that the other side is wrong (cutting them down) while we are the real brains around here (building us up).

Lawrence and Lorch\(^{(60)}\) place the management of conflict as a key concept in their argument on how to promote integration among the many specialists whose interests might conflict. They have in mind a set of events that look like this.

A conflict resolution process characterised by directly confronting conflicts instead of smoothing them over and achieved by organisation members learning how to be open and frank.

leads to

greater integration of teams and among people in diverse departments

leads to

firms successful in adapting to a changing environment.

It should be carefully distinguished between management of conflict and the elimination of feelings of conflict. A moderate amount of conflict is considered to be a source of creativity and innovation.
SOME APPROACHES TO OD

Very brief mention will be made of some of the approaches to OD. Detailed analysis is given in ref:61.

First the use of positive reinforcement in behaviour modification or conditioning is made. Many consultants object to the term "positive reinforcement". In discussing behaviour modification, consideration is given to some of the implementation stages. Transitional analysis examines the structure of the personality, interpersonal transaction, strokes and true structuring.

Gestalt approaches to OD are modification of therapeutic techniques for individuals and groups. Factors such as power, aggressiveness, dominance and conflict are considered. Human Resource accounting (HRA) a much discussed type of programme is not often put into practice. Currently, the greatest potential for HRA appears to be in examining and measuring the work of groups or the total systems. Flexible working hours is also gaining popularity in many countries.
METHODS OF ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT

There are many ways of OD practice. All the ways involve the following:

(1) Gathering data about the state of operations in the organisation, the state of interpersonal attitudes and behaviour, or both.

(2) Feedback of data to the various parties involved, who then analyse it to see how the human attitudes and behaviour system is affecting solution of the organisation's operating problems; and

(3) Team planning of new solutions to operating problems or new structures of duties, procedures, policies, and rules for the organisation's operations.

Beyond this general similarity, there are almost as many methods of OD as there are consultants engaging in this kind of work. While some may say that this proliferation of methods is due to the newness of this kind of management development, it is probably equally due to the fact that human behaviour is a very rich and variable phenomena. It is also subject to diverse viewpoints and interpretations that we shall probably always have considerable variations among OD methods.

The first two stages above can be conveniently classed as the diagnosis or unfreezing stage of planned or ganisation change. This is a stage in which participants in the organisation look deeply at the present state of affairs in the organisation - its successes and failures and particularly the way human attitudes and relationships either foster or hinder the solving of operating problems.

A number of applied behavioural scientists have used the term "Unfreezing" to denote the diagnosis phase of OD. This term implies that the people in organisations have a way of becoming "frozen" into out of date operating policies, customs, and job descriptions; or "frozen" into interpersonal attitudes of formality (rather than reality), of competition, of ritual, or of distrust. Still other practising OD consultants have taken the term "action research" from Kurt Lewin, a founder of this type of change philosophy, and mentioned earlier, implying that OD is similar to any type of applied research except that "the relationship of researcher and subject
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may reverse - the subjects becoming the researchers" (Bennis). (62)

Viewed in this way, the participants on OD teams within an organisation literally become researchers to discover how rigid operating practices, or rigid interpersonal attitudes, or both, are hampering organisational effectiveness. The OD consultant on the other hand, becomes an educator, training teams on how to do research on these two types of problems.

The third stage, action planning or refreezing, is the stage when the same participants, having faced up to and eliminated some of the structural and human blocks to effective problem solving, proceed to devise new ways of operating they solve patient care problems or advertising problems, and they invent new organisation structures such as new job descriptions, new procedures for the flow of work, or new policies for patient care or advertising.

**DIAGNOSIS OF ORGANISATIONAL PROBLEMS/METHODS**

(i) Questionnaire feedback methods

One of the earlier OD effort was that carried out by Floyd Mann (63) and his colleagues at the University of Michigan. They were bothered by the fact that companies were trying to improve effectiveness and change by training individual managers. The "manager development" approach did seem to be working. According to Mann, it assumes that a manager attends training sessions, that his own attitudes and beliefs change, and that when he returns to the job, his behaviour will change. This change will in turn be seen by his subordinates, who will then become more effective in their jobs, and begin to contribute to new and effective ways of operating the company. Yet even in training programmes designed and conducted by supposedly competent people, Mann found no evidence that the attitudes and beliefs of managers changed, or that they behaved any differently when they got back on the job. In fact, his assessment of these programmes pointed to the fact that certain factors other than attending a training programme were more powerful in determining how a manager acts on the job, and his department performs.
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Later the Michigan group tried to report findings from human relations research to organisations to understand what the researcher meant and how to use it in day to day operations.

A company-wide detailed study was made.\(^{(64)}\)

Since this effort at OD many innovations have been made. Nevertheless, this early effort attempted to get "families" within the organisation together for team diagnosis. And the presence of outside researchers undoubtedly had some of the effects, of interrupting the old organisation.

Further study was carried out at the Boise Cascade Corporation in 1970. Whether results of such a questionnaire actually influence real changes depends on what is done with the information. If people in one department feel that there is not much personal loyalty to the company, the reasons for this might be explored in a non threatening way so as to bring about a greater degree of commitment.\(^{(65)}\)

Some behavioural scientists (e.g. Schien 1964\(^{(66)}\)) do not believe that questionnaires are as effective as face to face giving information. They feel that the categories in a questionnaire are not rich enough in content, powerful enough in force, or personal enough in impact to have a real and meaningful effect on attitudes and perceptions.

(ii) \(T\)-Group and sensitivity training

Perhaps no other method in OD has received so much attention, and been the subject of so much controversy, as \(T\)-Group or sensitivity training. The method is difficult to describe to those who haven't been through it. Schein and Bennis\(^{(67)}\) have made an attempt to explain the method.

One characteristic of such efforts is that the individual is placed in an unstructured situation with other people. There are no rules for this.

A second characteristic for most \(T\)-Group efforts is that they concentrate on here and now experiences. No external factors are entertained.
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We can imagine how such a deliberately contrived "vacuum" might reveal behavioural insights never seen before. There are many theories of what happens in such a group over a period of time. Some of the goals of such training most frequently mentioned by professionals in the field are increased insight into one's own interpersonal attitudes, beliefs, or habits of behaviour (including how competent and successful one is), insights into these attitudes and habits on part of other people (including how competent and successful they are), and insights about the various processes of conflict, harmony, leadership or followership which occur in a structureless group over time.

T-Group are often used for other reasons than OD - and some OD efforts do not use T-Groups. However, the T-Group method, or some method which has some of its characteristics, is often used as part of the total OD programme. One way is by having a large number of individual managers from one organisation attend "stranger" labs (no one from the same company or work group) offered by the National Training Laboratories. It is thought that if many people in the same organisation have developed greater interpersonal awareness and competence by attending stranger group training, two results will follow:

Each manager is likely to be able to solve operating problems effectively; and the work in a stranger lab will make each manager better at going through other steps in OD such as confrontation meetings, chains of interlocking conferences, or action planning sessions.

Each participant would already have some experience, and would be better able to "unfreeze" in his own organisations. However, stranger labs are often used by companies for manager development.

The advantage of familial T-Groups is that people get to know themselves in relation to the individuals in their own organisations and vice versa. When the time comes to go back to work, it is thought by some trainers, these people will be better able to solve operating problems together than will men who have attended stranger laboratories. The disadvantage of familial labs compared stranger labs include the fact that it is more difficult
to get people to know each other historically to concentrate on "here and now", and the danger that unstructured experiences might generate some animosities which would jeopardise, rather than help, future work relations.

T-Group have in fact been successfully used in a wide variety of OD efforts. Anderson (68) shows, for example, that Proctor and Gamble utilised T-Groups with beneficial results; then dangers did not materialise at least in the opinion of the company and trainers.

No discussion of T-Group training will be complete without reference to the study done by Dunnette and Campbell. (69) They set out to find evidence that such training actually accomplishes the goals by those who advocate it. They conclude the following:-

1. That no researcher has yet demonstrated that T-Group have any marked effect on scores on objective attitude tests
2. That T-Groups may result in increased self awareness and interpersonal sensitivity
3. That the associates of most persons who have received T-Group training report desirable changes in their behaviour back on the job (e.g. more openness in communication, better leadership styles), but
4. That no hard evidence exists to show that organisations have increased in productivity, output or other organisational results.

(iii) Focused exercises on confrontation meetings

Focused exercises are in one sense a halfway between unfettered behaviour in a structureless group and the more circumscribed behaviour we all engage in, in the real world. On the one hand, these exercises are like T-Groups. They provide experiential learning (rather than reading about or hearing about someone else's experience), and they set up a situation in which people are removed from part of the real world of agendas, time limits, leaders, hierarchies, quality controls, competition, scare
resources, technology and so on. But in another way they differ from T-Groups. By creating situations which include certain of these things but not others, the trainer is able to design an experience which allows a group of participants to "see" things they might not otherwise see: how these constraints affect human behaviour and vice versa.

A wide variety of simulated experiences have been devised which generate some specific behaviour, such as competition, trust and openness, conflict, shared problem solving, division of scarce resources, and one way versus two way communication.

The experiences on confrontation meetings differ from T-Groups in a second important way. Not only is there an "agenda", but the "agenda" is imposed from the outside world. Remembering that human beings are innovated partly by what they bring to an organisation and partly by what is in the organisation around them, it is easy to see the importance of the externally imposed agenda. A stranger T-Group would emphasise what is within the individual, while the focused experience would enable participants to analyse both. The design imposed by the trainder can be arranged to highlight the organisational environment; enabling participants to "see" how agendas effect behaviour, and vice versa.

(iv) Interview methods

So far there have been shown two ways in which information (research data) is made available to participants in an organisation: by questionnaire and by direct feedback (T-Groups and focused exercises) from one part of the organisation to another. A third method, that of interview by an outside consultant and feedback by him to the teams, is today the principal method used by most OD consultants. In this method, the consultant interviews various people in the organisation and feeds back to the others, and the whole group, certain selected or summarised information on a wide range of subjects. While some of this information pertains to operating matters ("the branch manager seems to believe that the company is charging too little for the product"), consultants are especially valuable in the feeding back...
of the information on human processes in the team ("they say
you won't let them have a voice in decisions such as pricing,
which affect them"). Presumably the consultant has the skill
to state such feedback in a non threatening way, and as an outsider,
he can state touchy matters in a way less likely to cause the
recipients immediately to blame the other party. For both reasons,
OD theory suggests the person receiving such feedback is more
likely to think, rather than react in an aggressive way without
thinking. He is more likely to concentrate on the problem,
regardless of whether it is "fault", someone else's fault or both.

Another reason reason for using the interview method is that the
human problems in an organisation, which cannot readily be "seen"
by untrained perceivers, or by people who have lived in a
particularly structured organisation, can be highlighted
and emphasised.

OD consultants differ in the degree to which they stress direction
or selection by the outside consultant in the OD process. Some
consider them very important functions. A few deny that they seek
to "filter" or "highlight" information, since their function is
objective research - to discover and feedback, without bias or
selectivity, all information reported to them in the interviews.

Regardless of this disagreement, it is highly likely that all
consultants, given their training and interest in human affairs,
do in fact select out, filter, or otherwise reinterpret data.
It is also safe to say that, if OD is a worthy effort conducted
by competent practitioners, interpretation is a vital group dynamics
methods, the consultant's interpretations are an integral part
of the diagnosis.
Success and Failure

"In the last few years, more and more organisation leaders have realised that it is not enough to carry out piecemeal efforts to patch up an organisation problem here, fix a procedure there, or change a job description. To-day, there is a need for longer-range, co-ordinated strategy to develop organisation climates, ways of work, relationships, communication systems, and information systems that will be congenent with the predictable and unpredictable requirements of the years ahead. It is out of these needs that systematic planned change efforts - OD have emerged". (70)

The practice of any new and emerging discipline, is generally more of an art than science. There are precious few guidelines to assist the OD practitioners. In search for usable criteria, a number of authors have attempted to identify patterns of success or failure which have emerged from organisation change and development efforts. The criteria can be applied to specific cases.

(i) Some Conditions For Success

Larry Greiner, for example, analysed the reports of some eighteen studies of planned change in organisations. (71)

His conclusions regarding common patterns of success and failure are based upon an analysis of the conditions which led to change the manner in which change was introduced, the critical facilitators or blocks that were met during its implementation, and the more lasting results of the change. A number of conditions required for success can be deduced from the list of characteristics he found common to the more successful OD programmes. These are:

- The organisation is generally under considerable external and/or internal pressure to improve. Top management has been aroused to action and is searching for solutions.
- An intervention takes place at the top of the organisation in the form of a catalyst, who is either a new member of or a consultant to the top team. This generally induces a re-assessment of past practices and current problems.

- Top management assumes a direct and responsible role in the process. Several levels of management generally participate in the collection of data and the analysis of specific problems.

- New ideas and methods for developing solutions are generated at a number of levels in the organisation. This results in some level of commitment to change by organisation members.

- Some degree of experimentation with innovation takes place. The proposed solutions are generally developed, tested, and found acceptable before the scope of the change is expanded to include larger problems and/or the entire system.

- The organisation development programme is generally reinforced by positive results. The change effort spreads with each success experience and, as management support grows, is gradually accepted as a way of life.

(ii) Some Conditions For Failure

Richard Beckhard, on the other hand, has outlined a number of conditions which seem to contribute to the failure of OD efforts. A summary of those distilled from his experience follows:

- The existence of a credibility gap between top management statements of values and styles and their actual behaviour.

- The use of pieces of an OD programmes, or and hoc activities which are not based on systematic goals for change.

- A short time perspective or an unrealistic expectation of short term results.

- Overdependence and improper use of external and internal consultants.

- A lack of communication and lack of integration of OD efforts between the various levels within the organisation.

- Perceiving "good relationships" as an end goal of OD rather than as a condition of organisational effectiveness.
- Searching for quick solutions or cookbook prescriptions for organisational health.
- Applying an intervention inappropriately or without proper data gathering and diagnosis.

(iii) "Failure" Forms

In the experiment described by Larry E. Greiner(73), apart from their common "failure" to achieve the desired results, the most striking overall characteristic of seven less successful change studies is a singular lack of consistency - not just between studies but within studies.

Where each of the successful changes follow a similar and highly consistent route of one step building on another, the less successful changes are much less orderly.

There are three interesting patterns of inconsistency:-

1. The less successful changes begin from a variety of starting points. This is in contrast to the successful changes, which begin from a common point i.e. strong pressure both externally and internally. Only one less successful change, for example, began with the outside pressure on the organisation; another originated with the hiring of the consultant; and a third started with the presence of internal pressure, but without, outside pressure.

2. Another pattern of inconsistency is found in the sequence of change steps. In the successful change patterns, we observe some degree of logical consistency between steps, as each seems to make possible the next. But in the less successful changes, there are wide and seemingly illogical gaps in sequence. In a case a company lacked the presence of a newcomer to provide new methods and ideas to the organisation.

3. A final pattern of inconsistency is evident in the major approaches used to introduce change. In the successful cases, it seems fairly clear that shared approaches are used - that is, authority figures seek the participation of subordinates...
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in joint decision making. In less successful attempts, however, the approaches used lie closer to the extreme ends of the power distribution continuum. Thus in five less successful change studies, a unilateral approach (decree, replacement, structural) was used, while in two other studies a delegated approach (data discussion, T-Group) was applied. None of the less successful change studies reported the use of a shared approach. (74)
CONCLUSIONS

THE FUTURE OF ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT

To predict future is extremely difficult. Thus the predictions and recommendations can only be tentative. Who, in the early 1973, for instance could have predicted "sudden" oil and energy crisis that occurred in the fall and winter of 1973-1974?

Future is looked through the following areas:
- The individual in the organisation
- The organisation
- The need for a systems approach
- The need for a better theory and research

(i) THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE ORGANISATION

Today, there is a great deal of controversy about the signs of growing worker unhappiness and discontent on the job, particularly among young workers.

To accommodate the changing labour force, Thomas and Bennis suggest that a number of value shifts must occur in the near future.

1. A shift in the focus from the organisation to the rights of the individual:
2. Movement from conformity (uniformity) to pluralism
3. Greater awareness of the need for co-operation and inter-disciplinary approaches, including moving from independence to interdependence; and
4. Movement from moral absolutes to situational ethics. Much the same ground is covered by Walton, who also includes such factors as adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthful working conditions, greater opportunity to use and develop human capacities, and greater "constitutionalism" in the work organisation. (75)
As individuals change, so too does the general culture. Yet as Lunberg points out, OD has been relatively unconcerned about such phenomenon as justice, due process and the development of the new organisational forms that are neither bureaucratic or quasi bureaucratic.(76)

(ii) THE ORGANISATION

Considerable changes have occurred in the organisations since the early times. In addition to the changes that have occurred, there are some solid economic indicators that forecast the need for change. For example, the Boston Globe for July, 17, 1974, stated that more than 600 strikes were being conducted on that day alone by sanitation workers, machinists, transit employees, and state employees.(77) Two days later, the Wall Street Journal reported that the economy had sagged again in the second quarter, indicating a recession.(78)

There are other factors indicating the need for change. For example, absenteeism and turnover in most organisations are on the rise, as are involuntary bankruptcies among both small and large organisations.

(iii) THE NEED FOR A SYSTEMS APPROACH

The systems approach calls for greater emphasis on the appropriate level of intervention, as opposed to undue reliance on a particular technique. It also calls for more linkages with other practitioners within the organisation - with the architects and engineers who design new plants or buildings to modify existing ones, with the wage and salary administrators, with the computer people and others who profoundly affect the organisation.

The systems approach calls for a closer look at the "truth and love" syndrome. OD practitioners have never adequately come to grips with the issue of power versus truth and love. In today's overall climate and culture, it may be asking too much for an entire organisation to bask in trust and love. There
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are some authoritarian managers, and there are others who want to be told what to be done rather than take an additional responsibility and challenge. Thus it may be inappropriate for the OD consultant to never act as an expert; rather if an OD consultant is going to help a client redesign the organisation according to contingency theories, the consultant may have to act as an expert, at least in the beginning, and the organisational redesign may have to be implemented as a top management decision. However, the more the intervention moves toward the inter/and intrapersonal, the more the consultant’s role becomes one using a different kind of expertise to bring about self understanding and self awareness.

The systems approach calls for a much closer look at the reward subsystem existing in the organisation. It does little good to undertake team building at the top and then reward a particular manager for his individual efforts; this dichotomy may be disfunctional for the larger system.

(iv) THE NEED FOR BETTER THEORY AND RESEARCH

The development of OD techniques has outstripped the research and theory. Now, it remains to develop a metatheory that ties the various techniques together and considers the long terms effects. One such attempt to study the longitudinal effects of an OD programme has been made by Hand, et al who studied a human relations training programme, using control and experimental groups. (79)

Three months after the programme was completed, there was little observed or measured change in managerial behaviour or attitudes. However, in a follow up study conducted a year and a half later, the researchers found significant changes in the group that had undergone the training and negative changes in the control group. The change over the extended period of time appeared to be the result, at least partially, of the overall climate of the organisation.

There is a great need for a series of systems and systematic
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studies that tell us which programmes or interventions work best in which situations. To do this requires use of more than just attitudinal or anecdotal data. It requires the follow up over extended periods of time and the use of control groups.

According to Lundberg the call is for developing and using better "models of man" as well as establishing the linkage between OD and other change strategies, such as management science.

Further OD "failures" need to be reported and more rigorously analyzed.

Finally, we need more determined efforts at consolidating concepts and terms. The use of "cases" do not help us to "test" hypotheses, but do provide us with hypotheses to "test".
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