

AD-779 565

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN
PRACTICE

Robert E. Pownall

Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania

12 November 1973

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield Va. 22151

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
(1950)

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the Department of Defense.

OPERATIONAL CONCEPTS OF THE FUTURE

by

Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Tomlin
Military Intelligence

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

Lieutenant Colonel
Military Intelligence, Fort Belvoir
Denver, Colorado

ib

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Robert E. Pownall, LTC, MI
TITLE: Organizational Development In Practice
FORMAT: Essay
DATE: 12 November 1973
PAGES: 17

Organizational development is an effort planned, organization-wide, and managed from the top to increase organizational effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organization's "processes" using behavioral-science knowledge. It is an effective way to cope with the rapidly changing environment facing both the industrial and military community today. By use of a brief historical development of management theory coupled with the need for adapting to change and the knowledge based on five years of Organizational Development practice, an approach to determining whether Organizational Development can be used in the military is supplied. The author's conclusion is that Organizational Development can and should be adopted within the military establishment. Some specific suggestions are made regarding conditions to look for which favor a successful OD experience and some conditions which will lead to failure.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I	Suggested Reading List	p. 25
Appendix II	Conceptual Basis	p. 26
Appendix III	Team Building Agenda	p. 29
Appendix IV	Team Interrelationship Diagrams	p. 30
Appendix V	"Code of Conduct"	p. 31
Appendix VI	Some Assumptions About The Nature And Function of Organizations	p. 33

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN PRACTICE

INTRODUCTION

What is Organizational Development? How has it been applied in industry? Where and how might it be applied within the military establishment? Before these questions may be answered it is necessary to review briefly the recent history of management theory, and provide a definition of what Organizational Development (OD) constitutes within the framework of this essay. A brief discussion of the causes for the adoption of OD by industry will be provided together with their implications for the military environment. A review of the specific application of OD to an industrial situation with emphasis on the author's involvement during the past five years in applying some OD concepts in a manufacturing facility of a major consumer goods company will be provided. Suggestions will be made as to why the military establishment should consider utilizing OD; where it might be applied initially; and what is required to be successful.

MANAGEMENT THEORY DEVELOPMENT

Since the early nineteenth hundreds the emphasis in management theory has been on means to improve "motivation" and "productivity". Frederick W. Taylor is general considered the father of scientific management. He, together with other writers such as Frank and Lillian Gilbreth and Henry L. Gantt, stressed a rational approach to attaining improved productivity. The analytical approach applied to each job, and the subsequent stratification of jobs into small highly repetitive elements, made a ma-

for contribution to industrial productivity increases. It also created a number of problems in terms of human relations. It was an effective but unfeeling methodology.

Following World War II the management theme became one of "human relations". This was however mostly concerned with motivation based upon increased pay and benefits. This approach did not meet with the success expected. In the mid and late 1950's there became an increasing interest in the theory related to man's social needs and how meeting them might lead to improved productivity and motivation. Two of the key contributors to these theories were Chris Argyris¹ and A. H. Maslow². Argyris argued that the properties of formal organizations and the needs of the individual worker are incongruent with each other. He felt there was a strong barrier between the "scientific management" approach and the needs of the individual. He based part of his work on Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" concept. As a result, he viewed the individual's needs changing from basic food, clothing, and shelter, on through a hierarchy of love and affection, self-esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization.

Traditional organizations tend to frustrate the individual's goals of personal growth and independence by tight reliance on control, productivity, and systematized authority relationships. The workers response to these frustrations is seen more often today in situations such as the strikes and disruptions at the General Motors Lordstown Plant and at various other automobile manufacturing plants.

While Argyris sees the basic problem for managers as one of reducing the degree of dependency, submission, and frustration ex-

perenced by employees by offering job-enlargement and employee centered leadership, Douglas M. McGregor³ presented a different approach in 1960. In his book The Human Side of Enterprise emphasis is placed on his belief that management has created the incongruities between organizational and employee goals because it has made erroneous assumptions regarding the kinds of employee motivations that exist. He generalized a new set of assumptions which reflect a changing value base. His "Theory Y" assumptions are one of the key elements in developing the organizational-employee relationship needed to cope with the new environment of the 1970's. Theory Y is a process of creating opportunities, releasing potential, removing obstacles, encouraging growth, and providing guidance.

There have been several other authors whose contributions to the re-thinking of the role, values, and needs of individuals and organizations have contributed to the growth and development of what I consider OD. Appendix I provides a suggested reading list together with a list of some films available on the subject of OD and the concepts of several key authors in this field.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DEFINED

As the concepts and theories relating to individual and organizational growth, motivation, and productivity proliferated in the late 1950's and early 1960's, the term "Organizational Development" came to mean different things to different people. It was used in the context of many different activities such as: (1) the simple growth of an organization from conception to maturity; (2) training experiences ranging from "management development" through

"sensitivity training"; (3) systems development and research; and (4) the consideration of human resources in an organization plus the non-human resources.⁴

OD, as used in this essay is best described as follows:

"Organizational Development, or OD as it is sometimes called, is a reorientation of man's thinking and behavior toward his work organizations. It applies the scientific method and its underlying values of open investigation and experimentation to individual and group behaviors as they are directed toward the solution of work problems. It views both man and change optimistically. It applies a humanistic value system to work behaviors. It assumes people have the capability and motivation to grow through learning how to improve their own work climate, work processes, and their resulting products. It accepts as inevitable the conflicts among the needs of the individuals, work groups, and the organization, but advocates openly confronting these conflicts using problem solving strategies. Its goals are to maximize the utilization of organization resources in solving work problems through the optimum use of human potential. Lyman K. Randall, reprinted by permission of the author." 5

"Organization development is an effort (1) planned, (2) organization-wide, and (3) managed from the top to (4) increase organizational effectiveness and health through (5) planned interventions in the organization's "processes" using behavioral-science knowledge." 6

THE NEED FOR ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

There are two basic reasons for utilizing OD today. The emphasis on management development and changes in managerial style are often frustrated by the organization. A 9,9 style manager won't last long in a 9,1 style environment. The manager has the same individual need for personal growth and expression as any other human being.

The second, and perhaps more important, reason for utilizing OD is to cope with the rapidity of change each organization faces today. How does this relate to OD?

"For those concerned with organizational theory and

with organizational development work, these are exciting and challenging times. Probably never before have the issues at the interface between changing organizations and maturing men been so apparent, so compelling, and of such potentially critical relevance both to organizations and to man. And to a considerable extent, the sparks at the interface reflect differences in values both within the organization and within man--human values which are coming loose from their moorings, whose functional relevance is being re-examined and tested, and which are without question in transition.

Organizations themselves are faced with ferment and flux. In increasing instances, the older bureaucratic model--with its emphasis on relatively rigid structure, well defined functional specialization, direction and control exercised through a formal hierarchy of authority, fixed systems of rights, duties, and procedures, and relative impersonality of human relationships--is no longer adequately responsive to the demands placed upon it both from outside and inside the organization." 7

"It is my premise that the bureaucratic form of organization is out of joint with contemporary realities; that new shapes, patterns, and models are emerging that promise drastic changes in the conduct of the corporation and of managerial practices in general." 8

The recurring theme of changing values is perhaps the greatest reason for any organization adopting OD. Richard Beckhard cites change in both the environment and man as a significant cause for developing positive strategies in OD.⁹ Warren G. Bennis states that "Organizational Development is necessary whenever our social institutions compete for survival under conditions of chronic change."¹⁰

The military environment has also reflected some awareness and concern over changing values. "If the military establishment is to remain viable in this era of social change, management at all levels must completely understand this new generation of Americans...and the modern concepts, values, and attitudes which motivates them."¹¹ "... Today's soldier is concerned with what is taking place now... Today's young soldier feels that any person in authority must have proper credentials...Individuality is the key..."¹²

"In the context of major change, often the methods of operation that proved effective with past problems becomes obsolete. The military organization in the past relied heavily on tradition, standard operating procedures, and clear lines of hierarchical authority for effective functioning.... Recognition of inconsistencies between present practice and present need is stimulating a good deal of self examination among more progressive Air Force leaders."

13

"Two broad characteristics are predicted for organizations in the next twenty years. First, existing organizations will become more informal in their structure as they find traditional patterns unresponsive. Along with flexibility, the second characteristic will be diversity. As a growing portion of our people can afford nonsubsistence activities, more and more activities and organizations will be generated." 14

"... The functions of management in both the private and public sectors are the same. The sameness cannot be found on the level of profitability. It is the basic foundation and rationale for management that all organizations have in common. This overriding core of management is the creation of an atmosphere or environment whereby a designated group can carry out those functions necessary to accomplish stated goals." 15

Although there is a growing awareness in both the industrial and military community that adapting to change rapidly and effectively is essential, not everyone agrees. Change always results in resistance by some people. One military view towards change is expressed in the position that "leadership" or "commandership" will meet the challenge. LTC Robert Leider stated a not untypical view in his article "Must The Professionals Step Aside Again?"¹⁶ In the OD area it is possible to find examples of failure. There is no single way to cope with change. I believe, based on five years of successful experience, that the concepts of OD delineated in this essay and the suggested readings will offer to the military establishment some viable approaches to improved utilization of our limited resources.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN ACTION

Although this section will primarily relate the author's experience in the development and application of OD in a specific industrial plant, there are several excellent articles available to show what other companies have done. Two in particular are worth reading: "How Texas Instruments Turns Its People On"¹⁷ and "The Plant That Runs On Individual Initiative"¹⁸.

Before reviewing how my company became involved in an OD effort, it seems appropriate to attempt to put to rest a major misconception about OD as a managerial style or strategy. OD, as the term is used in this essay, is not "soft management"; it is not a "country club style" of management; and above all it is not abdication of management. It is a tough style of management which requires the participants to develop good interpersonal relationships, trust, openness, candor, and the willingness to confront problems directly.

OD has tended to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary in my company. Much of our manufacturing management started reading about subjects such as job design, new management styles, motivation and productivity in the early 1960's. The general strategy was for both the Industrial Engineering Division and Industrial Relations Division to provide suggested readings to the Plant Manager, Personnel Manager, and/or Industrial Engineer at each plant. As interest grew, the information and training opportunities were provided to other managers within each plant. By the mid 1960's most of our managers were familiar with Theory X - Theory Y, the hierarchy of needs, etc. from reading books by Saul Gellerman¹⁹, Douglas McGregor²⁰, and Chris Argyris²¹. This was followed by conference attendance at

company conducted and outside organizations such as MIT and UCLA. Several hundred of our managers had attended week long Managerial Grid, Phase I training based on the work of Blake and Mouton²².

In 1967 a new management team was assembled to design, build, and operate a new consumer products manufacturing facility. This plant was to combine the traditional corporate objectives of low cost, high quality, and customer service with the concepts of Theory Y, job enrichment, and the integration of individual and organizational goals. The task has not been easy nor is it easy to put into words what has been accomplished.

The author was one of six managers who constituted the team in early 1968 that was to develop a strategy to implement the charter we had from the company. It was not easy. Although all of us had the training and background information, we didn't know each other nor did we have a good idea of how to approach the problem. We did generally agree that OD offered an excellent opportunity to better utilize our resources, and to achieve the integration of personal and corporate goals.²³ We felt a need for change in many areas: managerial strategy; structure and roles; intergroup collaboration; open communications; approaches to motivation; and the creation of a climate different from our traditional plants.²⁴ Appendix II lists our basic concepts although this is a refined version prepared in 1971. Our early concept was not as elaborate. It said essentially, (1) we want to do what is right for the individual and the company, (2) we want to create a climate that will encourage everyone to develop to his full potential.

The implementation of OD requires, as defined earlier, planning, organization wide effort, and top management support. All of this was present in our effort to apply OD. Although I will discuss activities such as team building, organizational structure, and job design, it is important to keep two factors in mind as you read on: (1) although discussed sequential, these activities are strongly inter-related and must be worked together; and (2) the real key to OD success is not activities but attitude which will create and maintain the required climate within the organization. Climate or atmosphere is difficult to define but without the feeling by the people within the organization that openness, honesty, candor, and interpersonal feedback are acceptable means of behavior, the OD effort will be unsuccessful. You don't get a good climate with talk, only with positive actions by everyone at every level. We based our considerations of structure, job design, and other areas on a socio-technical system concept.²⁵ As a result we were concerned with both internal and external forces on our organization.

Our early efforts focused upon team building since although the six managers were committed to OD, it meant different things to each of us. We had to work out our interpersonal relationships, develop openness and trust, and feel free to provide feedback with candor. This brings up a key point. To get started in OD it is extremely desirable to hire an outside consultant to help you get started in the most effective manner. An outside consultant can point out interpersonal conflicts that are being avoided and thus are interfering with problem solving. We used several over the five years. As we developed our own process skills we found less need for the consult-

ant. With their help we developed the ability in our team to work together more effectively. What we learned by trial and error is now covered well by Warren Bennis²⁶ and Richard Beckhard²⁷.

Our team building action model involved a listing of problems seen by each of us and discussed with the consultant; the feeding back of this data during a two day off site meeting with the consultant; and the forced confrontation of interpersonal problems with the consultant's help. The confrontation area was one part missing from the OD literature at the time we started. It is critical to successful OD application. "There is no real growth--there is no real development--in the organization or in the individual within it if they do not confront and deal directly with their problems." ²⁸ It is difficult. Without a foundation having been built of trust, you feel alone as you take a risk to tell your boss he is wrong. It does work and it is only effective if you work at it all the time in a positive manner.

Following our team building efforts, we felt so strongly about the need for developing these relationships throughout the organization that we devoted a full week to team building activities for the new people we hired. An outline of topics is included in Appendix III. We use a two day seminar with greater stress on interpersonal relationships, the need for authentic relationships based on caring and communicating, and effective feedback. This is possible now because of several years exposure by our people to the proper climate plus the increased in-house OD skills in process consultation. "To be that which one (an individual or group) truly is--to be authentic--is a central value to us. Honesty, directness, congruence, if

widely practiced, create an organizational atmosphere in which energies get focused on real problems rather than game playing...." ²⁹

Our organizational structure and the job design for our employees are intertwined. To provide opportunities for individual growth and a challenging job we eliminated one level of management. This allowed more of the planning and controlling functions to be passed to our employees. Except for the Plant Manager, Personnel Manager, and Accounting Manager and their clerical staff, everyone was related to one of the operating modules. Unlike the traditional plant, the major staff functions were included within modular responsibilities. With this we saw four teams existing: (1) the total plant team of management, clerical, and technicians, (2) the Plant Manager's team of himself, the Personnel Manager, Accounting Manager, and the two modular Operations Managers, and (3) the two modular teams. This was too simple a view and did not take into account the fact that a team is really the relevant people to solve a problem. As a result we have a great many teams in a matrix type of organization. Appendix IV shows the major teams and their overlapping relationships. The teams are represented by circles to indicate their fully rounded responsibilities. They interact with each other. Teams blend both vertically and horizontally. Individuals within teams will act as boundary managers within or outside the plant to interface with the appropriate people. This conceptually fits with our job design which requires total responsibility by the individual for planning and controlling, as well as doing types of action. It is not a unique concept. It has a relationship to Likert's "linking-pin" concept. ³⁰

It is also consistent with the views of Lawrence-Lorsch regarding the basic definition of an organization, the interdependency of its parts, and its morphogenic properties.³¹ The teams continue to change and grow to meet the changing environment both inside and outside the plant. A team needs to be able to cope with three interfaces: (1) organization-environment; (2) group to group; and (3) individual to organization.³² Dealing with the process is critical to success. We are not always successful but we have been able to develop internal process consultants in both management and technician personnel who have the ability to sense where we are failing to be authentic in our relationships or to confront interpersonal problems. Edgar H. Shein provides some excellent insights into what role process consultation plays in OD.³³

Broad job design was a key concept in formulating our plans. To permit broad job design we were able to design out many jobs which, in traditional plants offer little or no opportunity for personal growth. This can't be done everywhere. The key is to recognize this type of job and try to match people to the job. We found that some people do not like added responsibility nor do they want to have an opportunity for planning or control of their work. This is important to recognize because as was stated earlier, OD is not a cure-all for organizational problems. The concepts used must fit the organization. Some guides to deciding if OD is for your organization will be covered later.

For those jobs which are available we have attempted to provide through our pay structure and environment both the opportunity and incentive for the individual to reach out for added responsibility. This concept was influenced greatly by the writings and talks by

It is also consistent with the views of Lawrence-Lorsch regarding the basic definition of an organization, the interdependency of its parts, and its morphogenic properties.³¹ The teams continue to change and grow to meet the changing environment both inside and outside the plant. A team needs to be able to cope with three interfaces: (1) organization-environment; (2) group to group; and (3) individual to organization.³² Dealing with the process is critical to success. We are not always successful but we have been able to develop internal process consultants in both management and technician personnel who have the ability to sense where we are failing to be authentic in our relationships or to confront interpersonal problems. Edgar H. Shein provides some excellent insights into what role process consultation plays in OD.³³

Broad job design was a key concept in formulating our plans. To permit broad job design we were able to design out many jobs which, in traditional plants offer little or no opportunity for personal growth. This can't be done everywhere. The key is to recognize this type of job and try to match people to the job. We found that some people do not like added responsibility nor do they want to have an opportunity for planning or control of their work. This is important to recognize because as was stated earlier, OD is not a cure-all for organizational problems. The concepts used must fit the organization. Some guides to deciding if OD is for your organization will be covered later.

For those jobs which are available we have attempted to provide through our pay structure and environment both the opportunity and incentive for the individual to reach out for added responsibility. This concept was influenced greatly by the writings and talks by

Dr. M. Scott Meyers of Texas Instruments. One of our early reading on job design and motivation was Dr. Meyers' "Who Are Your Motivated Workers?"³⁴ We also had an opportunity to discuss with him material from "Every Employee A Manager".³⁵ Our experience strongly supports in conclusions. Our employees have substantial ownership in the operation of the plant. The talk in the break area is nearly always related to plant problems: obtaining raw materials, working with the Engineering Division to get help on their project, etc. There are problems. In some cases poor training or communications by management has failed to get the individual to effectively do the total job rather than just what is fun for him. Overall our job design, organizational structure, team organization, and climate have resulted in superior results for the company and the individual.

The development of trust, openness, candor, and good interpersonal relationships is a time consuming process. Do not start with OD unless you are will to keep at it full time for years. We are still learning and growing after five hard years. We have been open with our people to a greater degree than any where else in our company. Our technicians are aware of unit expenses for our brands; they help prepare parts of the plant budget; they have been involved in establishing production targets in terms of both cases and line efficiencies; and they have been involved in deciding the best way to operate including crew size, number of shifts, and overtime needed. The key to our succesful attainment of corporate goals of low cost, high quality, and customer service has been to involve the appropriate people in decision making based on their having the relevent facts. Those people who can contribute compose the decision team.

I had mentioned earlier that our design is based on a socio-technical systems approach. Our work was based upon the understanding of systems design and analysis as presented by Eric Trist³⁶ and F. E. Emory.³⁷ From this open system concept we became more aware of the environment around us as a plant and the need to both recognize and cope with it. The plant as an enterprise both affects and is affected by its external environment.³⁸ Because of this interaction there is a need to manage the boundaries or interface points. This was especially clear to us as we put into operation concepts of organization and responsibility that were not accepted at that time by corporate staff divisions. Without the strong boundary manager present in our Division Manager it is possible that our attempt to apply OD would have been much less successful.

One final comment related to our organization. One of its strengths is the value system that has developed organically by members of the plant through the dynamics of group process. Members of the organization continue to place a high value on the character of their interpersonal relationships and continue to develop them in task group sessions. Norms developed in these sessions have become a "code of conduct" for the plant. Some of these norms are listed in Appendix V.

I believe what we have done is applicable within any organization. The specific approaches and techniques will change depending upon the situation. My company has successfully applied these same concepts but in a different degree to some of our traditional plants. It is slower because of the need to overcome years of tradition and a lack of candor that exists, but it can be done.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE MILITARY ENVIRONMENT

My basic premise is that the OD concepts discussed in this essay are applicable to the military environment. As noted earlier some segments of the military establishment have already recognized the need to adapt to changing conditions. The most logical area of application lies in major headquarters and commands with non-combat roles. Based on the Annual Defense Department Report, FY 1974, over half the projected manpower at the end of FY 1974 would fall into the non-combat area.³⁹ The military problem of coping with change and complexity, on a unit or command basis, is not significantly different from that of many large companies. For example, compare your situation to the following:

"...currently employs about 13,300 persons....It is an organization that is highly interdependent. We have a matrix organization: there are project offices and functional areas of technical capabilities.... A project office, to perform its task, must call upon capabilities and people throughout the organization....No one can really get his job done in this kind of a system without working with others. As a result, problems of relationships, of communication, of people being effectively able to problem solve with one another are extremely critical." 40

This organization is one of the leaders in the field of practical OD application on a large scale.

You must start by analyzing your own organization to see what "teams" exist within the total organization. A second analysis is needed to review the organization "processes" such as decision-making process, communication patterns and styles, relationships between interfacing groups, conflict management, and goal setting to mention just a few.⁴¹ Appendix VI lists some assumptions about the nature and functioning of organizations that will be useful

in making your analysis. Based on the data collected you must then ask yourself several key questions about your organization to determine if it is ready to move into OD or if additional preparation is needed. One goal the organization must adopt to be successful is to learn about OD change. Unless this goal is timely, economical and fits the organizations needs, the OD effort will fail. Another question which must be answered relates to the climate and values in the organization. As has been noted earlier, OD has a set of values. If the two sets of values are too far apart OD cannot be applied. Two other questions relate to each other: (1) have the key people become involved in the early planning and (2) has adequate preparation been made by exposing key people to the OD concepts to get their reactions. OD requires top management support and long term commitment. Top management doesn't have to be the Commanding General but it does have to be a person who has the stature to act effectively as a boundary manager with higher and adjacent organizations that may not wish to change too. 42

Assuming you find the conditions right to move into OD, what kind of goals or objectives might be right to work towards. This will depend on the organization, but some goals might be:

"1. To develop a self-renewing, viable system that can organize in a variety of ways depending on tasks....3. To move toward high collaboration and low competition between interdependent units.... 4. To create conditions where conflict is brought out and managed.... 5. To reach the point where decisions are made on the basis of information source rather than organizational role." 43

Again, it is essential to stress that the key people in the organization see a need for organizational change and that they are willing to commit to the long term effort required to succeed.

There is no single solution to coping with change. There are some basic guides as to what can cause your efforts to fail:

"1. A continued discrepancy between top management statements of value and styles and their actual behavior....2. A big program of activities without any solid base of change goals....3. Confusion of ends and means....4. Short time frame....5. No connection between behavioral-science-oriented change efforts and management-services/operations-research-oriented change efforts...6. Overdependence on outside help....7. Overdependence on inside specialists...8. A large gap between the change effort at the top of the organization and efforts in the middle of the organization....9. Trying to fit a major organization change effort into an old structure....10. Confusing "good relationships" as an end with good relationships as a condition....11. The search for "cookbook" solutions....12. Applying an intervention or strategy inappropriately...."44

There are also a number of reasons why an OD effort can be successful: as it is in my company. There is a recognized need for change. Someone in the organization is willing to make the diagnosis. There is strong leadership by key people. There is a willingness to take risks in trying new relationships. The expectation exists that the change must be planned and results will be a long time in coming but progress will be made. There is a willingness to accept the feedback and other communications in the climate being built and act appropriately on the data. The system rewards people for the effort of changing and improving.⁴⁵

At least one segment of the military has recognized the need:

"Preparing for change and assisting in the search for organizational self-renewal are key responsibilities of every member of the Air Force. New concepts of organizational design, new techniques for organizational analysis, and new methods for the development of leadership skills provide potentials that were not previously available. It is becoming clear that conflict between needs for personal self-realization and the need for organizational performance and flexibility is unnecessary."⁴⁶

FOOTNOTES

1. Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization.
2. A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality.
3. Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise.
4. Leslie E. This, Organizational Development: Fantasy Or Reality, pp. 6-10.
5. Warren H. Schmidt (ed.), Organizational Frontiers and Human Values, p. 22.
6. Richard Beckhard, Organizational Development: Strategies and Models, p. 6.
7. Robert Tannenbaum and Sheldon A. Davis, Values, Man and Organizations, pp. 1-2.
8. Warren Bennis, et al., The Planning of Change, p. 570.
9. Richard Beckhard, pp. 5-6.
10. Warren G. Bennis, Organizational Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects, p. 18.
11. Paul J. Giddens, CAPT, "Military Management In A Decade of Change" The Review, May-June 1970, p. 47.
12. Albert F. Ledebuhr, COL., "A New Look At The Ultimate Weapon, Army, November 1971, pp. 24-25.
13. David C. Korten, "New Directions For Air Force Leadership" Air University Review, November-December 1970, p. 60.
14. "Man And The 1990 Environment", Army, May 1971, p. 34.
15. Thomas Schwartz, MAJOR, "Management-Creating The Environment", Defense Management Journal, April 1972, pp. 21-22.
16. Robert Leider, LTC, "Must The Professionals Step Aside Again?", Army, June 1972, pp. 40-45.
17. "How Texas Instruments Turns Its People On.", Business Week, September 29, 1973, p. 88-90.
18. "The Plant That Runs On Individual Initiative", Management Review, July 1972, pp. 20-25.
19. Saul W. Gellerman, Motivation and Productivity,
20. Douglas McGregor
21. Chris Argyris, Understanding Organizational Behavior

FOOTNOTES

22. Robert E. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid
23. Richard Beckhard, p. 3.
24. Ibid., pp. 16-19.
25. F. E. Emery, Characteristics Of Socio-Technical Systems.
26. Bennis
27. Beckhard
28. Shelodon Davis, "An Organic Problem Solving Method Of Organizational Change", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1967, p. 5.
29. Robert Tannenbaum and Sheldon A. Davis, p. 12.
30. Rensis Likert, The Human Organization, Its Management And Values
31. Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action, pp. 10-17.
32. Ibid., pp. 23-83.
33. Edgar H. Schien, Process Consultation: Its Role In Organizational Development.
34. M. Scott Meyers, "Who Are Your Motivated Workers?", Harvard Business Review, January-February 1964, pp. 73-88.
35. M. Scott Meyers, "Every Employee A Manager", California Management Review, Spring 1968, pp. 9-20.
36. Eric L. Trist and H. Murray, Work Organization at the Coal Face: A Comparative Study of Mining Systems.
37. F. E. Emory, Characteristics of Socio-Technical Systems
38. Ibid., p. 3.
39. Elliot L. Richardson, Annual Defense Department Report FY 1974, pp. 95 and 122.
40. Davis, p. 8.
41. Beckhard, p. 26.
42. Bennis, pp. 46-47

FOOTNOTES

43. Beckhard, pp. 14-15.

44. Beckhard, pp. 93-96.

45. Beckhard, pp. 96-97

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
2. Argyris, Chris. Understanding Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1960.
3. Argyris, Chris. Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin-Dorsey, 1962.
4. Argyris, Chris. Integrating The Individual And The Organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.
5. Beckhard, Richard. Organizational Development: Strategies and Models. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
6. Bennis, Warren. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966
7. Bennis, Warren. Organizational Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
8. Bennis, Warren, Kenneth Benne, and Robert Chin. The Planning Of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1969.
9. Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf, 1964.
10. Blake, Robert R., H. A. Shepard, and J. S. Mouton. Managing Inter-Group Conflict In Industry. Houston: Gulf, 1964.
11. Davis, James H., et al. "Social Change: A Necessary Variable in Army Planning." Army, Vol. 21, May 1971, pp. 32-35.
12. Davis, Sheldon. "An Organic Problem Solving Method Of Organizational Change." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 3, No.1, 1967.

(An excellent presentation on OD applied to IRW Systems with special emphasis on the use of confrontation.)
13. Emory, F. E. Characteristics of Socio-Technical Systems. London: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, 1959.
14. Gellerman, Saul W. Motivation and Productivity. New York: American Management Association, 1963.

(An excellent introduction to the subject with a wide range of articles.)
15. Gellerman, Saul W. Management By Motivation. New York: American Management Association, 1968.

16. Giddens, Paul J. CPT. "Military Management In A Decade Of Change." The Review, Vol. 49, May-June 1970, pp. 42-115.
17. Herzberg, Frederick. Work And The Nature Of Man. Cleveland: World, 1968.
19. Hoefling, John A. COL. "Leadership--There Is No 'Right' Way." Army, Vol. 20, July 1970, pp. 31-38.
20. Hoefling, John A. BG. "Leadership In The Volunteer Army." Army, Vol. 21, August 1971, pp. 38-42.
21. "How Texas Instruments Turns Its People On." Business Week, 29 September 1973, pp. 88-90.
22. Korten, David C. "New Directions For Air Force Leadership-- Design For Organizational Renewal." Air University Review, Vol. 22 November-December 1970, pp. 59-68.

(Covers the reasons why the military must look towards more innovative ways to cope with change. Provides good specific illustrations of OD applied to the Air Force.)
23. Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch. Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action. Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley, 1969.
24. Leavitt, Harold. Managerial Psychology. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
25. Leavitt, Harold, William R. Dill, and Henry B. Eyring. The Organizational World. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.
26. Ledebuhr, Albert F. COL. "A New Look At The 'Ultimate Weapon' (A Young Soldier)." Army, Vol. 21, November 1971, pp. 22-25.
27. Leider, Robert. LTC. "Must The Professionals Step Aside Again?" Army, Vol. 22, June 1972, pp. 40-45.
28. Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization, Its Management And Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
29. Likert, Rensis. New Patterns Of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
30. McGregor, Douglas. The Professional Manager. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
31. McGregor, Douglas. Leadership And Motivation. Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 1966.

32. McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side Of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- (A classic in the field. Must be read to gain an understanding of the concept of Theory X-Theory Y.)
33. "Man and The 1970 Environment." Army Vol. 21, May 1971, p. 34.
34. Maslow, A. H. Motivation And Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
35. Maslow, A. H. Eupsychian Management. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1965.
36. Meyers, N. Scott. "Every Employee A Manager." California Management Review, Spring 1968, pp. 9-20.
- (A detailed discussion of job enrichment of the type used by Texas Instruments. Helps clarify what constitutes meaningful work and how to enrich work.)
37. Meyers, N. Scott. "Who Are Your Motivated Workers?" Harvard Business Review, January-February 1964, pp. 73-88.
- (Details what motivates employees to work effectively; what dissatisfies workers; and when workers become dissatisfied.)
38. "The Plant That Runs On Individual Initiative." Management Review, July 1972, pp. 20-25.
- (An interesting example of a small plant designed to apply OD concepts.)
39. Patrone, F. A. LTC. "Effective Styles Of Management." Defense Management Journal, Vol. 7, Fall 1971, pp. 46-49.
40. Richardson, Elliot L. Posture Statement Presented To The 93d Congress, 2d Session, 1973. Washington: US Department of Defense, 10 April 1973.
41. Schmidt, Warren H. (ed.). Organizational Frontiers and Human Values. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1971.
42. Schien, Edgar H. Process Consultation: Its Role In Organizational Development. Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- (A key book on the subject. This is an essential part of an effective OD effort.)
43. Schwartz, Thomas. MAJ. "Management-Creating the Environment." Defense Management Journal, Vol. 8, April 1972, pp. 21-22.

44. Tannenbaum, Robert and Sheldon Davis. Values, Man, And Organizational Development. Paper presented at McGregor Conference on Organizational Development sponsored by Organizational Studies Group, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, M. I. T., 12-14 October 1967.

(An important discussion of trends and why OD is important.)

45. This, Leslie. Organizational Development: Fantasy or Reality? Washington: Society for Personnel Administration, Supervisor Booklet No. 7, undated.
46. Trist, Eric. and H. Murray. Work Organization At The Coal Face. London: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, 1958.

APPENDIX I

Introductory Material

1. Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change.
2. Saul W. Gellerman, Motivation and Productivity.
3. M. Scott Meyers, "Who are Your Motivated Workers?", Harvard Business Review, January-February 1964, pp. 73-88.
4. M. Scott Meyers, "Every Employee A Manager", California Management Review, Spring 1968, pp. 9-20.
5. Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid
6. The Gellerman Motivation and Productivity Film Series from BNA, Rockville, Maryland, especially:
 - a. Understanding Motivation with Dr. Gellerman
 - b. Human Nature And Organizational Realities with Dr. Argyris
 - c. Motivation Through Job Enrichment with Dr. Herzberg
7. The Effective Executive Film Series by Peter Drucker from BNA, especially:
 - a. What Can I Contribute?
 - b. Staffing For Strength

Advanced Material

1. Warren Bennis, Organizational Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects.
2. Richard Beckhard, Organizational Development: Strategies and Models.
3. Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action.
4. Edgar H. Schein, Process Consultation. Its Role In Organizational Development.
5. Warren Schmidt, Organizational Frontiers and Human Values.
6. F. E. Emory, Characteristics of Socio-Technical Systems.

APPENDIX II

CONCEPTUAL BASIS

Our plant is one among many in the Manufacturing Division of our Company. Before preceeding to the concepts used here, it is necessary to understand the broad Manufacturing Division functions, objectives, and performance measurements. The following statement would apply to all manufacturing plants.

1. Manufacturing Division Function

Manufacture and ship Company finished products to customers.

2. Manufacturing Division Objective

Accomplish the stated function within designated qualifications in such a manner as to maximize the continuing, long term profitability of the Company.

3. Evaluation of Division Performance

Measure the specific achievements toward attainment of the stated objective.

There are two classes of concepts at our plant. First are those of a general nature that would tend to be used over a long period of time as guides to plant actions. The second group of concepts are more specific in nature and represent today's interpretation of the general concepts. Over time, this group of concepts could change with some being dropped, added, or modified.

The two general concepts applicable to our plant are:

1. Create a culture in which there are no artificial barriers which could prevent any individual from making his maximum contribution towards achieving the objective of the enterprise.

2. Provide an atmosphere in which each individual is properly trained, motivated, and rewarded to attain maximum success in achieve the objective of the enterprise.

The more specific concepts felt to be applicable in today's situation are:

1. Broad, flexible job design, without restrictive job titles or job boundries, should be used.
2. Maximum flexibility should be used in accomplishing tasks and solving problems. This does not mean that "everyone is to be able to do everything". Team members should learn to do those jobs for which aptitude and interest exist.
3. Team orientation should be towards the total operation rather than individual jobs.
 - a.) The effectiveness of the team effort is greater than the sum of individual efforts.
 - b.) Team membership for problem solving must be carefully defined. (Members without input or a stake in the solution should not be involved in most cases.)
4. Mutual trust is a building block of work effectiveness.
5. Hygiene factors must be satisfied on a continuing basis in such areas as pay, employee benefits, work rules, and facilities.
6. Solving problems and establishing relationships should be accomplished through an open exchange of thoughts and feelings, aimed at satisfying both individual and Company needs.
7. A dynamic organization is maintained by encouraging exposure to environment that encourages change and provides

freedom to respond to these signals.

8. Mature people are proactive in assuming increasing responsibility, given appropriate training, input, and freedom.
9. Decisions are best made close to the source of input, implementation, effect, and accountability.
10. Teams gain unity and direction in a large part through goals in which they have participated in setting.
11. Long term organizational health needs must be considered in situations where short term production goals threaten to become over-riding.

APPENDIX III

TEAM BUILDING AGENDA

A Model of Organizations

Team Critique Checklist

Setting Goals

Analyzing Problems in Teams

Team Building and Shared Leadership

Talking and Listening

The Johari Window

Giving Interpersonal Feedback

Organization and Individual Needs

The New Truck Dilemma (BNA Film)


Job Enrichment Questionnaire

Growth-Key To Effective Jobs

Getting Performance In Organizations

APPENDIX IV

The circles below represent teams and their interaction. Module A has a one shift operation with making, packing, and shipping teams. Module B has a three shift operation with making, packing, and shipping teams on each shift. These shifts are considered teams as well as the three teams within each shift. There is also an interrelationship across shifts in Module B based on technology, i.e. making, packing, and shipping.



Environment

APPENDIX V

"Code of Conduct"

Individual

1. Each individual is expected to invest his personal abilities in a way which provides maximum benefit to the team.
2. Any individual has the right to work through (confront/support) issues whenever he feels the code of conduct has been violated.
3. Each person has a right to learn and grow at his own rate, and this is respected provided that he (she) demonstrates a continuing effort towards growth.
4. There is a common basis of trust and respect for others.
5. It is alright to extend one's abilities to accomplish something, because help and support can be expected from other members of the team.

Team

1. The team operates on the basis of full and free communication of information relevant to the production of the brand.
2. The atmosphere of team meetings permits and values emotional expression as well as task-oriented problem solving.
3. Team decisions normally follow the pattern of: (a) sharing data, (b) expression of opinions, (c) selection of tentative decision, (d) attempts to sway group by those whose disagree, (e) acceptance of the decision by the group.

Leadership

1. Although he is designated by management, the team leader earns his leadership from below by demonstrating his capability and

not through his hierarchical designation.

2. The team leader is responsible for interpreting and relating information and for maintaining and enriching the environment.
3. The team leader is responsible for process facilitation during team meetings.

Organization

1. Influence is based on technical competence and knowledge rather than power and organizational position.

APPENDIX VI

SOME ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE NATURE AND FUNCTIONING OF ORGANIZATIONS

The following assumptions grow naturally from the concepts shown in Appendix II:

1. The basic units to deal with in promoting change are teams rather than individuals.
2. A key change goal is to prevent or at least reduce inappropriate competition between parts of the organization.
3. Decision making in an effective organization is located close to the source of input, implementation, and accountability rather than being based on hierarchy or role.
4. Goals are the basis for managing an organization's affairs.
5. Development of trust, openness, and communication between and across levels in the organization is essential to an effective organization.
6. Allowing people to fully participate will result in real "ownership".

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER AD 779 565
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Organizational Development in Practice		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Student Essay
7. AUTHOR(s) LTC Robert E. Pownall, MI		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army War College Carlisle Barracks, Pa. 17013		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same as Item 9.		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE 12 November 1973
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 17
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Reproduced by NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE U S Department of Commerce Springfield VA 22151		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Organizational development is an effort planned, organization-wide, and managed from the top to increase organizational effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organization's "processes" using behavioral-science knowledge. It is an effective way to cope with the rapidly changing environment facing both the industrial and military community today. By use of a brief historical development of management theory coupled with the need for adapting to change and the knowledge based on five years of Organizational Development practice, an approach to determining whether		

Block 20 continued

Organizational Development can be used in the military is supplied. The author's conclusion is that Organizational Development can and should be adopted within the military establishment. Some specific suggestions are made regarding conditions to look for which favor a successful OD experience and some conditions which will lead to failure.

ia