

CHAPTER 2

Definitions of Organization Development

The literature contains numerous definitions of organization development. We examine several here and present one of our own. A good way to gain an appreciation for what OD is all about is to see how various authors have described the field over the years. No single accepted definition of OD exists, but there is general agreement on the nature of the field and its major characteristics.

Some early definitions of organization development follow.¹

Organization development is an effort (1) *planned*, (2) *organization-wide*, and (3) *managed from the top*, to (4) *increase organization effectiveness and health* through (5) *planned interventions* in the organization's "processes," using *behavioral-science* knowledge. (Beckhard, 1969)

Organization development (OD) is a response to change, a complex educational strategy intended to change the beliefs, attitudes, values, and structure of organizations so that they can better adapt to new technologies, markets, and challenges, and the dizzying rate of change itself. (Bennis, 1969)

OD can be defined as a planned and sustained effort to apply behavioral science for system improvement, using reflexive, self-analytic methods. (Schmuck and Miles, 1971)

Organization development is a process of planned change—change of an organization's culture from one which avoids an examination of social processes (especially decision making, planning and communication) to one which institutionalizes and legitimizes this examination. (Burke and Hornstein, 1972)

More recent definitions of organization development are these.²

[The aims of OD are] . . . (1) enhancing congruence between organizational structure, processes, strategy, people, and culture; (2) developing new and creative organizational solutions; and (3) developing the organization's self-renewing capacity. (Beer, 1980)

Organization development is an organizational process for understanding and improving any and all substantive processes an organization may develop for performing any task and pursuing any objectives. . . . A "process for improving processes"—that is what OD has basically sought to be for approximately 25 years. (Vaill, 1989)

Organizational development is a set of behavioral science-based theories, values, strategies, and techniques aimed at the planned change of the organizational work setting for the purpose of enhancing individual development and improving organizational per-

formance, through the alteration of organizational members' on-the-job behaviors. (Porras and Robertson, 1992)

[OD is] . . . a systematic application of behavioral science knowledge to the planned development and reinforcement of organizational strategies, structures, and processes for improving an organization's effectiveness. (Cummings and Worley, 1993)

Organization development is a planned process of change in an organization's culture through the utilization of behavioral science technologies, research, and theory. (Burke, 1994, p. 12)

As you can see, these definitions overlap a great deal (that's encouraging), and contain several unique insights (that's enlightening). All authors agree that OD applies behavioral science to achieve planned change. Likewise, they agree that the target of change is the total organization or system and that the goals are increased organizational effectiveness and individual development.

Schmuck and Miles provide an important insight with the words "reflexive, self-analytic methods." In OD, organization members systematically *critique* how they are doing to learn how to do better. Burke and Hornstein's idea of "legitimizing" an "examination of social processes" speaks to the same issue of becoming more self-analytical.

Several definitions emphasize the importance of organization *processes* (Beckhard, Burke and Hornstein, and Vaill). Vaill depicts OD as a "process for improving processes"—a keen observation. Likewise, several definitions emphasize the crucial role of organization *culture* (Burke and Hornstein and Burke). Organization culture and processes are high-priority targets in most OD programs.

Beer and Cummings and Worley emphasize achieving *congruence* among the components of the organization such as strategy, structure, culture, and processes. Cummings and Worley suggest getting the components right (planned development), and keeping them right (reinforcement). Porras and Robertson suggest that OD is a "package" of theories, values, strategies, and techniques. This package gives OD its distinct character compared to other improvement strategies.

Bennis calls OD both a response to change and an educational strategy intended to change beliefs, attitudes, values, and organization structure—all directed toward making the organization better able to respond to changing environmental demands. His definition is as relevant today as when it was first written. Porras and Robertson state that the aim of OD is to alter people's behaviors by changing organizational work settings. Beer's definition is the only one to mention "developing the organization's self-renewing capacity"—a central goal in all OD programs—but all these authors agree with the desirability of creating self-renewing, "learning organizations."

Collectively, these definitions convey a sense of what organization development is and does. They describe in broad outline the nature and methods of OD. There is no set definition of OD and no agreement on the boundaries of the field, that is, what practices should be included and excluded. But these are not serious constraints given that the field is still evolving, and that practitioners share a central core of understanding, as shown in the preceding definitions.

Now let's turn to our definition of organization development. We do not propose it as the "right" definition, but as one that includes characteristics we think are important for the present and future of the field. *Organization development is a long-term*

CHAPTER 2

Definitions of Organization Development

The literature contains numerous definitions of organization development. We examine several here and present one of our own. A good way to gain an appreciation for what OD is all about is to see how various authors have described the field over the years. No single accepted definition of OD exists, but there is general agreement on the nature of the field and its major characteristics.

Some early definitions of organization development follow.¹

Organization development is an effort (1) *planned*, (2) *organization-wide*, and (3) *managed from the top*, to (4) *increase organization effectiveness and health* through (5) *planned interventions* in the organization's "processes," using *behavioral-science* knowledge. (Beckhard, 1969)

Organization development (OD) is a response to change, a complex educational strategy intended to change the beliefs, attitudes, values, and structure of organizations so that they can better adapt to new technologies, markets, and challenges, and the dizzying rate of change itself. (Bennis, 1969)

OD can be defined as a planned and sustained effort to apply behavioral science for system improvement, using reflexive, self-analytic methods. (Schmuck and Miles, 1971)

Organization development is a process of planned change—change of an organization's culture from one which avoids an examination of social processes (especially decision making, planning and communication) to one which institutionalizes and legitimizes this examination. (Burke and Hornstein, 1972)

More recent definitions of organization development are these.²

[The aims of OD are] . . . (1) enhancing congruence between organizational structure, processes, strategy, people, and culture; (2) developing new and creative organizational solutions; and (3) developing the organization's self-renewing capacity. (Beer, 1980)

Organization development is an organizational process for understanding and improving any and all substantive processes an organization may develop for performing any task and pursuing any objectives. . . . A "process for improving processes"—that is what OD has basically sought to be for approximately 25 years. (Vaill, 1989)

Organizational development is a set of behavioral science-based theories, values, strategies, and techniques aimed at the planned change of the organizational work setting for the purpose of enhancing individual development and improving organizational per-

formance, through the alteration of organizational members' on-the-job behaviors. (Porras and Robertson, 1992)

[OD is] . . . a systematic application of behavioral science knowledge to the planned development and reinforcement of organizational strategies, structures, and processes for improving an organization's effectiveness. (Cummings and Worley, 1993)

Organization development is a planned process of change in an organization's culture through the utilization of behavioral science technologies, research, and theory. (Burke, 1994, p. 12)

As you can see, these definitions overlap a great deal (that's encouraging), and contain several unique insights (that's enlightening). All authors agree that OD applies behavioral science to achieve planned change. Likewise, they agree that the target of change is the total organization or system and that the goals are increased organizational effectiveness and individual development.

Schmuck and Miles provide an important insight with the words "reflexive, self-analytic methods." In OD, organization members systematically *critique* how they are doing to learn how to do better. Burke and Hornstein's idea of "legitimizing" an "examination of social processes" speaks to the same issue of becoming more self-analytical.

Several definitions emphasize the importance of organization *processes* (Beckhard, Burke and Hornstein, and Vaill). Vaill depicts OD as a "process for improving processes"—a keen observation. Likewise, several definitions emphasize the crucial role of organization *culture* (Burke and Hornstein and Burke). Organization culture and processes are high-priority targets in most OD programs.

Beer and Cummings and Worley emphasize achieving *congruence* among the components of the organization such as strategy, structure, culture, and processes. Cummings and Worley suggest getting the components right (planned development), and keeping them right (reinforcement). Porras and Robertson suggest that OD is a "package" of theories, values, strategies, and techniques. This package gives OD its distinct character compared to other improvement strategies.

Bennis calls OD both a response to change and an educational strategy intended to change beliefs, attitudes, values, and organization structure—all directed toward making the organization better able to respond to changing environmental demands. His definition is as relevant today as when it was first written. Porras and Robertson state that the aim of OD is to alter people's behaviors by changing organizational work settings. Beer's definition is the only one to mention "developing the organization's self-renewing capacity"—a central goal in all OD programs—but all these authors agree with the desirability of creating self-renewing, "learning organizations."

Collectively, these definitions convey a sense of what organization development is and does. They describe in broad outline the nature and methods of OD. There is no set definition of OD and no agreement on the boundaries of the field, that is, what practices should be included and excluded. But these are not serious constraints given that the field is still evolving, and that practitioners share a central core of understanding, as shown in the preceding definitions.

Now let's turn to our definition of organization development. We do not propose it as the "right" definition, but as one that includes characteristics we think are important for the present and future of the field. *Organization development is a long-term*

effort, led and supported by top management, to improve an organization's visioning, empowerment, learning, and problem-solving processes, through an ongoing, collaborative management of organization culture—with special emphasis on the culture of intact work teams and other team configurations—using the consultant-facilitator role and the theory and technology of applied behavioral science, including action research. This definition is lengthy, but it includes a number of components we consider essential. We will explain this definition in some detail.

By *long-term effort* we mean that organizational change and development take time—several years in most cases. Ralph Kilmann's book, *Beyond the Quick Fix*, tells the story correctly: There is no "quick fix" when it comes to lasting organizational improvement.³ In fact, it is more accurate to describe "improvement" as a never-ending journey of continuous change. One program or initiative moves the organization to a higher plateau; then another moves it to yet a higher plateau of effectiveness.

The phrase *led and supported by top management* states an imperative: Top management must lead and actively encourage the change effort. Organizational change is hard, serious business; it includes pain and setbacks as well as successes. Top management must initiate the improvement "journey" and be committed to seeing it through. Most OD programs that fail do so because top management was ambivalent, lost its commitment, or became distracted with other duties.

By *visioning processes* we mean those processes through which organization members develop a viable, coherent, and shared picture of the nature of the products and services the organization offers, the ways those goods will be produced and delivered to customers, and what the organization and its members can expect from each other. Visioning means creating a picture of the desired future that includes salient features of the human side of the organization and then working together to make that picture a reality.

By *empowerment processes* we mean those leadership behaviors and human resource practices that enable organization members to develop and use their talents as fully as possible toward individual growth and organizational success. By empowerment, we mean involving large numbers of people in building the vision of tomorrow, developing the strategy for getting there, and making it happen. For empowerment to become a fact of life, it must be built into the very fabric of the organization—its strategy, structure, processes, and culture.

By *learning processes* we mean those interacting, listening, and self-examining processes that facilitate individual, team, and organizational learning. Peter Senge describes learning organizations as "... organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together."⁴ As Chris Argyris advises, people and organizations must avoid the trap of "defensive routines," those habitual reactions that prevent embarrassment and threat, but that also prevent learning.⁵

Problem-solving processes refer to the ways organization members diagnose situations, solve problems, make decisions, and take actions on problems, opportunities, and challenges in the organization's environment and its internal functioning. Michael Beer's definition called for "developing new and creative organizational solutions." We believe solutions to problems are enhanced by tapping deeply into the creativity, commitment, vitality, and common purposes of all members of the organization, in contrast

to having only a select few involved. We further believe that having a compelling, widely shared vision of a desired future creates the best climate for effective problem solving by all the organization's members. Empowerment means involving people in problems and decisions and letting them be responsible for results.

By *ongoing collaborative management of the organization's culture* we mean, first, that one of the most important things to manage in organizations is the *culture*: the prevailing pattern of values, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, expectations, activities, interactions, norms, sentiments, and artifacts.⁶ And second, managing the culture should be a *collaborative* business, one of widespread participation in creating and managing a culture that satisfies the wants and needs of individuals at the same time that it fosters the organization's purposes. Collaborative management of the culture means that everyone, not just a small group, has a stake in making the organization work. Just as visioning, empowerment, learning, and problem-solving processes are opportunities for collaboration in organization development, so is managing the culture.

By including culture so prominently in our definition, we affirm our belief that culture is the bedrock of behavior in organizations. The reciprocal influence among culture, strategy, structure, and processes makes each important, and each influences the others. Still, culture is of primary importance. Edgar Schein clarifies the nature and power of culture in his definition: "Culture can now be defined as (a) a pattern of basic assumptions, (b) invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore (e) is to be taught to new members as the (f) correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems."⁷ So culture consists of basic assumptions, values, and norms of behavior that are viewed as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel—that is why culture change is necessary for true organizational improvement.

Our definition also places considerable weight on organizational processes. Processes are *how* things get done, and we highlight the importance of visioning, empowerment, learning, and problem-solving processes. Processes are relatively easy to change, so they are the place OD programs often begin—getting people to stop doing things one way and start doing them a different way. But change becomes permanent when the culture changes and people accept the new ways as the "right" ways. We believe that when the culture promotes collaboration, empowerment, and continuous learning the organization is bound to succeed.

By *intact work teams and other configurations* we recognize that teams are central to accomplishing work in organizations. We think teams are the basic building blocks of organizations. When teams function well, individuals and the total organization function well. Further, team culture can be collaboratively managed to ensure effectiveness.

The most prevalent form of teams in organizations is intact work teams consisting of superior and subordinates with a specific job to perform. Team building and role and goal clarification interventions are standard activities in OD programs directed toward intact work teams. But in many organizations today, intact work teams do not have a boss in the traditional sense—the teams manage themselves. These self-directed teams assume complete responsibility for planning and executing work assignments. In addition to team building and role and goal clarification, members are trained in competencies such as planning, maintaining quality control, and using management information. Over time, self-directed teams control performance appraisals, hiring, firing, and

training. The results are usually highly gratifying both for the team members and for the organization.

Today's organizations increasingly use ad hoc teams that perform a specific task and disband when the task is completed. The current method for getting complex tasks done in organizations is to assemble a *cross-functional team* comprised of members from all the functional specialties required to get the job done, such as design, engineering, manufacturing, and procurement. The old method was to have functional specialists work on the problem sequentially. When one function finished with its part of the project, the process "threw the results over the wall" to the next functional unit. This method resulted in loss of synergy, wasted time, much rework, and considerable antagonism among the separate functional specialists.

In *Liberation Management*, Tom Peters predicts that the work of tomorrow (most of which will be "brain work") will be done by *ad hoc teams* brought together to accomplish a task, and then disbanded with the people going on to new tasks.⁸ He uses the terms *multifunctional projectization* and *horizontal systems* to describe these teams and their work. Temporary, multifunctional, constantly shifting teams will be the dominant configuration for getting work done, according to Peters. The thesis of *Liberation Management* is that contemporary bureaucratic structures with their functional specialties and rigid hierarchies are *all wrong* for the demands of today's fast-paced marketplace. He writes,

But I've come to realize that, in this madcap world, turned-on and theoretically empowered people . . . will never amount to a hill of beans in the vertically oriented, staff-driven, thick-headquarters corporate structures that still do most of the world's business. Empower until you're blue in the face. Call in the best consultants and create the best strategies. It'll make no difference unless the arteries are unlogged (the "structure" part), then radically rewired (the "systems" part).⁹

The skills required to work effectively in teams will be at a premium in such a world.

The phrase *using the consultant-facilitator role* conveys our belief that leaders can benefit from seeking professional assistance in planning and implementing OD initiatives. In the early phases, at least, the services of a third-party consultant-facilitator are desirable. The third-party role is powerful: That person is typically seen as bringing objectivity, neutrality, and expertise to the situation. Also, the third party is not captive to the culture of the unit undertaking the program. This need for objectivity does not mean that the third party cannot be a member of the organization; rather, it means that he or she should not be a member of the particular unit initiating the OD effort.

Part of an effective OD effort is a growing appreciation of the consultant-facilitator role and a growing capability of many organizational members to perform that role, whether on an ad hoc or a more formal basis. Numerous members should be encouraged to increase their consultation skills and use these skills in various ways, such as helping to run more effective meetings or providing counsel to peers. We are thus calling attention to the *facilitator role* in organizations as well as *facilitator persons*.

By the *theory and technology of applied behavioral science* we mean insights from the sciences dedicated to understanding people in organizations, how they function, and how they can function better. OD *applies* knowledge and theory. Therefore, in addition to the behavioral sciences such as psychology, social psychology, sociology, and so on,

applied disciplines such as adult education, psychotherapy, social work, economics, and political science make contributions to the practice of OD. Porras and Robertson state:

Organizational development (OD) is the practical application of the science of organizations. Drawing from several disciplines for its models, strategies, and techniques, OD focuses on the planned change of human systems and contributes to organization science through the knowledge gained from its study of complex change dynamics.¹⁰

And finally, by *action research* we mean the participative model of collaborative and iterative diagnosis and taking action in which the leader, organization members, and OD practitioner work together to define and resolve problems and opportunities. Because of the extensive applicability of this model in OD, another definition of organization development could be *organization improvement through participant action research*.

The definition we have just analyzed contains the elements we believe are important for OD. To summarize, here are the primary distinguishing characteristics of organization development.

1. OD focuses on culture and processes.
2. Specifically, OD encourages collaboration between organization leaders and members in managing culture and processes.
3. Teams of all kinds are particularly important for accomplishing tasks and are targets for OD activities.
4. OD focuses on the human and social side of the organization and in so doing also intervenes in the technological and structural sides.
5. Participation and involvement in problem solving and decision making by all levels of the organization are hallmarks of OD.
6. OD focuses on total system change and views organizations as complex social systems.
7. OD practitioners are facilitators, collaborators, and co-learners with the client system.
8. An overarching goal is to make the client system able to solve its problems on its own by teaching the skills and knowledge of continuous learning through self-analytical methods. OD views organization improvement as an ongoing process in the context of a constantly changing environment.
9. OD relies on an action research model with extensive participation by client system members.
10. OD takes a developmental view that seeks the betterment of both individuals and the organization. Attempting to create "win-win" solutions is standard practice in OD programs.

These characteristics of organization development depart substantially from traditional consultation modes. Schein identifies the three following basic models of consultation—the first two are not OD, the third model is a good description of OD.¹¹

In the "purchase of expertise model" a leader or unit identifies a need for information or expertise the organization cannot supply and hires a consultant to meet that need. Examples include hiring a consultant to (1) survey consumers or employees about some matter, (2) find out how other organizations organize certain units, or (3) search out information such as the marketing strategy of a competitor. The consultant then makes recommendations.

In the “doctor-patient model” a leader or group detects symptoms of ill health in a unit, or more broadly in the organization, and employs a consultant to diagnose what is causing the problem or problems. The consultant, like a physician, then prescribes a course of action to remedy the ailment.

In the “process consultation model” the consultant *works with* the leader and group to diagnose strengths and weaknesses and to develop action plans. Furthermore, in this model the consultant assists the client organization to become more effective in diagnosing and solving problems.

The first two models depict traditional management consulting; the third model is more typical of OD consulting. In OD the clients receive help in the ways they go about solving problems. The consultant suggests general processes and procedures for addressing problems. The consultant helps the clients generate valid data and learn from them. In short, the OD consultant is an expert on *process*—how to structure effective problem solving and decision making.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

These definitions clarify the distinctive features of OD and suggest why it is such a powerful change strategy. The participative, collaborative, problem-focused nature of OD marshals the experience and expertise of organization members as they work on their most important problems and opportunities in ways designed to lead to successful outcomes. In the next chapter, we trace the history of OD to show how these distinctive features developed.

Notes

1. See Richard Beckhard, *Organization Development: Strategies and Models* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 9; Warren G. Bennis, *Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 2; Richard Schmuck and Matthew Miles, *Organization Development in Schools* (Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books, 1971), p. 2; and Warner Burke and Harvey A. Hornstein, *The Social Technology of Organization Development* (Fairfax, VA: Learning Resources Corp., 1972), p. ix.
2. See Michael Beer, *Organization Change and Development* (Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing, 1980), p. 10; Peter B. Vaill, “Seven Process Frontiers for Organization Development,” in *The Emerging Practice of Organization Development*, Walter Sikes, Allan B. Drexler, and Jack Gant, eds. (La Jolla, CA: Copublished by NTL Institute and University Associates, 1989), p. 261; Jerry I. Porras and Peter J. Robertson, “Organizational Development: Theory, Practice, and Research,” in Marvin D. Dunnette and Leaetta M. Hough, eds., *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2d ed., vol. 3 (Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1992), p. 272; Thomas G. Cummings and Christopher G. Worley, *Organization Development and Change*, 5th ed. (St. Paul, MN: West Publishing, 1993), p. 2; W. Warner Burke, *Organization Development: A Process of Learning and Changing*, 2d ed. (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1994), p. 12.
3. Ralph H. Kilmann, *Beyond The Quick Fix: Managing Five Tracks to Organizational Success* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984).

4. Peter M. Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (New York: Doubleday/Currency, 1990), p. 3.
5. Chris Argyris, *Strategy, Change, and Defensive Routines* (Boston: Pitman, 1985).
6. A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (New York: Vintage Books, 1952). They examined 164 definitions of culture and arrived at the following synthesis: “Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action,” pp. 291, 357, authors’ emphasis. Our definition is congruent with their synthesis. See also Ralph H. Kilmann, Mary J. Saxton, Roy Serpa, and Associates, *Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985), p. ix.
7. Edgar H. Schein, “Organizational Culture,” *American Psychologist*, 45 (February 1990), p. 111.
8. Tom Peters, *Liberation Management: Necessary Disorganization for the Nanosecond Nineties* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992).
9. Ibid., p. 13.
10. Porras and Robertson, “Organizational Development: Theory, Practice, and Research,” p. 720.
11. Edgar H. Schein, *Process Consultation, Vol. I: Its Role in Organization Development* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1988), pp. 5–11.

CHAPTER 3

A History of Organization Development

The history of organization development is rich with the contributions of behavioral scientists and practitioners, many of whom are well known, as well as the contributions of many people in client organizations. Even if we were aware of all the significant contributors, which we are not, we could not do justice to the richness of this history in a short essay. Therefore, all we can do is write about what we believe to be the central thrusts of that history, based on our research to date, and hope that the many people who are not mentioned will not be offended by our incompleteness. Our focus will be largely the origins of OD plus some discussion of current trends and the current extent of application.

Systematic organization development activities have a recent history and, to use the analogy of a mangrove tree, have at least four important trunk stems. One trunk stem consists of innovations in applying laboratory training insights to complex organizations. A second major stem is survey research and feedback methodology. Both stems are intertwined with a third, the emergence of action research. Paralleling these stems, and to some extent linked, is a fourth stem—the emergence of the Tavistock sociotechnical and socioclinical approaches. The key actors in these stems interact with each other and are influenced by experiences and concepts from many fields, as we will see.

THE LABORATORY TRAINING STEM

The T-Group

Laboratory training, essentially unstructured small-group situations in which participants learn from their own actions and the group's evolving dynamics, began to develop about 1946 from various experiments in using discussion groups to achieve changes in behavior in back-home situations. In particular, an Inter-Group Relations workshop held at the State Teachers College in New Britain, Connecticut, in the summer of 1946 influenced the emergence of laboratory training. This workshop was sponsored by the Connecticut Interracial Commission and the Research Center for Group Dynamics, then at MIT.

The Research Center for Group Dynamics (RCGD) was founded in 1945 under the direction of Kurt Lewin, a prolific theorist, researcher, and practitioner in interpersonal, group, intergroup, and community relationships.¹ Lewin had been recruited to MIT largely through the efforts of Douglas McGregor of the Sloan School of Man-

agement, who had convinced MIT President Carl Compton of the wisdom of establishing a center for group dynamics. Lewin's original staff included Marian Radke, Leon Festinger, Ronald Lippitt, and Dorwin Cartwright.² Lewin's field theory and his conceptualizing about group dynamics, change processes, and action research profoundly influenced the people associated with the various stems of OD.

Through a series of events at the New Britain workshop of 1946, what was later to be called the "T-group" ("T" for "training") began to emerge. The workshop staff consisted of Kurt Lewin, Kenneth Benne, Leland Bradford, and Ronald Lippitt. The latter three served as leaders of "learning groups" (sometimes called "L-groups"). Each group, in addition to group members and a leader, had an observer who made notes about interactions among members. At the end of each day, the observers met with the staff and reported what they had seen. At the second or third evening session, three members of the workshop asked if they could sit in on the reporting session, and were encouraged to do so. One woman disagreed with the observer about the meaning of her behavior during the day's sessions, and a lively discussion ensued. The three workshop members then asked to return to the next reporting session, and, because of the lively and rich discussion, Lewin and the staff enthusiastically agreed. By the next evening, about half of the 50–60 members of the workshop attended the feedback session. These sessions soon became the most significant learning experiences of the conference.³

This experience led to the National Training Laboratory in Group Development, organized by Benne, Bradford, and Lippitt (Lewin died in early 1947). They held a three-week session during the summer of 1947 at the Gould Academy in Bethel, Maine.⁴ Participants met with a trainer and an observer in Basic Skill Training Groups (later called T-groups) for a major part of each day. The 1947 laboratory was sponsored by the Research Center for Group Dynamics (MIT), the National Education Association (NEA), Teachers College of Columbia University, University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), Springfield College, and Cornell University. The work of that summer evolved into the National Training Laboratory, later called NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, and into contemporary T-group training. Out of the Bethel experiences and NTL grew a significant number of laboratory training centers sponsored by universities. One of the first was the Western Training Laboratory, headed by Paul Sheats and sponsored by UCLA. The Western Training Laboratory offered its first program in 1952.

In addition to Lewin and his work, extensive experience with role playing and Moreno's psychodrama influenced Bradford, Lippitt, and Benne's invention of the T-group and the subsequent emergence of OD.⁵ Further, Bradford and Benne were influenced by John Dewey's philosophy of education, including concepts about learning and change and about the transactional nature of humans and their environment.⁶ Benne, in collaboration with R. Bruce Raup and others, built on Dewey's philosophy, focusing on the processes by which people who differ reach policy agreements.⁷ In addition, Benne was influenced by the works of Mary Follett, an early management theorist, including her ideas about integrative solutions to problems in organizations.⁸

As a footnote to the emergence of the T-group, the widespread use of flip-chart paper as a convenient way to record, retrieve, and display data in OD activities and in training sessions was invented by Ronald Lippitt and Lee Bradford during the 1946 New Britain sessions. Lippitt reports,

The blackboards were very inadequate, and we needed to preserve a lot of the material we produced. So I went down to the local newspaper and got a donation of the end of press runs. The paper was still on the rollers. We had a "cutting bee" of Lee, Ken, myself and several others to roll the sheets out and cut them into standard sizes that we could put up in quantity with masking tape on the blackboards and walls of the classrooms. We took the practice back to MIT and I had the shop make some boards with clamps across the top. We hung them in our offices and the seminar room, and Lee did the same thing at the NEA in Washington. . . . The next summer at Bethel we had a large supply of cut newsprint and used some of the boards on easels, as well as using the walls.⁹

Bradford also reports that he and Ronald Lippitt used "strips of butcher paper" in their early work with organizations.¹⁰

In a sense, the T-group emerged from an awareness that had been growing for a decade or more, awareness of the importance of helping groups and group leaders focus on group and leadership *processes*. This growing awareness was particularly evident in adult education and group therapy.¹¹ As the use of the laboratory method evolved, stated goals of T-group experiences tended to include such statements as "(1) self-insight . . . , (2) understanding the conditions which inhibit or facilitate group functioning, (3) understanding interpersonal operations in groups, and (4) developing skills for diagnosing individual, group, and organizational behavior."¹²

While these insights and skills were practical and relevant for most participants, one driving force for the rapidly growing popularity of T-groups was probably their spiritual and therapeutic (therapy for normals) aspects. Art Kleiner captures these aspects:

. . . toward the end of the two weeks (or three, or one), something wonderful and unfathomable would happen. It was rarely written down in the voluminous scholarly literature that NTLers created about T-Groups, but it kept drawing people back, session after session, and it prodded some participants to drop out of their management jobs to become educators and psychologists. After two or three weeks of soul-baring in a group of soul-barers, each person in the room would reach a moment when he or she discovered some core of redemption, some inner worth, deep within. The same feeling surged in those moments that, perhaps, surged when crowds gathered around Pelagius in Rome, and that surges whenever people gather to understand the deepest ties they hold in common.

Some of the NTL participants described the experience as "unconditional love"; others, as "pure joy"; others, as a kind of mystical breakthrough or peak experience. . . . After you experienced that peak, you knew that the unconscious was not a Freudian cesspool spewing forth bitter legacies of childhood traumas. It was a source of Pelagian grace and hidden value, terrifying in its power and yet delightful in its beauty. It could only come forward when people learned, in a trusting, empathic environment like a T-Group, how to break free of their old ways of talking and thinking.

A few NTL participants never felt the Pelagian grace rise within them. They sat in their T-Groups, puzzled and mildly disappointed, while everyone around them was swept up in a contact conversational high.¹³

Over the next decade, as trainers began to work with social systems of more permanency and complexity than T-groups, they began to experience considerable frustration in transferring laboratory behavioral skills and insights of individuals into solving problems in organizations. Personal skills learned in the "stranger" T-groups setting

were difficult to transfer to complex organizations. However, the training of "teams" from the same organization emerged early at Bethel and undoubtedly was a link to the total organizational focus of Douglas McGregor, Herbert Shepard, Robert Blake, and Jane Mouton and subsequently the focus of Richard Beckhard, Chris Argyris, Jack Gibb, Warren Bennis, Eva Schindler-Rainman, and others.¹⁴ All had been T-group trainers in NTL programs.

Robert Tannenbaum

Some of the earliest sessions of what would now be called "team building" were conducted by Robert Tannenbaum in 1952 and 1953 at the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station at China Lake, California.¹⁵ According to Tannenbaum, the term *vertically structured groups* was used with groups dealing with "personal topics (such as departmental sociometrics, interpersonal relationships, communication, and self-analysis), and with organizational topics (such as deadlines, duties and responsibilities, policies and procedures, and—quite extensively—with interorganizational-group relations)."¹⁶ These sessions, which stimulated a 1954 *Personnel* article by Tannenbaum, Kallejian, and Weschler, were conducted "with all managers of a given organizational unit present."¹⁷ The more personally oriented dynamics of such sessions were described in a 1955 *Harvard Business Review* article by the same authors.¹⁸

Tannenbaum, along with Art Shedlin, also led what appears to be the first non-degree training program in OD, the Learning Community in Organizational Development at UCLA. This annual program was first offered as a full-time, ten-week, residential program, January–March 1967.¹⁹

Tannenbaum, who held a Ph.D. in Industrial Relations from the School of Business at the University of Chicago, was influenced early by Mary Parker Follett in management theory, V. V. Anderson's *Psychiatry in Industry*, Roethlisberger and Dickson's *Management and the Worker*, and Burleigh Gardner's *Human Relations in Industry*. He was on the planning committee for the Western Training Laboratory (WTL) and a staff member for the first session (1952). During that first session he co-trained with a psychiatric social worker who had attended a Bethel program, and in subsequent sessions, in his words, "co-trained with a psychiatrist, an educator, a clinical psychologist . . . and I learned much from them."²⁰

Chris Argyris

In 1957, Chris Argyris, then a faculty member at Yale University (later at Harvard), was one of the first to conduct team building sessions with a CEO and the top executive team. Two of Argyris's early clients were IBM and Exxon. His early research and interventions with a top executive group are reported in his 1962 book *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness*.²¹

In 1950, while working on a Ph.D. at Cornell University, Argyris visited Bethel as a member of NTL's research staff in order to study T-groups. In his words, "I became fascinated with what I saw, and wanted to become a trainer. Several years later . . . I was invited to become a staff member."²²

Argyris was later to make extensive contributions to theory and research on laboratory training, OD, and organizational learning. One of his several books on OD, *Intervention Theory and Method*, stands as a classic in the field.²³

According to Argyris, three people had the greatest impact on his early career:

Number one was Kurt Lewin.²⁴ . . . I was at Clark, finishing my undergraduate degree. I would go over (to MIT) and sit in on his seminars.²⁵ . . . But his writings . . . had the greatest impact.²⁶ Next came Roger Barker, and his studies on psychological ecology and behavioral settings. I worked with Roger for several years. His greatest impact was not only on helping me to understand how to study behavioral settings more rigorously, but his whole approach to knowledge, which was to explore, to enquire, and to experiment. Finally, there was Bill Whyte at Cornell University, with whom I received my Ph.D. (in organizational behavior). Bill was not only a very thoughtful and encouraging advisor, but he was very smart and learned about field work. He had a sensitivity for what it meant to be an ethnographer that helped me to learn a lot about what to do in the field.²⁷

Argyris interacted with many of the early leaders in the T-group and OD fields. For example, in referring to Douglas McGregor, he states, "I had many wonderful discussions with him in the advanced president's programs at Bethel and in Florida." In referring to Bradford, with whom he worked numerous times from 1950 on, he states that "he was, without any doubt, the person who helped make NTL come alive."²⁸

Douglas McGregor

Beginning about 1957, Douglas McGregor, as a professor-consultant, working with Union Carbide, was one of the first behavioral scientists to address the transfer problem and to talk systematically about and to help implement the application of T-group skills in complex organizations.²⁹ John Paul Jones, who had come up through industrial relations at Union Carbide, in collaboration with McGregor and with the support of a corporate executive vice president and director, Birny Mason, Jr. (later president of the corporation), established a small internal consulting group. In large part, this group used behavioral science knowledge to help line managers and their subordinates learn how to be more effective in groups. McGregor's ideas were a dominant force in this consulting group; other behavioral scientists who influenced Jones's thinking were Rensis Likert and Mason Haire. Jones's organization was later called an "organization development group."³⁰

Among the many influences on Douglas McGregor, of course, was Kurt Lewin, a colleague at MIT whom McGregor had helped recruit. It is also clear that he was influenced by Leland Bradford, Edwin Boring, Irving Knickerbocker, Jay Forrester, and Gordon Allport.³¹ McGregor also must have been influenced by Carl Rogers, the leading theorist and practitioner in client-centered therapy, because McGregor assigned Rogers' writings to his classes at MIT.³² McGregor's classic work, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, which has had a great impact on managers since its publication in 1960, cites an extensive list of psychologists, sociologists, and management theorists, including Peter Drucker.³³ (See the discussion of Richard Beckhard, which refers to the influence of McGregor's consulting work at General Mills on *The Human Side of Enterprise*.) (As a historical footnote, McGregor was president of Antioch College from 1948 to 1954 after his first tour as a professor at MIT. Subsequent to this college presidency, McGregor returned to MIT to start a program in organizational studies.³⁴)

Herbert Shepard

During the same year, 1957, introductions by Douglas McGregor led to Herbert Shepard's joining the employee relations department of Esso Standard Oil (now Exxon) as a research associate. Shepard was to have a major impact on the emergence of OD. Although we will focus mainly on Shepard's work at Esso, we also want to note that Shepard was later involved in community development activities and, in 1960, at the Case Institute of Technology, founded the first doctoral program devoted to training OD specialists.

Before joining Esso, Shepard had completed his doctorate at MIT and stayed for a time as a faculty member in the Industrial Relations Section. Among influences on Shepard were Roethlisberger and Dickson's *Management and the Worker* (1939) and a biography of Clarence Hicks. (As a consultant to Standard Oil, Hicks had helped develop participative approaches to personnel management and labor relations.) Shepard was also influenced by Farrell Toombs, who had been a counselor at the Hawthorne plant and had trained under Carl Rogers. In addition, Shepard was heavily influenced by the writings of Kurt Lewin and others of NTL. He attended an NTL lab in 1950 and subsequently was a staff member in many of its programs.³⁵

In 1958 and 1959 Shepard launched three experiments in organization development at major Esso refineries: Bayonne, New Jersey; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; and Bayway, Texas. At Bayonne, he conducted an interview survey that was discussed with top management. The survey was followed by a series of three-day laboratories for all members of management.³⁶ Paul Buchanan, who had worked earlier at the Naval Ordnance Test Station and more recently had been using a somewhat similar approach in Republic Aviation, collaborated with Shepard at Bayonne and subsequently joined the Esso staff.

Herbert Shepard and Robert Blake

At Baton Rouge, Robert Blake joined Shepard, and the two initiated a series of two-week laboratories attended by all members of "middle" management. At first, they tried to combine the case method with the laboratory method, but their designs soon emphasized T-groups, organizational exercises, and lectures. One innovation in this training program was an emphasis on intergroup as well as interpersonal relations. Although working on interpersonal problems affecting work performance was clearly an organizational effort, between-group problem solving had even greater organization development implications because it involved a broader and more complex segment of the organization.

At Baton Rouge, efforts to involve top management failed, and as a result follow-up resources for implementing organization development were not available. By the time the Bayway program started, two fundamental OD lessons had been learned: the requirement for top management's active involvement in and leadership of the program and the need for on-the-job application.

Bayway brought two significant innovations. First, Shepard, Blake, and Murray Horwitz used the instrumental laboratory, which Blake and Jane Mouton had been developing in social psychology classes at the University of Texas and which they later developed into the Managerial Grid approach to organization development.³⁷ (An essential dimension of the instrumented lab is feedback based on measurements of group and

individual behavior during sessions.³⁸) Second, at Bayway more resources were devoted to team development, consultation, intergroup conflict resolution, and so forth than were devoted to laboratory training of "cousins," that is, organization members from different departments. As Robert Blake stated, "It was learning to *reject* T-group stranger-type labs that permitted OD to come into focus," and it was intergroup projects, in particular, that "triggered real OD."³⁹

Robert Blake and Jane Mouton

Several influences on Robert Blake up to that point were important in the emergence of OD. While at Berea College majoring in psychology and philosophy (later an M.A., University of Virginia, and a Ph.D., University of Texas), Blake was strongly influenced by the works of Korzybski and the general semanticists and found that "seeing discrete things as representative of a continuous series was much more stimulating and rewarding than just seeing two things as 'opposites.'" This thinking contributed in later years to Blake's conceptualization of the Managerial Grid with Jane Mouton and to their intergroup research on win-lose dynamics. This intergroup research and the subsequent design of their intergroup conflict management workshops were also heavily influenced by Muzafer Sherif's fundamental research on intergroup dynamics.⁴⁰ Jane Mouton's influence on Blake's thinking and on the development of the Grid stemmed partly, in her words, "from my undergraduate work (at Texas) in pure mathematics and physics which emphasized the significance of measurement, experimental design, and a scientific approach to phenomena."⁴¹ (Mouton later attained an M.A. from the University of Virginia and a Ph.D. from the University of Texas.)

During World War II, Blake served in the Psychological Research Unit of the Army Air Force where he interacted with many behavioral scientists, including sociologists. This experience contributed to his interest in "looking at the system rather than the individuals within the system on an isolated one-by-one basis."⁴² (This system-wide approach is probably one of many links between systems concepts or systems theory and OD.)

Another major influence on Blake was the work of John Bowlby, a medical member of the Tavistock Clinic in London, who was working in family group therapy. After completing his Ph.D. work in clinical psychology, Blake went to England for 16 months in 1948 and 1949 to study, observe, and do research at Tavistock. As Blake states it,

Bowlby had the clear notion that treating mental illness of an individual out of context was an . . . ineffective way of aiding a person. . . . As a result, John was unprepared to see patients, particularly children, in isolation from their family settings. He would see the intact family: mother, father, siblings. . . . I am sure you can see from what I have said that if you substitute the word organization for family and substitute the concept of development for therapy, the natural next step in my mind was organization development.⁴³

Among others at Tavistock who influenced Blake were Wilfred Bion, Henry Ezriel, Eric Trist, and Elliott Jaques.

After returning from Tavistock and taking an appointment at Harvard, Blake joined the staff for the summer NTL programs at Bethel. His first assignment was joint responsibility for a T-group with John R. P. French. Blake was a member of the Bethel staff from 1951 to 1957 and continued after that with NTL labs for managers at Harriman House,

Harriman, New York. Among other influences on Blake were Jacob Moreno's action orientation to training through the use of psychodrama and sociodrama and E. C. Tolman's notions of purposive behavior in humans.⁴⁴

Richard Beckhard

Richard Beckhard, another major figure in the emergence and extension of the OD field, came from a career in the theater. In his words,

I came out of a whole different world—the theater—and went to NTL in 1950 as a result of some discussions with Lee Bradford and Ron Lippitt. At that time they were interested in improving the effectiveness of the communications in large meetings and I became involved as head of the general sessions program. But I also got hooked on the whole movement. I made a career change and set up the meetings organization, "Conference Counselors." My first major contact was the staging of the 1950 White House conference on children and youth. . . . I was brought in to stage the large general sessions with six thousand people. . . . I had been doing a lot of large convention participative discussion type things and had written on the subject. . . . At the same time I joined the NTL summer staff. . . . My mentors in the field were Lee Bradford, in the early days, and Ron Lippitt and later, Ren Likert, and very particularly, Doug McGregor, who became both mentor, friend, father figure . . . and in the later years, brother. Doug had left MIT and was at Antioch as president. . . . Doug and I began appearing on similar programs. One day coming back on the train from Cincinnati to Boston, Doug asked if I was interested in joining MIT. . . .

In the period 1958–63, I had worked with him (McGregor) on two or three projects. He brought me to Union Carbide, where I replaced him in working with John Paul Jones, and later, George Murray and the group. We (also) worked together at . . . Pennsylvania Bell and . . . at General Mills.⁴⁵

Beckhard worked with McGregor at General Mills in 1959 or 1960, where McGregor was working with Dewey Balsch, vice president of personnel and industrial relations, in an attempt to facilitate "a total organizational culture change program which today might be called quality of work life or OD." Beckhard goes on to say, "The issues that were being worked were relationships between workers and supervision; roles of supervision and management at various levels; participative management for real. . . . This experience was one of the influences on Doug's original paper, 'The Human Side of Enterprise' . . . and from which the book emerged a year or so later."⁴⁶

Beckhard developed one of the first major nondegree training programs in OD, NTL's Program for Specialists in Organizational Training and Development (PSOTD). The first program was an intensive four-week session held in the summer of 1967 at Bethel, Maine, the same year that UCLA launched its Learning Community in OD. Core staff members the first year in the NTL program were Beckhard as dean, Warner Burke, and Fritz Steele. Additional resource persons the first year were Herbert Shepard, Sheldon Davis, and Chris Argyris.

In addition, Beckhard along with McGregor, Rensis Likert, Chris Argyris, Robert Blake, Lee Bradford, and Jack Gibb, founded NTL's Management Work Conferences. These conferences are essentially laboratory training experiences for middle managers. As an extension of this program, Beckhard was also active in developing and conducting NTL's senior executive conferences and presidents' labs.⁴⁷

Warren Bennis

One of the major figures associated with the evolution of the OD field has been Warren Bennis. As described in Art Kleiner's book, *The Ages of Heretics*, Warren Bennis has been a "... lecturer, professor, essayist, university president, author of prominent books on leadership, dreamer of grand visions, and the only NTLer to actually take the helm of a large organization and try to reshape it from the top." Bennis had been an industrial management professor in Douglas McGregor's department at MIT, a T-group trainer, and a participant in a number of the early major OD consulting projects, including one at the U.S. State Department.⁴⁸

During his career, Bennis became vice president for academic affairs at State University of New York at Buffalo, and then president of the University of Cincinnati. His associates and mentors, particularly in the earlier years, included Douglas McGregor, Ed Schein, Mason Haire, Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Kenneth Benne, Herb Shepard, Leland Bradford, Peter Drucker, and Robert Chin.⁴⁹ He was also influenced by the labor economist George Schultz (later to be Secretary of Labor and Secretary of State), Elton Mayo, and Henry Stack Sullivan. Some of his more notable publications include the book *The Planning of Change*,⁵⁰ written with Kenneth Benne and Robert Chin, and the essay "Democracy Is Inevitable,"⁵¹ coauthored with Philip Slater.

Eva Schindler-Rainman

Probably one of the first persons to be an NTL staff member doing OD work and having been trained almost exclusively in the social work field was Eva Schindler-Rainman. Schindler-Rainman was awarded both a masters and doctorate from the University of Southern California with specialties in group work, organizational behavior, and community organization. While employed as director of personnel and training for the Los Angeles Girl Scouts Council, in the early 1950s she attended one of the first events of the Western Training Laboratory. Her T-group trainers there were Gordon Hearn and Marguerite Vanderwerker.

About 1959, Schindler-Rainman was on the staff of an NTL-sponsored Community Development Laboratory at UCLA's Arrowhead Conference Center where she was a T-group co-trainer with Leland Bradford. Others on the staff were Warren Schmidt, Kenneth Benne, and Max Birnbaum.

Reflecting on transferring her social work, community development experiences, and T-group training to the emerging field of OD, Schindler-Rainman observes

... I would say that I began consciously doing OD work when I was the Director of Training and Personnel for the Girl Scouts. ... I did OD-type work with school districts, organizing a coordinating council that made it possible to bring in-service classes from UCLA to teachers from all of those districts.⁵²

Schindler-Rainman goes on to describe her work with the Health Department in Los Angeles, and the Education Extension Department at UCLA where she was at one time assistant director. Along with Charles Ferguson, she later became one of the associate directors of the Department of Conferences at UCLA, headed by Warren Schmidt. She also worked with Robert Tannenbaum, Irv Weschler, Joan Lasko, and

Jerry Reisel. In addition, she worked with Richard Beckhard, who was doing a series of interventions with the California Cancer Society.

Schindler-Rainman's formal link to NTL came with a staff assignment at Bethel about 1966. Ronald Lippitt was the dean. Other staff members included Dorothy Mial, Cyril Mill, and Matthew Miles. Some of the other women with whom Schindler-Rainman worked, in addition to Dorothy Mial, were Edith Seashore, Miriam Ritvo, and Peggy Lippitt. Referring to the women in the field, Schindler-Rainman recounts, "Edie [Edith Seashore] was the person doing more OD interventions than anybody else as far as I know."⁵³ (From AGE OF HERETICS by Art Kleiner. Copyright© 1996 by Art Kleiner. Used by permission of Doubleday, a division of Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.⁵⁴)

Schindler-Rainman worked with a wide range of clients, both in the United States and internationally. A few of her well-known publications are *The Creative Volunteer Community: A Collection of Writings*,⁵⁵ *Building the Collaborative Community*,⁵⁶ *The Volunteer Community*,⁵⁷ and *Team Training for Community Change*.⁵⁸ (The latter three were coauthored with Ronald Lippitt.) Schindler-Rainman's extensive professional training, her collaboration with a number of key men and women in the early days of NTL and the OD movement, and her early and extensive contribution to the community development movement clearly identify her as one of the pioneers in the laboratory training stem of OD.

The Term Organization Development

It is not entirely clear who coined the term *organization development*, but the term likely emerged more or less simultaneously in two or three places through the works of Robert Blake, Herbert Shepard, Jane Mouton, Douglas McGregor, and Richard Beckhard.⁵⁹ The phrase *development group* had been used earlier by Blake and Mouton in connection with human relations training at the University of Texas, and it appeared in their 1956 document distributed for use in the Baton Rouge experiment.⁶⁰ (The same phrase appeared in a Mouton and Blake article first published in the journal *Group Psychotherapy* in 1957.⁶¹) The Baton Rouge T-groups run by Shepard and Blake were called *development groups*,⁶² and this program of T-groups was called "organization development" to distinguish it from the complementary management development programs already underway.⁶³

Referring to his consulting with McGregor at General Mills, Beckhard gives this account of the term emerging there:

At that time we wanted to put a label on the program at General Mills. ... We clearly didn't want to call it management development because it was total organization-wide, nor was it human relations training although there was a component of that in it. We didn't want to call it organization improvement because that's a static term, so we labeled the program "Organization Development," meaning system-wide change effort.⁶⁴

Thus, the term emerged as a way of distinguishing a different mode of working with organizations and as a way of highlighting its developmental, systemwide, dynamic thrust.

The Role of Human Resources Executives

It is of considerable significance that organization development efforts in three of the first corporations to be extensively involved, Union Carbide, Esso, and General Mills,

included human resources people seeing themselves in new roles. At Union Carbide, John Paul Jones, in industrial relations, now saw himself as a behavioral science consultant to other managers.⁶⁵ At Esso, the 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.⁶⁶ At General Mills, the vice president of personnel and industrial relations, Dewey Balsch, saw his role as including leadership in conceptualizing and coordinating changes in the culture of the total organization.⁶⁷ Thus, in the history of OD we see both external consultants and internal staff departments departing from their traditional roles and collaborating in a new approach to organization improvement.

THE SURVEY RESEARCH AND FEEDBACK STEM

Survey research and feedback,⁶⁸ a specialized form of action research (see chapter 7) constitutes the second major stem in the history of organization development. The history of this stem revolves around the techniques and approach developed over a period of years by staff members at the Survey Research Center (SRC) of the University of Michigan.

Rensis Likert

The SRC was founded in 1946 after Rensis Likert, director of the Division of Program Surveys of the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and other key members of the division moved to Michigan. Likert held a Ph.D. in psychology from Columbia, and his dissertation, *A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes*, was the classic study that developed the widely used five-point Likert scale. After completing his degree and teaching at Columbia for awhile, Likert worked for the Life Insurance Agency Management Association. There he conducted research on leadership, motivation, morale, and productivity. He then moved to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, where his Division of Program Surveys furthered a more scientific approach to survey research in its work with various federal departments, including the Office of War Information.⁶⁹ In 1948 after helping to develop and direct the Survey Research Center, Likert became the director of a new Institute for Social Research, which included both the SRC and the Research Center for Group Dynamics. The latter had moved to Michigan from MIT after Lewin's death.

Floyd Mann, Rensis Likert, and Others

Part of the emergence of survey research and feedback was based on refinements made by SRC staff members in survey methodology. Another part was the evolution of feedback methodology. As related by Rensis Likert,

In 1947, I was able to interest the Detroit Edison Company in a company-wide study of employee perceptions, behavior, reactions and attitudes which was conducted in 1948. Floyd Mann, who had joined the SRC staff in 1947, was the study director on the project. I provided general direction. Three persons from D.E.: Blair Swartz, Sylvanus Leahy and Robert Schwab with Mann and me worked on the problem of how the company

could best use the data from the survey to bring improvement in management and performance. This led to the development and use of the survey-feedback method. Floyd particularly played a key role in this development. He found that when the survey data were reported to a manager (or supervisor) and he or she failed to discuss the results with subordinates and failed to plan with them what the manager and others should do to bring improvement, little change occurred. On the other hand, when the manager discussed the results with subordinates and planned with them what to do to bring improvement, substantial favorable changes occurred.⁷⁰

Another aspect of the Detroit Edison study was the process of feeding back data from an attitude survey to the participating departments in what Mann calls an "interlocking chain of conferences."⁷¹ Additional insights are provided by Baumgartel, who participated in the project and who drew the following conclusions from the Detroit Edison study:

The results of this experimental study lend support to the idea that an intensive, group discussion procedure for utilizing the results of an employee questionnaire survey can be an effective tool for introducing positive change in a business organization. It may be that the effectiveness of this method, in comparison to traditional training courses, is that it deals with the system of human relationships as a whole (superior and subordinate can change together) and it deals with each manager, supervisor, and employee in the context of his own job, his own problems, and his own work relationships.⁷²

Links between the Laboratory Training Stem and the Survey Feedback Stem

As early as 1940, links occurred between people who were later to be key figures in the laboratory training stem of OD and people who were to be key figures in the survey feedback stem. These links, which continued over the years, were undoubtedly of significance in the evolution of both stems. Of particular interest are the links between Likert and Lewin and between Likert and key figures in the laboratory training stem of OD. As Likert states, "I met Lewin at the APA annual meeting at State College, Pa., I believe in 1940. When he came to Washington during the war, I saw him several times and got to know him and his family quite well."⁷³ In 1944 Likert arranged a dinner at which Douglas McGregor and Kurt Lewin explored the feasibility of a group dynamics center at MIT.⁷⁴

Likert further refers to McGregor: "I met McGregor during the war and came to know him very well after Lewin had set up the RCGD at MIT. After the war, Doug became very interested in the research on leadership and organizations that we were doing in the Institute for Social Research. He visited us frequently and I saw him often at Antioch and at MIT after he returned." Likert goes on to refer to the first NTL lab for managers held at Arden House in 1956: "Douglas McGregor and I helped Lee Bradford launch it. . . . Staff members in the 1956 lab were: Beckhard, Benne, Bradford, Gordon Lippitt, Malott, Shepard and I. Argyris, Blake, and McGregor joined the staff for the 1957 Arden House lab."⁷⁵

Argyris refers to Likert:

Rensis Likert was also a leader in the field when I was a graduate student, and I had the highest respect for him and his commitment to trying to connect theory with practice.

Indeed, I've always been a bit sad to see how many of his colleagues, who saw themselves as more researchers, at times would downplay Rensis' commitment to practice. They saw him as being too . . . committed to the world of practice. I never felt that. I felt that it was the combination of practice and theory that made him an important member of our community. I would put Lewin first on that dimension, and Ren Likert and Doug McGregor next, each in his own way making important contributions.⁷⁶

Links between group dynamics and survey feedback people were extensive, of course, after the RCGD moved to Michigan with the encouragement of Rensis Likert and members of the SRC. Among the top people in the RCGD who moved to Michigan were Leon Festinger, Dorwin Cartwright, Ronald Lippitt, and John R. P. French, Jr. Cartwright, selected by the group to be the director of the RCGD, was particularly knowledgeable about survey research, since he had been on the staff of the Division of Program Surveys with Rensis Likert and others during World War II.⁷⁷

THE ACTION RESEARCH STEM

In earlier chapters we briefly described action research as a collaborative, client-consultant inquiry. Chapter 7 describes four versions of action research, one of which, participant action research, is used with the most frequency in OD. The laboratory training stem in the history of OD has a heavy component of action research; the survey feedback stem is the history of a specialized form of action research; and Tavistock projects have had a strong action research thrust, as we will discuss shortly.

Because we will treat the history of action research in some detail later, we will mention only a few aspects here. For example, William F. Whyte and Edith L. Hamilton used action research in their work with Chicago's Tremont Hotel in 1945 and 1946; John Collier, commissioner of Indian Affairs, described action research in a 1945 publication; Kurt Lewin and his students conducted numerous action research projects in the mid-1940s and early 1950s. The work of these and other scholars and practitioners in inventing and utilizing action research was basic in the evolution of OD.

THE SOCIOTECHNICAL AND SOCIOCLINICAL STEM

A fourth stem in the history of OD is the evolution of socioclinical and sociotechnical approaches to helping groups and organizations. Parallel to the work of the RCGD, the SRC, and NTL was the work of the Tavistock Clinic in England. The clinic was founded in 1920 as an outpatient facility to provide psychotherapy based on psychoanalytic theory and insights from the treatment of battle neurosis in World War I. A group focus emerged early in the work of Tavistock in the context of family therapy in which the child and the parent received treatment simultaneously.⁷⁸ (See the reference earlier in this chapter to John Bowlby's influence on Robert Blake and, in turn, the emergence of the concept of "organization development.") The action research mode also emerged at Tavistock in attempts to give practical help to families, organizations, and communities.

W. R. Bion, John Rickman, and Others

The professional staff of the Tavistock Clinic was extensively influenced by such innovations as World War II applications of social psychology to psychiatry, the work of W. R. Bion and John Rickman and others in group therapy, Lewin's notions about the "social field" in which a problem was occurring, and Lewin's theory and experience with action research. Bion, Rickman, and others had been involved with the six-week "Northfield Experiment" at a military hospital near Birmingham during World War II. In this experiment each soldier was required to join a group that performed some task such as handicraft or map reading as well as discussed feelings, interpersonal relations, and administrative and managerial problems. Insights from this experiment carried over into Bion's theory of group behavior.⁷⁹

Eric Trist

A clear historical and conceptual connection can be made between the group dynamics field and the sociotechnical approaches to assisting organizations. Tavistock's sociotechnical approach is particularly significant in that it grew out of Eric Trist's 1947 visit to a British coal mine at Haighmoor; his insights as to the relevance of Lewin's work on group dynamics and Bion's work on leaderless groups resulted in a new approach to solving mine problems.⁸⁰ Trist was also influenced by the systems concepts of Von Bertalanffy and Andras Angyal.⁸¹

At Haighmoor, Trist observed miners working in teams—teams that the miners themselves had organized—which was in stark contrast to the typical assembly-line structure in the mines of that day. According to Kleiner, each team ran the job and sold the coal, and would take care of team member's families in the case of an accident. Each miner might handle several different jobs, and team members were compensated on the basis of the team tonnage produced. The results of the team approach were remarkable in terms of safety and productivity.⁸²

Trist's subsequent experiments in work design and the use of semiautonomous work teams in coal mining were the forerunners of other work redesign experiments in various industries in Europe, India, Australia, and the United States. In these experiments, terms such as *industrial democracy*, *open systems*, and *sociotechnical systems* were used by Trist and his colleagues, including Fred Emery.⁸³ (Emery's extensive collaboration with Eric Trist includes the development of "Search Conferences," to be discussed later.)

Tavistock-U.S. Links

Tavistock leaders, including Trist and Bion, had frequent contact with Kurt Lewin, Rensis Likert, Chris Argyris, and others in the United States. One product of this collaboration was the decision to publish the journal *Human Relations* as a joint publication between Tavistock and MIT's Research Center for Group Dynamics.⁸⁴ Some Americans prominent in the emergence and evolution of the OD field, for example, Robert Blake, as we noted earlier, and Warren Bennis,⁸⁵ studied at Tavistock. Chris Argyris held several seminars with Tavistock leaders in 1954.⁸⁶

The sociotechnical approach focused on the nonexecutive ranks of organizations and especially the redesign of work. The focus on teams and the use of action research and participation was consistent with evolving OD approaches. Some contemporary quality of work life (QWL) and some total quality management (TQM) programs are amalgamations of OD, sociotechnical, and other approaches.

THE CHANGING CONTEXT

Even though it is important to understand how OD emerged, it is also important to understand the changing milieu in which contemporary OD activities are occurring. That context has changed dramatically throughout the 1980s and 1990s. As authors are prone to say, the environment has become increasingly "turbulent." In the United States, the pace of technological innovation, company mergers, acquisitions, leveraged buyouts, bankruptcies, success stories, downsizings, and changes in law has intensified. At the same time, thousands of small companies are born each year. Globalization of companies is commonplace. Worldwide, many previously centralized and autocratic societies are moving toward creating democratic institutions and privatizing business and industry. These changes create opportunities for OD applications, but also stretch the capabilities of leaders and OD practitioners to the utmost.

In this context what might be called *second-generation OD* is evolving. Practitioners still rely on the first-generation techniques of OD that are highly relevant to adaptive, incremental change, such as action research, a focus on teams, team building, the use of facilitators, process consultation, survey feedback, intergroup problem solving, sociotechnical systems approaches to job design, and participative management. Indeed, theory building and/or research as well as application relative to all of these OD basics is growing. But the field is reaching far beyond these first-generation approaches in the sense that many applications of OD are now more complicated and more multifaceted.

SECOND-GENERATION OD

Practitioners and researchers are giving considerable attention to emerging concepts, interventions, and areas of application that might be called second-generation OD. Each, to some extent, overlaps with some or all of the others. Second-generation OD, in particular, has a focus on organizational transformation.

Interest in Organizational Transformation

More and more, practitioners and scholars are talking and writing about "organizational transformation." Amir Levy and Uri Merry give one of the most complete explorations of this topic in their book, *Organizational Transformation*. They define the term as follows: "Second-order change (organization transformation) is a multi-dimensional, multi-level, qualitative, discontinuous, radical organizational change involving a paradigmatic shift."⁸⁷

Increasingly, OD professionals distinguish between the more modest, or evolutionary, efforts toward organization improvement and those that are massive and, in a sense, revolutionary. For example, Nadler and Tushman refer to "transitions" on the one hand, and "frame bending" on the other.⁸⁸ Goodstein and Burke contrast "fine tuning" and "fundamental, large-scale change in the organization's strategy and culture."⁸⁹ Barczak, Smith, and Wilemon differentiate "adaptive, incremental change" from "large-scale change."⁹⁰ Beckhard and Pritchard contrast "incremental" change strategies and "fundamental" change strategies.⁹¹ Organizational transformation is seen as requiring more demands on top leadership, more visioning, more experimenting, more time, and the simultaneous management of many additional variables.

Interest in Organizational Culture

Efforts to define, measure, and change organizational culture have become more sophisticated. Schein in particular has written extensively about culture.⁹² He has devised interventions to help leaders and employees identify those cultural assumptions that will assist the organization in attaining its goals and those that hinder goal attainment. Making such distinctions is done through a joint exploration to identify sequentially the organization's *artifacts*, such as office layout and status symbols; the *values* underlying these artifacts; and the *assumptions* behind those values.⁹³ Others have helped organizations focus on culture through the use of questionnaires aimed at identifying actual and desired norms. Participants then make agreements about new norms and how to monitor and reinforce the changes.⁹⁴ (For greater detail, see chapter 11.)

Interest in the Learning Organization

The works of Argyris,⁹⁵ Argyris and Schon,⁹⁶ and Senge have stimulated considerable interest in the conditions under which individuals, teams, and organizations learn. Argyris, for example, has focused on the defensive routines of organizational members, or "master programs in their heads that tell them how to deal with embarrassment and threat." Basically, according to Argyris, individuals tend to follow these rules:

1. Bypass embarrassment and threat whenever possible.
2. Act as though you are not bypassing them.
3. Don't discuss steps 1 and 2 while they are happening.
4. Don't discuss the undiscussability of the undiscussable.⁹⁷

Workshops with top management teams are designed to tackle simultaneously major tasks such as strategy formulation plus learning how to recognize defensive routines that hinder improvements in communications and the quality of team decision making.⁹⁸

Senge writes extensively about the importance of systems thinking ("the fifth discipline") in organizations, and about the learning disabilities that plague organizations. One learning disability, for example, is focusing on one's own job exclusively with little sense of responsibility for the collective product. Another is blaming the "enemy out there" for things that are wrong, whether it's another department in the same organization or a competitor overseas.⁹⁹ Senge is noted for workshops in which he uses games and exercises to create an awareness of these disabilities and to develop different ways of thinking about complex problems.¹⁰⁰

Intensified Interest in Teams

A focus on intact work teams and other team configurations has been central to OD since the emergence of the field, but recent years have seen a widening and deepening interest in teams, especially what are called high-performance teams, cross-functional teams, and self-managed teams. Interest has intensified particularly in self-managed or self-directed teams. This interest has accelerated due to converging pressures on organizations to improve quality, to become more flexible, to reduce layers of management, and to enhance employee morale.¹⁰¹

Laboratory training methods have proved highly useful in training team members in effective membership and leadership behaviors, and in training supervisors and managers in the arts of delegation and empowerment. Furthermore, many organizations use team-building approaches to help self-managed teams and cross-functional teams get started. In addition, as self-managed teams have assumed many functions previously performed by management, supervisors and middle managers have used team-building approaches within their own ranks to help reconceptualize their own roles.

Interest in Total Quality Management (TQM)

The past decade has seen a mushrooming of interest in total quality management worldwide, and then perhaps some decline in application as both successes and failures have been reported. Applications that have been successful appear to have some ingredients in common with OD efforts.

Ciampa, who acknowledges the pioneering contributions of Joseph Juran, W. Edwards Deming, and Armand Feigenbaum to the development of TQM,¹⁰² provides a clear statement on the relationship between TQM and OD. First, his definition: "Total Quality is typically a companywide effort seeking to install and make permanent a climate where employees continuously improve their ability to provide on demand products and services that customers will find of particular value."¹⁰³ He then goes on to say that one element that separates successful TQ efforts from less successful ones is

... a particular set of values about the individual and the individual's role in the organization. TQ efforts in these companies encourage true employee involvement, demand teamwork, seek to push decision-making power to lower levels in the company, and reduce barriers between people. ... These values are at the core of Organization Development (OD), as well."¹⁰⁴

Burke also comments on the contribution OD can make to TQM efforts. Focusing on the OD practitioner, he states: "... the quality movement, to be successful, is highly dependent on effective process—and process is the OD practitioner's most important product."¹⁰⁵ (For more on OD and TQM, see chapter 12.)

Interest in Visioning and Future Search

Interventions designed to help organizational members look to the future—visioning—are not new to OD, but renewed interest has developed in using interventions to look at trends projected into the future and their organizational implications. Marvin Weisbord, for example, has built on the work and experience of Ronald Lippitt and Edward Lindaman,¹⁰⁶ Ronald Fox, Ronald Lippitt, and Eva Schindler-Rainman,¹⁰⁷ and

Eric Trist and Fred Emery¹⁰⁸ to develop "future search conferences." In a two- or three-day conference, participants are asked to "(a) build a data base, (b) look at it together, (c) interpret what they find, and (d) draw conclusions for action."¹⁰⁹ This last part of the conference asks participants to develop next action steps and a structure for carrying them out, including task forces and specific assignments.¹¹⁰

Senge believes that "the origin of the vision is much less important than the process whereby it comes to be shared." He strongly urges that "shared visions" be based on encouraging organizational members to develop and share their own personal visions, and he claims that a vision is not truly shared "until it connects with the personal visions of people throughout the organization."¹¹¹ This type of connection obviously requires OD-like processes to implement.

Rediscovering Large Meetings and Getting the "Whole System" in the Room

As described earlier, one contributing factor in the emergence of the OD movement was the experience of people such as Leland Bradford, Ronald Lippitt, and Richard Beckhard in improving the effectiveness of large meetings. Early on, Beckhard wrote an article entitled "The Confrontation Meeting," which was really about getting the total management group of an organization together in a one-day session to diagnose the state of the system and to make plans for quickly improving conditions.¹¹² In recent years, Marvin Weisbord and others have written about the importance of OD consultants "getting the whole system in the room." For example, with reference to future search conferences, he advises that such conferences involve all of top management and "people from as many functions and levels as feasible." Again, the final products are action plans and specific assignments to carry the process forward.¹¹³

Other Directions and Areas of Interest

Several other areas are notable in second-generation OD. Assistance in developing diversity awareness workshops and in "managing" and "valuing" diversity has been much in evidence recently. Expanded interest in sociotechnical systems design, interrelated with interest in self-managed teams and in total quality management, has been apparent. OD applications to quality of work life (QWL) programs have continued but are less evident because of the heightened attention to TQM. Partially as a result of a focus on teams and teamwork, a great deal of attention has been directed toward developing congruent reward systems, including productivity gainsharing plans and skills-based pay plans. Research and conceptualizing about action research, process consultation, and third-party roles have continued and perhaps increased. There is renewed interest in the concept of community as well as spirituality relative to organizational transformation and high-performance organizations. Considerable work has been done with "appreciative inquiry" workshops. (In these sessions, participants focus on the best of "what is" and use these themes as a springboard for focusing on "what might be."¹¹⁴) Interest in physical settings continues among OD practitioners.

Widespread business and media interest in *reengineering*—called by various names such as *business process reengineering* and *core process redesign*¹¹⁵—has caught the attention of OD practitioners and theorists. OD processes and values appear *not* to underly most reengineering efforts, and the almost-stamped by business and industry

to embrace reengineering raises a number of issues pertaining to the role that OD practitioners should or should not play relative to this phenomenon. (See chapter 12.)

All these areas are fruitful areas for OD theory, research, and practice. However, with the diffusion of OD techniques into so many areas, identifying what is and what is not OD becomes more difficult. Thus, the importance of examining the assumptions and the processes underlying various improvement efforts cannot be overstated—not because OD or the term “OD” is inherently sacred—because the fundamental building blocks of OD as defined in this book are vital ingredients, we believe, to long-term organizational effectiveness and to participant satisfaction and development.

EXTENT OF APPLICATION

Applications emerging from one or more of the stems described previously are evident in contemporary organization development efforts occurring in many countries, including England, Japan, Norway, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Canada, Sweden, Germany, Finland, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Mexico, France, Venezuela, and the Netherlands, as well as in the United States. Among the large number of organizations in America that have at one time or another embarked on organization development efforts are Union Carbide and Exxon (the first two companies), Connecticut General Insurance Company, Hewlett-Packard, Tektronix, Graphic Controls, Equitable Life Assurance Company, Digital Equipment Corporation, Procter & Gamble, Microelectronics and Computer Technology Corporation (MCC), Mountain Bell Telephone, Searle Laboratories, the Boeing Company, Bankers Trust, Ford Motor Company, Heinz Foods, Polaroid, Sun Oil, and TRW Inc.

Applications have varied, with the total organization involved in many instances, but with only some divisions or plants in others. Further, some efforts have moved ahead rapidly, only to flounder at a later time. In many situations, OD approaches have become an ongoing way of managing with little program visibility and under different terminology. Thus, the extent of application is sometimes difficult to report with any precision.

Applications at TRW Space & Electronics Group (S&EG) were of major significance in the emergence and history of OD. Among the key figures in the beginnings of OD there in the early 1960s (then called TRW Systems Group) were Jim Dunlap, director of industrial relations; Shel Davis, who was later promoted to that position; Ruben Mettler, president; and Herb Shepard. T-group labs conducted by internal trainers, NTL, and UCLA staff members were also important in providing impetus to the effort in its early phases. Early applications of OD at TRW Systems included team building, intergroup team building, interface laboratories between departments and between company and customers, laboratory training, career assessment workshops, and organization redesign and structuring for improved productivity and quality of working life.¹¹⁶ (For more on the life of Shel Davis and his contribution to the OD field, see the essay by Celeste A. Coruzzi. In that essay, Warner Burke refers to him as “the pioneer internal OD consultant.”¹¹⁷)

After successful applications in the 1960s, OD activities at TRW declined during the 1970s and 1980s. However, according to Michael Thiel, director of leadership and organization effectiveness at S&EG, “radical structural change within the defense in-

dustry has forced TRW (and other defense contractors) to critically examine and shift basic operating paradigms.”¹¹⁸ Thiel goes on to say:

This has led to the rebirth of “OD-like” activities as part of cultural change and organization transformation efforts. Since 1989, S&EG has been actively pursuing the creation/implementation of a total quality culture, incorporating continuous process improvement, employee empowerment, performance management, and the use of concurrent engineering/integrated product development with cross-functional teams. OD methodologies such as organizational diagnosis, values clarification, offsite meetings, sensing, etc. have been used where appropriate in these activities. Other tools include team facilitation, team-based experimental education and survey/feedback systems.

Most of these “organization effectiveness” interventions are spearheaded by the Human Resources organization, either HR generalists, or specialists from my office. In addition, there are a number of line/technical managers involved in various facets (specifically team facilitation/process improvement, and self-managed work teams).¹¹⁹

Business and industrial organizations are by no means the only kinds of institutions involved. Applications can be made, for example, in public school systems; colleges; medical schools; social welfare agencies; police departments; professional associations; governmental units at the local, county, state, and national levels; the White House;¹²⁰ various health care delivery systems; churches; Native American tribes; and the U.S. military.

The history of OD in the U.S. military is beyond the scope of this book, but OD activities in the military services have been extensive. For example, at one time, the Army ran an Organizational Effectiveness Center at Fort Ord, California, and graduated some 1,702 officers as internal consultants between 1975 and 1985.¹²¹ In 1977, the Navy was utilizing 300 full-time OD specialists.¹²² Further, during that period, the Naval Postgraduate School offered a masters degree in human resources management, which was essentially a masters degree in OD. Students in that program included active duty officers from the Air Force, Coast Guard, and Army in addition to Navy officers.¹²³

Some community development strategies share a number of elements in common with organization development, such as the use of action research, the use of a change agent, and an emphasis on facilitating decision-making and problem-solving processes.¹²⁴ Undoubtedly, some of the commonality stems from OD practitioners working in the community development field. For example, in 1961 Herbert Shepard conducted community development laboratories at China Lake, California, sponsored by the Naval Ordnance Test Station. These one-week labs involved military persons and civilians of all ages and socioeconomic levels. Outcomes included the resolution of some community and intercommunity issues.¹²⁵ In later years, such conferences have been called *search conferences* or *future search conferences*.

In addition to emphasizing the diversity of systems using OD consultants, we want to emphasize that intraorganization development efforts have not focused on just top management teams, although the importance of top management involvement will be discussed in later chapters. The range of occupational roles that have been involved in OD is almost limitless and has included production workers,¹²⁶ managers, soldiers, military officers, miners, scientists and engineers, ministers, psychologists, geologists, lawyers, accountants, nurses, physicians, teachers, computer specialists, foresters, technicians, secretaries, clerical employees, board members, and flight crews.

The emergence and growth of the OD Network indicates the widespread application of organization development concepts. The OD Network began in 1964 and by 1998 had a membership of about 34,000 and 46 regional networks. Most members either have major roles in the OD efforts of organizations or are scholar-practitioners in the OD field. Although most Network members reside in the United States, in 1998 the Network included 184 international members, the majority from Canada. Thirty-one countries were represented in addition to the United States.

The OD Network began with discussions at the Case Institute of Technology between Herbert Shepard, Sheldon Davis of TRW Systems, and Floyd Mann of the University of Michigan,¹²⁷ and through the initiative of Leland Bradford and Jerry Harvey of NTL and a number of industrial people who had attended labs at Bethel. Among the industrial founders of the organization, originally called the Industrial Trainers Network, were Sheldon Davis of TRW Systems, George Murray of Union Carbide, John Vail of Dow Chemical, and Carl Albers of the Hotel Corporation of America. Other early members were from Procter & Gamble, Weyerhaeuser, Bankers Trust, West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company, the U.S. State Department, the U.S. National Security Agency, Pillsbury, Eli Lilly, Polaroid, Esso, Parker Pen, American Airlines, Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, RCA, Sandia, National Association of Manufacturers, General Foods, Armour & Company, Heublein, and Du Pont. Jerry Harvey was the first secretary/coordinator of the emerging organization, and Warner Burke assumed that role in 1967 shortly after joining NTL full-time. At that time the Network had fewer than 50 members; when Warner Burke stepped aside as executive director in 1975, it had approximately 1,400 members.¹²⁸ That same year the OD Network became independent of NTL.

The Academy of Management, whose members are mostly professors in management and related areas, established a Division of Organization Development within its structure in 1971. This unit, renamed The Division of Organization Development and Change, had 1,601 members by 1998. The OD Forum of the American Society for Training and Development had 11,374 members at the beginning of that year. The Society of Industrial-Organizational Psychology of the American Psychological Association has held workshops on organization development at the annual APA conventions; several annual conventions going back at least to 1965 have included papers or symposia on organization development or related topics.¹²⁹ In 1974 the *Annual Review of Psychology* for the first time devoted a chapter entirely to a review of research on organization development.¹³⁰ Chapters on OD have appeared at other times, for example, 1977,¹³¹ 1982, 1987,¹³² and 1991.¹³³ The 1982 chapter was written by authors from the Netherlands and France, indicative of OD's international applications.¹³⁴

The first doctoral program devoted to training OD specialists was founded by Herbert Shepard in 1960 at the Case Institute of Technology. Originally called The Organizational Behavior Group, this program is now part of the Department of Organizational Behavior, School of Management, Case Western Reserve University. UCLA also has a program at the doctoral level. Pepperdine offers a Doctor of Education in Organization Change (EdDOC), and Benedictine University offers a Ph.D. in Organization Development.

Masters degree programs in organization development or masters programs with concentrations in OD have been offered in recent years by several universities, includ-

ing New York University, Brigham Young, Pepperdine, Loyola, Bowling Green, New Hampshire, Central Washington University, Columbia, Case Western Reserve, Antioch, University of South Florida, University of San Francisco, Sonoma State University, California School of Professional Psychology, Fielding Institute, Eastern Michigan University, and Sheffield Polytechnic in England. The American University and NTL Institute jointly offer a masters of science in organization development. The John F. Kennedy University and NTL cosponsor a masters program that has organization development and change as a major component. Many other major U.S. universities, if not most, now have graduate courses concentrating on organization development, including UCLA, Stanford, Harvard, University of Washington, University of Southern California, Hawaii, Oklahoma, Colorado, Indiana, and Purdue. In England, such courses are found at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology and the University of Bath.¹³⁵

This rapid growth in OD interest and attention has been given impetus by special programs in OD, particularly NTL Institute's Program for Specialists in OD (PSOD), now called Integrating OD Theory and Practice. Other NTL OD programs include such offerings as What is OD?, Facilitating and Managing Complex Systems Change, Consultation Skills, Diversity and OD, Group Process Consultation, Team Building, Managing Conflict, and Creating and Sustaining High-Performing Teams. Another strong source of OD education and training is Teachers College at Columbia University. As part of its organizational psychology program, Columbia offers both a two-part Principles of Organization Development Program and a three-part Advanced Program in Organization Development and Human Resources Management. Another organization, the Organization Development Institute, offers numerous workshops, and sponsors an Organization Development World Congress held in a different country each year. Other professional programs in OD have been or are now being offered in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere under the sponsorship of universities, foundations, professional associations, and other institutions.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Organization development emerged largely from applied behavioral sciences and has four major stems: (1) the invention of the T-group and innovations in the application of laboratory training insights to complex organizations, (2) the invention of survey feedback technology, (3) the emergence of action research, and (4) the evolution of the Tavistock sociotechnical and socioclinical approaches.

Key figures in this early history interacted with each other across these stems and were influenced by concepts and experiences from a wide variety of disciplines and settings. These disciplines included social psychology, clinical psychology, family group therapy, ethnography, military psychology and psychiatry, the theater, general semantics, social work, systems theory, mathematics and physics, philosophy, psychodrama, client-centered therapy, survey methodology, experimental and action research, human resources management, organizational behavior, general management theory, and large conference management.

The context for applying OD approaches has changed to an increasingly turbulent environment. While practitioners still rely on OD basics, they are giving considerable attention to new concepts, interventions, and areas of application. Among the directions of interest in second-generation OD are organizational transformation, organizational culture, the learning organization, high-performance teams, total quality management, "getting the whole system in the room," future search, and the role OD practitioners should play in reengineering.

The field of OD is emergent in that a rapidly increasing number of behavioral scientists and practitioners are building on the research and insights of the past as well as rediscovering the utility of some of the earlier insights. These efforts, often under different terminology, are now expanding and include a wide range of organizations, types of institutions, occupational categories, and geographical locations.

In the chapters that follow, the assumptions, theory, and techniques of organization development, as well as problems with implementing OD processes, will be examined in considerable depth. We will also speculate on the future viability of OD or OD-like processes.

Notes

1. The phrase *group dynamics* was coined by Kurt Lewin in 1939. See Warrent Bennis, address to the Academy of Management, San Diego, California, August 3, 1981.
2. This and the next paragraph are based on Kenneth D. Benne, Leland P. Bradford, Jack R. Gibb, and Ronald O. Lippitt, eds., *The Laboratory Method for Changing and Learning: Theory and Application* (Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1975), pp. 1-6; and Alfred J. Marrow, *The Practical Theorist: The Life and Work of Kurt Lewin* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), pp. 210-214. For additional history, see Leland P. Bradford, "Biography of an Institution," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 3 (April-June 1967), pp. 127-143; and Alvin Zander, "The Study of Group Behavior During Four Decades," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 15 (July-September 1979), pp. 272-282. We are indebted to Ronald Lippitt for his correspondence, which helped to clarify this and the following paragraph.
3. Jerrold I. Hirsch, *The History of the National Training Laboratories 1947-1986* (New York: Peter Lang publishing, 1987), pp. 17-18; and address by Ronald Lippitt, Academy of Management annual conference, Chicago, Illinois, August 1986. For more on Bradford, see David L. Bradford, "A Biography of Leland P. Bradford," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 26, no. 1 (1990), viii.
4. See also Nancie Coan, "A History of NTL Institute in Bethel," *NTL Institute News & Views* (February 1991), pp. 11-15.
5. Peter B. Smith, ed., *Small Groups and Personal Change* (London: Methuen & Co. 1980), pp. 8-9.
6. Robert Chin and Kenneth D. Benne, "General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems," in Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, eds., *The Planning of Change*, 2d ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehardt and Winston, 1969), pp. 100-102.
7. Correspondence with Kenneth Benne. Raup was Benne's Ph.D. major professor at Columbia. Benne states that he was also influenced by Edward Lindeman. For more on Benne, see Paul Nash, "Biography of Kenneth D. Benne," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28 (June 1992), p. 167.
8. Chin and Benne, op cit., p. 102.
9. Correspondence with Ronald Lippitt.
10. Conversation with Lee Bradford, conference on current theory and practice in organization development, San Francisco, March 16, 1978.
11. See, for example, S. R. Slavson, *An Introduction to Group Therapy* (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1943); and S. R. Slavson, *Creative Group Education* (New York: Association press, 1937), especially chapter 1.
12. Edgar H. Schein and Warren G. Bennis, *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965), p. 35.
13. Art Kleiner, *The Age of Heretics* (New York: Currency and Doubleday, 1996), pp. 41-42.
14. Based largely on correspondence with Ronald Lippitt. According to Lippitt, as early as 1945 Bradford and Lippitt were conducting "three-level training" at Freedman's Hospital in Washington, D.C., in an effort "to induce interdependent changes in all parts of the same system." Lippitt also reports that Leland Bradford very early was acting on a basic concept of "multiple entry," that is, simultaneously training and working with several groups in the organization.
15. Correspondence with Robert Tannenbaum.
16. Tannenbaum correspondence; memorandum of May 12, 1952, U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station from E. R. Toporeck to "Office, Division and Branch Heads, Test Department," and "Minutes, Test Department Management Seminar, 5 March 1953."
17. Robert Tannenbaum, Verne Kallejian, and Irving R. Weschler, "Training Managers for Leadership," *Personnel*, 30 (January 1954), p. 3.
18. Verne J. Kallejian, Irving R. Weschler, and Robert Tannenbaum, "Managers in Transition," *Harvard Business Review*, 33 (July-August 1955), pp. 55-64.
19. Tannenbaum correspondence.
20. Ibid.
21. Correspondence with Chris Argyris; and Chris Argyris, *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness* (Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1962).
22. Argyris correspondence.
23. Chris Argyris, *Intervention Theory and Method* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1970).
24. Argyris correspondence.
25. Donald D. Bowen, "Competence and Justice: A Conversation with Chris Argyris," p. 4.2 of a manuscript accepted for publication in the 1988 *OD Annual*.
26. Argyris correspondence.
27. Ibid. Argyris's Ph.D. in organizational behavior may have been the first ever awarded.
28. Argyris correspondence.
29. See Richard Beckhard, W. Warner Burke, and Fred I. Steele, "The Program for Specialists in Organization Training and Development," p. ii, mimeographed paper (NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, December 1967); and John Paul Jones, "What's Wrong with Work?" in *What's Wrong with Work?* (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1967), p. 8. According to correspondence with Rensis Likert, the link between McGregor and John Paul Jones occurred in the summer of 1957. Discussion took place between the two when Jones attended one of the annual two-week seminars at Aspen, Colorado, organized by Hollis Peter of the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior and conducted by Douglas McGregor, Mason Haire, and Rensis Likert.
30. Gilbert Burck, "Union Carbide's Patient Schemers," *Fortune*, 72 (December 1965), pp. 147-149. For McGregor's account, see "Team Building at Union Carbide," in Douglas McGregor, *The Professional Manager* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), pp. 106-110.