CHAPTER-2 (A)

Organization Development (OD) - A Theoretical Approach
Definitions of Organization Development (OD):

Various authors have defined OD in multifarious ways. Some of the definitions are as follows:

Organization Development (OD) 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)

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)

Organization Renewal is the process of initiating, creating and confronting needed changes so as to make it possible for organizations to become or remain viable, to adapt to new conditions, to solve problems, to learn from experiences, and to move toward greater organizational maturity. (Lipit, 1970)

Organization Development 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)

OD 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 Homstein, 1972)

Organization Development is a process to enhance congruence between organizational structure, processes, strategy, people, and culture; to develop new and creative organizational solutions; and to develop the organization's self-renewing capacity. (Beer, 1989)
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)

Organization Development is a top-management-supported, long-range effort to improve an organization's problem-solving and renewal process, particularly through a more effective and collaborative diagnosis and management of organization culture—with special emphasis on formal work team, temporary team, and inter-group culture—with the assistance of a consultant-facilitator and the use of theory and technology of applied behavioral science, including Action Research. (French and Bell, 1990)

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

Organization Development 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)

Organization Development has been defined as a series of planned processes by which human resources are identified, utilized, and developed in ways that strengthen organizational effectiveness by increasing problem solving capabilities and planning. (The Organization Development Institute)
Analysis of these definitions suggest that organization development is not just "anything done to better an organization"; it is a particular kind of change process designed to bring about a specific end result. It is a prescription for the process of planned change in organizations in which key elements relate to:

1. The nature of the effort/programme (it is a long-range, planned, system-wide process);
2. The nature of the change activities (they utilize behavioral science interventions of an educational, reflexive, self-examining, learn-to-do-it-yourself nature);
3. The targets of the change activities (they are directed toward the human and social processes of organizations, specifically individuals' beliefs, attitudes, and values, the culture and processes of work groups—regarded as the basic building blocks of the organization—and the process and culture of the total organization); and
4. The desired outcomes of the change activities (the goals are needed changes in the targets of the interventions that cause the organization to be better able to adapt, cope, solve its problems, and renew itself).

OD differs from the traditional consulting because client involvement is encouraged throughout the entire process. The ways in which people communicate and work together are addressed concurrently with technical or procedural issues that need resolution (Chicago OD Network).

**Origin and History of OD:**

The history of OD has been enriched with the valuable contributions of very well-known behavioral scientists and practitioners. The history of OD can be basically divided into 4 parts:
- Innovations in applying laboratory training insights to complex organizations.
- Survey research and feedback methodology.
The above two parts are intertwined with a third, the emergence of action research.

Paralleling to the above three, and to some extent linked, the fourth one is the emergence of the Travistock socio-technical and social-clinical approach.

The key actors in these areas interact with each other and are influenced by experiences and concepts from many fields.

**The Origin of Laboratory Training:**

**The T-Group**

It began to develop about 1946 from various experiments in using discussion groups to achieve changes in behavior in back-home situations. It was very much unstructured and small group situation in which participants learn from their own actions and the group's evolving dynamics. In 1946, an Inter-Group Relations workshop held at the State Teachers College in New Britain, Connecticut. This laid the stone for the development of laboratory training. This workshop was sponsored by Connecticut Interracial Commission and the Research Centre for Group Dynamics (RCGD), then at MIT. Kurt Lewin, a prolific theorist, researcher, and practitioner in inter-personal group, inter-group, and community relationships had founded the RCGD in the year 1945. Lewin's original staff members were Marian Radke, Leon Festinger, Ronald Lippit, and Darwin Cartwright. Through a series of events at the New Britain workshop of 1946, the T-Group was emerged. The staffs of the workshop were Kurt Lewin, Kenneth Benne, Leland Bradford, and Ronald Lippit. Excluding Kurt Lewin, other members were served as leaders of 'L-groups'. Each group had a leader, members and an observer. The duty of the observer was to make notes about the interactions among the members. At the end of each day, the observers met with the staff to report their findings. At the second or third evening sessions, three members of the workshop were asked and encouraged to sit in the reporting sessions sequentially. By this 50-60 members of the workshop attended the feedback session. These sessions became the most important learning experiences of the conference and led to National Training Laboratory (NTL) in Group Development, organized by Benne, Bradford, and Lippit (Lewin died in early 1947). During the 1946 session, Ronald
Lippit and Lee Bradford used flip-chart paper as a convenient way to record, retrieve, and display data in OD activities and training sessions. They held a three-week session during the summer of 1947 at the Gould Academy in Bethel, Maine. There were participants, who met with a trainer and an observer in Basic Skill Training Groups (later called T-groups) for a major part of each day. This 1947 laboratory was sponsored by RCGD (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 NTL, later called NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, and into contemporary T-group training. A significant number of laboratory training centers, sponsored by various universities were grown out of the Bethel experiences and NTL. The first one was The Western Training Laboratory, headed by Paul Sheats and sponsored by UCLA and offered its first programme in 1952.

In addition to Lewin and his work, extensive experience with role playing and Moreno’s psychodrama influenced Benne, Bradford, and Lippit’s invention of the T-group and subsequent emergence of OD. Bradford and Benne were influenced by John Dewey’s philosophy of education, concepts about learning and change, and about transactional nature of humans and their environment. Benne was influenced by Mary Follett and her ideas about integrative solution to organizational problems. Bradford and Lippit used ‘strips of butcher paper’ in their early work with organizations. The awareness that led to the emergence of T-group was the awareness of the importance of helping groups and group leaders’ focus on group and leadership processes. This awareness was evident in adult education and group therapy. With the evolvement of the use of the laboratory methods, stated goals of T-group experiences tended to include statements like: self-insight, understanding the conditions that obstruct or facilitate group functioning, understanding interpersonal operations in groups, and developing skills for diagnosing individual, group and organizational behavior. These insights and skills were practical and relevant for most participants. The driving force for the growing popularity of T-groups was their spiritual and therapeutic aspects.
Over the next decade, as the trainers started to work with social systems of more permanency and complexity, they experienced considerable frustration in transferring laboratory behavioral skills and insight of individuals into solving problems in organizations. Personal skills learned in the stranger T-groups setting were difficult to be transferred to complex organizations. However, the training of teams from the same organization emerged early at Bethel and 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 Schndler-Rainman, and others. All had been T-group members in the NTL programme.

**Robert Tannenbaum (1952)**

He conducted some of the earliest sessions of 'team building' in 1952 and 1953 at the U.S Naval Ordnance Test Station at China Lake, California. He mentioned that the term vertically structured groups was used with groups dealing with 'personal topics and with organizational topics'. These sessions, which stimulated a 1954 personnel article by Tannenbaum, Kallejian, and Weschler, were conducted with all managers of a given organizational unit present. Tannenbaum and Art Shedlin led the first nondegree programme in OD, the Learning Community in Organization Development at UCLA. He was in the planning committee for the Western Training Laboratory (WTL) and a staff member for the first session (1952).

**Chris Argyris (1957)**

In 1957, Chris Argyris, the then faculty member at Yale University (later Harvard), was the first member to conduct team building sessions with a CEO and the top executive team. Two of Argyris early clients were IBM and Exxon. His 1962 book named "Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness" described his early research and interventions with a top executive. In 1950, while working on a Ph.D, Argyris visited Bethel as a member of the NTL's research staff in order to study T-groups and became very much fascinated with the same. Later he made extensive contributions to the theory and research on laboratory training. One of his famous books on OD is
“Intervention Theory and Method”. Argyris’s work was greatly influenced by the studies of Kurt Lewin, Roger Barker and Bill Whyte’s studies.

**Douglas McGregor (1957)**

Douglas McGregor, professor-consultant, working with Union Carbide, addressed the transfer problem and talked systematically about transfer problem and helped in the implementation of the T-group skills in complex organizations in the beginning of 1957 with the help of a small internal consulting group, established by Paul Jones along with McGregor and Birny Mason. McGregor’s work was influenced by Kurt Lewin, Leland Bradford, Edwin Boring, Irving Knickerbocker, Jay Forrester, Gordon Allport, and Carl Rogers’s studies. McGregor’s classic work, ‘The Human Side of the Enterprise’, was published in 1960.

**Herbert Shepard (1957)**

He was involved in community development activities in 1960, at the Case Institute of Technology, founded the first doctoral programme devoted to training OD specialist. In 1958 and 1959 Shepard launched three experiments in OD 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, which was followed by a series of three-day laboratories for all members of the management.

**Herbert Shepard and Robert Blake (1958 and 1959)**

Robert Blake joined Herbert Shepard at Baton Rouge, and both of them initiated a series of two-week laboratories attended by all member of ‘middle’ management. Firstly they tried to combine the case method with the laboratory method, but their design soon emphasized T-groups, organizational exercises and lectures. One innovation in this training programme was an emphasis on inter-group as well as interpersonal relations. At Baton Rouge, efforts to involve top management failed. This led to the unavailability of follow-up resources necessary for implementing OD. By the time the Bayway programme began, two fundamental OD lessons had been learned: the requirement for top management’s active involvement in and leadership of the
programme and the need for on-the-job application. Bayway brought two important innovations. Firstly, Shepard, Blake, and Murray Horwitz used the instrumented laboratory, which Blake and Jane Mouton had been developing in social psychology classes at the University of Texas and which they later developed into Managerial Grid approach to OD. Secondly, at Bayway more resources were devoted to team development, consultation, inter-group conflict resolution, and so forth.

**Robert Black and Jane Mouton (1959)**

Robert 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 opposite". This thinking had a contribution in later years to Blake's conceptualization of the Managerial Grid with Jane Mouton and to their inter-group research on win-lose dynamics. This inter-group research and the subsequent design of their inter-group conflict management workshops were also heavily influenced by Muzafer Sherif's fundamental research on inter-group dynamics. During World War II, Blake served in the Psychological Research Unit of the Army Air Force where he got the opportunity to interact with many behavioral scientists and sociologists. This experience led him to 'look at the system rather than the individuals within the system on an isolated one-by-one basis'.

**Eva Schindler-Rainman (1959)**

While employed as Director of Personnel and Training for Los Angeles Girl Scouts Council, in the early 1950s she attended one of the first events of the Western Training Laboratory. About 1959, Schindler-Rainman was on the staff of an NTL-sponsored Community Development Laboratory at UCLA's Arrowhead Conference Centre. Her formal link to NTL came with a staff assignment at Bethel about 1966. She worked with a wide range of clients, both in United States and internationally. A few of her well-known publications are- The Creative Volunteer Community: A Collection of Writings, Building the Collaborative Community, The Volunteer Community, and Team Training for Community Change.
Richard Beckhard (1969)

He came from a career in theatre and went to NTL in 1950. Beckhard helped them in improving the effectiveness of the communications in large meetings and set up the meetings organization "Conference Counselors". Beckhard developed one of the first major nondegree training programmes in OD, NTL's Programme for Specialists in Organizational Training. Robert Blake, Lee Bradford, and Jack Gibb, founded NTL's Management Work Conferences, which were essentially laboratory training experiences for middle managers. As an extension to this programme, Beckhard also played a vital role in developing and conducting NTL's senior executive conferences and presidents' lab.

Warren Bennis (1969)

He was the authors of prominent books on leadership, dreamer of grand visions, and the only NTL'er to actually take the helm of a large organization and try to reshape it from the top. He was influenced by the works of Douglas McGregor, Ed. Schien, Mason Haire, Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Kenneth Benne, Herb Shepard, L. Bardford, Peter Drucker, Robert Chin, George Schultz, Elton Mayo, and Henry Stack Sullivan.

Origin of the Term Organization Development

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. Earlier Blake and Mouton used the term development group in connection with human relations training at the University of Texas and the term also appeared in their 1956 document distributed for use in the Baton Rouge experiment. The Baton Rouge T-group run by Shepard and Blake were called development groups. This programme of T-groups was called 'organization development' to distinguish it from the complementary management development programmes already underway.

Changing Role of Human Resource Executives

The three corporations that extensively started OD were Union Carbide, Esso, and General Mills. They included people seeing themselves, departing from their traditional roles and collaborating in a new approach to organizational improvement.
The Survey Research and Feedback:

The history of survey research and feedback revolves around the techniques and approach developed over a period of years by staff members at the Survey Research Centre (SRC) of the University of Michigan.

Rensis Likert (1948)

The SRC was founded in the year 1946 after Rensis Likert, director of the Division of Programme Surveys of the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and other key members of the division moved to Michigan. His book ‘A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes’ was the classic work that developed the widely used five-point Likert Scale. At the Life Insurance Agency Management Association, Likert conducted research on leadership, motivation, morale and productivity. In 1948 Likert developed and directed the SRC. Then he became the director of a new institute for Social Research, which included both the SRC and RCGD.

Floyd Mann, Rensis Likert, and Others

One 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. In 1948, Detroit Edison Company made a company-wide study of employee perceptions, behavior, reactions and attitudes. It involved the process of feeding back data from an attitude survey to the participating departments. Mann called it ‘inter-locking chain of conferences’. Additional insights were provided by Baumgartel.

Links between the Laboratory Training and the Survey Feedback

As early as 1940, links occurred between people who were latter 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 played a vital role in the evolution of OD. Links between group dynamics and survey feedback people became extensive after RCGD moved to Michigan with the encouragement of Rensis Likert and members of SRC.
The Action Research:

The Laboratory Training part in the history of OD has a heavy component of action research. The Survey Feedback is the specialized form of action research. Travistock projects have had a strong action research thrust. 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 Socio-Technical and Socio-Clinical Part:

The major objective of this was to help groups and organizations. Parallel to the work of the RCGD, the SRC, and NTL was the work of the Travistock 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.

W. R. Bion, John Rickman, and Others

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.

Eric Trist

Travistock's socio-technical approach was particularly significant in that it grew out of Eric Trist's 1947 visit to a British coal mine at Haghmoor. Trist's experiments in work design in various industries in Europe, India, Australia, and the United States included terms such as industrial democracy, open systems, and socio-technical systems.

Relation between Travistock and U.S

Trist and Bion had a regular contact with Kurt Lewin, Rensis Likert and Chris Argyris. This led to the publication of journal named Human Relations, as a joint publication between Travistock and MIT's RCGD. The socio-technical
approach focused on the non executive ranks of organizations and especially the redesign of work.

**New Era of OD:**

IT is necessary and important to consider the changing scenario of OD in the context of technological innovation, company mergers, acquisitions, leveraged buyouts, bankruptcies, success stories, downsizings, and changes in law. This has led to the emergence of, what is called *Second-Generation OD*. It has a focus on *Organizational Transformation*. Amir Levy and Uri Merry define organizational transformation as "a multi-dimensional, multi-level, qualitative, discontinuous, radical organizational change involving a paradigmatic shift".

OD professionals have made an attempt to distinguish between the more modest, or evolutionary, efforts toward organization improvement and those that are massive and, revolutionary in nature. For example-

- Nadler and Tushman differentiate between ‘transition’ and ‘frame bending’.
- Goodstein and Burke differentiate between ‘fine-tuning’ and ‘fundamental, large-scale change in the organization’s strategy and culture’.
- Barczak, Smith, and Wilemon differentiate between ‘adaptive, incremental change’ and ‘large-scale change’.
- Beckhard and Pritchard differentiate between ‘incremental’ change strategies and ‘fundamental’ change strategies.

In this new era of OD, *culture* plays a vital role. Attempt is made to define, measure, and change organizational culture in a sophisticated way. Schein has written a lot about culture. He has devised interventions to help leaders and employees to identify those cultural assumptions that assist the organization in attaining its goals and those that hinder goal attainment. This 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.
In the second generation OD, **Learning Organization** takes an important place. The works of Argyris, Argyris and Schon, 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 organization members, or "master programmes in their heads that tell them how to deal with embarrassment and threat". Senge has written extensively about the importance of systems thinking in organizations, and about the learning disabilities that plague organizations. He conducted workshops to create awareness about these disabilities and to develop different ways of thinking about complex problems.

In the new era of OD there is a widening and deepening interest in **teams**, especially what are called high-performance teams, cross-functional teams, and self-managed teams. This interest has increased mainly due to pressure on organizations to improve quality, to become more flexible, to reduce layers of management and to enhance employee morale. Laboratory training methods have been proved to be useful in training team members in effective membership and leadership behaviors, and in training supervisors and managers in the arts of delegation and empowerment.

The second-generation OD has taken interest in **Total Quality Management (TQM)**. Ciampa has acknowledged the pioneering contributions of Joseph Juran, W.Edwards Deming, and Armand Feigenbaum to the development of TQM and given a clear statement on the relationship between TQM and OD. Burke has also said about the contribution OD can make to TQM efforts. It has also given more emphasis on **Visioning** and **Future Search Conferences**. Senge has given emphasis on sharing the organization vision by linking it with the personal vision of people through out the organization. Eric Trist and Fred Emery have developed future search conferences.

The proponents of OD have given stress on improving the effectiveness of **large meetings**. In recent years, Marvin Weisbord and others have written about the importance of OD consultants in "getting the whole system in the room".
Other areas of interest in the second generation OD are: the development of Diversity Awareness Workshops; Socio-technical Systems Design; OD application to Quality of Work Life (QWL) programmes; development of congruent Reward Systems; research on Action Research and Process Consultation; Organizational Spirituality; workshops on Appreciative Inquiry; and Business Process Re-engineering (BPR).

Models and Theories of Planned Change:

Model by Kurt Lewin (1890-1947):

One of his favorite sayings is: "If you want truly to understand something, try to change it".

Kurt Lewin introduced two ideas about change that have been influential since 1940s. These are as follows:

**Force Field Analysis:**

Force Field Analysis is a management technique developed by Kurt Lewin, a pioneer in the field of social sciences, for diagnosing situations. It is useful when looking at the variables involved in planning and implementing a change programme and is undoubtedly be of use in team building projects, when attempting to overcome resistance to change. Lewin assumed that in any situation there are both driving and restraining forces that influence any change that may occur.

**Driving Forces**

Driving forces are those forces affecting a situation that are pushing in a particular direction; they tend to initiate a change and keep it going. In terms of improving productivity in a work group, pressure from a supervisor, incentive earnings, and competition may be examples of driving forces.

**Restraining Forces**

Restraining forces are forces acting to restrain or decrease the driving forces. Apathy, hostility, and poor maintenance of equipment may be examples
of restraining forces against increased production. Equilibrium is reached when the sum of the driving forces equals the sum of the restraining forces. In the above example, equilibrium represents the present level of productivity, as shown in Figure 2.1 below.

**Figure 2.1 : Force Field Analysis Model**

Equilibrium

This equilibrium, or present level of productivity, can be raised or lowered by changes in the relationship between the driving and the restraining forces.

A Three Stage Model of Change:

Kurt Lewin proposed that change is a three stage process: Unfreezing the old behavior (or situation), Moving to a new level of behavior, and Refreezing the behavior at the new level, as shown in Figure 2.2 below. Change entails moving from one equilibrium point to another.
Figure 2.2 : Lewin’s Three-Stage Model of Change

Lewin’s model is a powerful tool for understanding change situations. Edgar Schien took this idea and improved it by specifying the psychological mechanism involved in each stage as described below:

**Unfreezing**
- Creating motivation and readiness to change through disconfirmation, creation of guilt or anxiety, and provision of psychological safety.

**Moving/Changing through Cognitive Restructuring**
- Helping the client to see things, judge things, feel things and react to things differently based on a new point of view obtained through identifying with a new role model and scanning the environment for new relevant information.

**Refreezing**
- Helping the client to integrate the new point of view into the total personality and self-concept and significant relationships.

**Model by Ronald Lippit, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley:**
- Ronald Lippit, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley expanded Lewin’s three stage model into a seven-stage model representing the consulting process, which is as follows:

_phase 1:_ Developing a need for change. This stage corresponds to Lewin’s Unfreezing Phase.

_phase 2:_ Establishing a change relationship.
Phase 3: Clarifying or diagnosing the client system's problem.
Phase 4: Examining alternative routes and goals; establishing goals and intention of action.
Phase 5: Transforming intentions into actual change efforts. Phases 3, 4 and 5 correspond to Lewin's Moving phase.
Phase 6: Generalizing and stabilizing change. This phase has resemblance with Lewin's Refreezing phase.
Phase 7: Achieving a terminal relationship, that is terminating the client-consultant relationship.

**Action Research Model:**

Action research is known by many other names, including participatory research, collaborative inquiry, emancipatory research, action learning, and contextual action research, but all are variations on a theme. Put simply, action research is "learning by doing" - a group of people identify a problem, do something to resolve it, see how successful their efforts were, and if not satisfied, try again. While this is the essence of the approach, there are other key attributes of action research that differentiate it from common problem-solving activities that we all engage in every day. A more succinct definition is, "Action research...aims to contribute both to the practical concerns of people in an immediate problematic situation and to further the goals of social science simultaneously. Thus, there is a dual commitment in action research to study a system and concurrently to collaborate with members of the system in changing it in what is together regarded as a desirable direction. Accomplishing this twin goal requires the active collaboration of researcher and client, and thus it stresses the importance of co-learning as a primary aspect of the research process."

Action research is used in real situations, rather than in contrived, experimental studies, since its primary focus is on solving real problems. It can, however, be used by social scientists for preliminary or pilot research, especially when the situation is too ambiguous to frame a precise research question. Mostly, though, in accordance with its principles, it is chosen when
circumstances require flexibility, the involvement of the people in the research, or change must take place quickly or holistically.

Kurt Lewin is generally credited as the person who coined the term “action research” in his 1946 paper “Action Research and Minority Problems”.

The research needed for social practice can best be characterized as research for social management or social engineering. It is a type of action-research, a comparative research on the conditions and effects of various forms of social action, and research leading to social action. Research that produces nothing but books will not suffice (Lewin, 1946).

His approach involved a spiral of steps, “each of which is composed of a circle of planning, action and fact-finding about the result of the action”. The basic cycle involves is depicted in Figure 2.3 below.

**Figure 2.3 : Lewin's Cycle of Action Research**

**Description of the Initial Cycle**

The first step is to examine the idea carefully in the light of the means available. Frequently more fact-finding about the situation is required. If this first period of planning is successful, two items emerge: namely, “an overall plan” of
how to reach the objective and secondly, a decision in regard to the first step of action. Usually this planning has also somewhat modified the original idea.

The next step is "composed of a circle of planning, executing, and reconnaissance or fact finding for the purpose of evaluating the results of the second step, and preparing the rational basis for planning the third step, and for perhaps modifying again the overall plan". What we can see here is an approach to research that is oriented to problem-solving in social and organizational settings, and that has a form that parallels, Dewey's conception of learning from experience.

Eric Trist, another major contributor to the field from that immediate post-war era, was a social psychiatrist whose group at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London engaged in applied social research, initially for the civil repatriation of German prisoners of war. He and his colleagues tended to focus more on large-scale, multi-organizational problems.

Both Lewin and Trist applied their research to systemic change in and between organizations. They emphasized direct professional - client collaboration and affirmed the role of group relations as basis for problem-solving. Both were avid proponents of the principle that decisions are best implemented by those who help to make them.

Figure 2.4 describes the use of action research as a generic process in organization development. The process is iterative and cyclical. The key aspects of the model are diagnosis, data gathering, feedback to the client group, data discussion and work by the client group, action planning, and action. The sequence tends to be cyclical, with the focus on new or advanced problems as the client group learns to work more effectively together.
Figure 2.4: An Action Research Model


**Current Types of Action Research**

By the mid-1970s, the field was evolved, revealing 4 main ‘streams’ that had emerged: traditional, contextural (action learning), radical, and educational action research:

**Traditional Action Research**

Traditional Action Research stemmed from Lewin’s work within organizations and encompassed the concepts and practices of Field Theory, Group Dynamics, T-Groups, and the Clinical Model. The growing importance of labor-management relations led to the application of action research in the areas of Organization Development, Quality of Working Life (QWL), Socio-
technical systems (e.g., Information Systems), and Organizational Democracy. This traditional approach tended toward the conservative, generally maintaining the status quo with regards to organizational power structures.

**Contextural Action Research (Action Learning)**

Contextural Action Research, also sometimes referred to as Action Learning, is an approach derived from Trist's work on relations between organizations. It is contextual, insofar as it entails reconstituting the structural relations among actors in a social environment; domain-based, in that it tries to involve all affected parties and stakeholders; holographic, as each participant understands the working of the whole; and it stresses that participants act as project designers and co-researchers. The concept of organizational ecology, and the use of search conferences come out of contextural action research, which is more of a liberal philosophy, with social transformation occurring by consensus and normative incrementalism.

**Radical Action Research**

The Radical stream, which has its roots in Marxian 'dialectical materialism' and the praxis orientations of Antonio Gramsci, has a strong focus on emancipation and the overcoming of power imbalances. Participatory Action Research, often found in liberationist movements and international development circles, and Feminist Action Research both strive for social transformation via an advocacy process to strengthen peripheral groups in society.

**Educational Action Research**

A fourth stream, that of Educational Action Research, has its foundations in the writings of John Dewey, the great American educational philosopher of the 1920s and 30s, who believed that professional educators should become involved in community problem-solving. Its practitioners, not surprisingly, operate mainly out of educational institutions, and focus on development of curriculum, professional development, and applying learning in a social context.
It is often the case that university-based action researchers work with primary and secondary school teachers and students on community projects.

Both action research and OD are variants of applied behavioral science. They are both action oriented and data based. They both call for close collaboration between insider and outsider. They are both problem-solving social interventions. A sound organization development programme rests on an action research model.

**H.J. Leavitt’s Model (1964):**

Leavitt's model focuses on the interactive nature of the various sub-systems in a change process. Organization is a system of four interacting sub-system: task, structure, people and technology. Change in anyone of the sub-systems tends to have consequences for the other sub-systems. Hence OD effort should not only focus on the intended change but also the effects of change on the other sub-systems. Change can be brought out in any of the sub-systems depending upon the diagnosis of the situation. The planned change may be interpersonal training of the required sort or technological change or structural modification or task modification. Figure 2.5 depicts the model.

*Figure 2.5 : H.J Leavitt’s Model (Four Interacting Sub-Systems)*

Model by Ralph Kilmann (1972):

According to him change has five-sequential stages like; (1) Initiating the programme, (2) Diagnosing the problems, (3) Scheduling the tracks, 4. Implementing the tracks and 5. Evaluating the results.

Scheduling and implementing the tracks involve intervening in five critical leverage points, called tracks, that when function properly, cause the organization to be successful. Kilmann's five tracks are the culture track, the management skills track, the team-building track, the strategy-structure track, and the reward system track. Interventions include training programmes, problem-solving sessions, critique of current practices and procedures etc.

Model by Jerry I. Porras and Peter J. Robertson (1987):

The basic premise of this model is that OD interventions alter features of the work setting causing changes in individuals' behaviors, which in turn lead to individual and organizational improvements. Organizational change occurs only when individuals change their behavior, and these behavior changes occur when elements of the work setting have been modified by OD interventions. The work setting plays a vital role in this model. It consists of four factors: organizing arrangements, social factors, physical setting, and technology, as shown in the figure.

This model shows how OD interventions can be linked to factors in work setting. For example, OD interventions that focus on goals, strategies, and rewards affect organizing arrangements and so on. OD interventions that focus on culture, management style, and interaction processes affect social factors. OD interventions that focus on physical ambience, interior design affect physical setting. Interventions that focus on job design and workflow design affect technology. Figure 2.6 shows Stream Organizational Model and work setting in the larger organizational framework.
Figure 2.6: Stream Organizational Model and Organizational Work Setting Factors

Model by Warner Burke and Gorge Litwin (1992):

This model examines organizational change and performance. It provides a link between an assessment of the wider institutional context and the nature and process of change within an organization. It makes the following key points:

- The external environment is the most powerful driver for organizational change.

- Changes in the external environment lead to significant changes within an organization – its mission and strategy, its organizational culture and its leadership.

- Changes in these key factors lead to other changes within an organization – changes in structure, systems and management practices. These are more operational factors and changes in them may or may not have an organization-wide impact.

- Together these changes affect motivation, which in turn have an impact upon individual and organizational performance.

- There is a feedback loop: the organizational performance can directly affect
  - the external environment.

- The model describes 12 organizational variables (incorporating the 7 variables of the 7-S Framework by Pascale and Athos) and the relationships between them, as shown in Figure 2.7. Each of the variables interacts and a change in any one of them can eventually have an impact upon the others. This is useful in explaining not only how organizations perform, but also how they can be changed.
The model speaks how to create first-order change and second-order change (otherwise called as transactional change and transformational change). In first-order change, some features of the organization change, i.e. structure, management practices, and systems (policies and procedures). These are components of organizational climate. OD interventions directed toward the
above components result in first-order change. The bottom-half (green boxes) of the above figure displays the factors involved in transactional change. Transactional leadership is required for causing this type of change.

In second-order change the nature of the organization is fundamentally and substantially altered—the organization is transformed. These are changes in organization’s mission and strategy, leadership, and organization culture. OD interventions directed towards the above components result in second-order change. The top half (yellow boxes) the above figure displays the factors involved in transformational change. Transformational leadership is required for bringing this type of change.

The OD practitioners size up the change situation, determines the kind of change required (transactional or transformational), and then targets interventions toward factors of the organization that produce the desired change.

**Systems Theory:**

A second foundation of OD is systems theory, which views organizations as open systems in active exchange with their environments. Ludwig von Bertalanffy first articulated the principle of general systems theory in 1950, and Karz and Kahn were the first to apply open systems theory to organizations in 1966. Systems theory is one of the most important conceptual tools available for understanding the dynamics of organizations and organizational change. Several authors have defined system in different ways. For example according to Ludwig von Bertalanffy “system is a set of elements standing in interaction”. According to Kast and Rosenzweig “system is an organized, unitary whole composed of two or more interdependent parts, components, or subsystems and delineated by identifiable boundaries from its environmental suprasystem”. In total system denotes interdependency, interconnectedness, and interrelatedness among elements in a set that constitutes an identifiable whole or gestalt.
Organizations are open systems. Hence study of open system is required to have a good understanding of the organization.

The Various Nature of Open Systems as Given by Katz, Kahn and Hanna
1. All open systems are input-throughput-output mechanisms.
2. Every system is delineated by a boundary. What is inside the boundary is the System and what is outside the boundary is the environment.
3. Open systems have purposes and goals, the reasons for their existence.
4. Information is important to systems in many ways. Feedback is information from the environment about system performance.
5. There is a steady state or dynamic homeostasis.
6. Equifinality- systems have multiple paths to goals.

Congruence among System Elements
David Nadler and Associates at Delta Consulting Group developed the congruence model for understanding organizational dynamics and change. It is an important diagnostic tool. This model depicts the organization as an input-throughput-output system.

The three major input factors are environment, resources, and history.

Outputs are performance at the total organization level, unit/group level, and individual level.

Elements of the organization are strategy, work, people, formal organization, and informal organization.

The congruence model's value is an analytical tool for assessing the characteristics and functioning of each of the elements and evaluating the 'goodness of fit'. There should be harmony among the system's elements, so that the organization can produce satisfactory outputs. System models are essential for the practice of OD. Figure 2.8 explained the congruence model showing the organization as a system.
Socio-Technical Systems Theory and Open Systems Planning:

Socio-Technical Systems theory and Open System Planning are two major variations of open systems theory. These two play very important role in OD.

The term Socio-Technical Systems (or STS) is largely associated with experiments done by Eric Trist, Fred Emery, and others that emerged under the auspices of the Travistock Institute in Great Britain. According to this all organizations have two interdependent systems, a social system and a technical system and changes in one system affect the other system. According to Cumming and Worly the premises of STS theory are: "effective work systems must jointly optimize the relationship between their social and technical parts" and "such systems must effectively manage the boundary separating and relating them to the environment" in such a way that effective exchanges occur with the environment along with protection from external disruptions. A number
of design principles have been developed to implement STS theory. These principles are optimizing the social and technical systems, forming autonomous work groups, training group members in multiple skills, giving information and feedback to the people doing the work, and identifying core tasks.

Open Systems Planning is one of the important applications of systems theory in OD. It entails scanning the environment to determine the expectations of external organizations and stakeholders, developing scenarios of possible futures, both realistic and ideal, and developing action plans to ensure that a desirable future occurs.

**Open Systems Thinking**

According to Peter Senge, open system thinking is required for creating learning organizations, which cope effectively with rapidly changing environmental demand. He said that there are five disciplines that must be mastered to create a learning organization. These are personal mastery, mental models, building shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking.

**OD Interventions’ Uses and Effectiveness**

An important part of managing an OD programme well is to execute each phase well. Warne Burke describes the following phases of OD programmes: 1) Entry, 2) Contracting, 3) Diagnosis, 4) Feedback, 5) Planning Change, 6) Intervention, and 7) Evaluation.

An OD intervention is a “set of structured activities in which selected organizational units (target groups or individuals) engage with a task or a sequence of tasks where the task goals are related directly or indirectly to organizational improvement”. There are differences between OD interventions and traditional interventions.

Under the basis of primary target of the intervention, OD interventions are classified as follows:
Individuals:

Life-and Career-Planning Activities, Coaching and Counseling, T-group (Sensitivity Training), Education and Training, Grid OD Phase-1, Work Redesign, Gestalt OD, and Behavior Modeling.

Dyads/Triads:

Process Consultation, Third-Party Peacemaking, Role Negotiation Technique, and Gestalt OD.

Teams and Groups:


Inter-group Relations:

Inter-group Activities (Process Directed and Task Directed), Organizational Mirroring, Partnering, Process Consultation, Third-Party Peacemaking at Group Level, Grid OD Phase 3, and Survey Feedback.

Total Organization:


These classification schemes are intended to help to understand the range and uses of OD interventions.

Interventions for Individuals:

A number of OD intervention techniques are used to improve individual's skills, abilities, and knowledge to make them more effective. These are as follows:
Life-and Career Planning Activities:

Edgar Schein at MIT has identified eight themes and has shown that people prioritize preferences for these. For example a person with a primary theme of Security/Stability seeks secure and stable employment over, say, employment that is challenging and riskier. People tend to stay anchored in one area and their careers do echo this in many ways.

**Technical/Functional Competence**

This kind of people like being good at something and work to become a guru or expert. They like to be challenged and then use their skill to meet the challenge, doing the job properly and better than almost anyone else.

**General Managerial Competence**

Unlike technical/functional people, these folks want to be managers (and not just to get more money, although this may be used as a metric of success). They like problem-solving and dealing with other people. They thrive on responsibility. To be successful, they also need emotional competence.

**Autonomy/Independence**

These people have a primary need to work under their own rules and streams. They avoid standards and prefer to work alone.

**Security/Stability**

Security-focused people seek stability and continuity as a primary factor of their lives. They avoid risks and are generally 'lifers' in their job.

**Entrepreneurial Creativity**

These folks like to invent things, be creative and, most of all, to run their own businesses. They differ from those who seek autonomy in that they share the workload. They find ownership very important. They easily get bored. Wealth, for them, is a sign of success.
Service/Dedication to a Cause

Service-oriented people are driven by how they can help other people more than using their talents (which may fall in other areas). They may well work in public services or in such as HR.

Pure Challenge

People driven by challenge seek constant stimulation and difficult problems that they can tackle. Such people will change jobs when the current one gets boring and their career can be very varied.

Lifestyle

Those who are focused first on lifestyle look at their whole pattern of living. They not so much balance work and life as integrate it. They may even take long periods off work in which to indulge in passions such as sailing or travelling.

In his book, "Career Dynamics", Schein (1987) provides a "self-analysis form", a questionnaire that a person can use to provide information to help determine his or her own career anchor.

Herbert A. Shepard has developed many life goal exercises for career development of individuals.

Effective career planning and development requires a comprehensive programme integrating both corporate business objectives and employee career needs. As shown in Figure 2.9 below, this is accomplished through human resource planning aimed at developing and maintaining a workforce to meet business objectives.
Figure 2.9: Individual Career Planning and Human Resources Planning

Individual Career Planning

- Personal objectives and life plans
- Occupational and organizational choice
- Job assignment choice
- Performance and development planning and review
- Retirement

Human Resources Planning

- Business objectives and plans
- Ways to attract, recruit, and orient new talent to the firm
- Methods for matching individuals' interests and capabilities with job opportunities
- Ways to help people perform effectively and develop
- Ways for helping employees prepare for satisfying retirement

Source: Adapted from Business Horizon, vol. 16. Copyright © 1973 by the Foundation for the School of Business at Indiana University.

Life- and career planning activities may take one day, an entire week, or, when spread out a few hours at a time, several weeks. These activities involve generating data about oneself, analyzing the data both individually and in groups, and formulating clear goals and action plans for achieving them. These activities tend to be very meaningful for organization members who volunteer for the experience.

Pros:

- This is an excellent way for an organization or a manager to send a message that people are as important as tasks, capital equipment, or profits.
- It is an intervention that can truly be self-empowering.
• It builds stronger alignment between the individual and the organization.

• It unleashes new energy and potential for both the individual and the organization.

**Cons:**

• Some people may decide that their goals are not congruent with the organization and leave.

• If the client is doing this to manipulate individuals into early retirement or in some other direction they do not want to go, it will often backfire.

**Coaching and Mentoring:**

In their book *The 21st Century Supervisor*, Brad Humphrey and Jeff Stokes (2000) assert that "Coaching employees will be one of the supervisor's single greatest contributions to the organization!" (p. 86). They go on to identify coaching as one of the nine essential skills for organizational leaders. Edgar Schein has emphasized the OD consultant's role in coaching and counseling.

In 1969, coaching assumed a new level of importance when Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard introduced a management model entitled Situational Leadership. The model, represented in Figure 2.10, maintains that people (whether at work, or at home), are generally operate in one of four situational contexts. The key to effective personnel management, therefore, is effectively identify the context in which an individual is working, and to lead the person accordingly.

Blanchard and Hersey's second quadrant is entitled 'Coaching'. They believed that many people in the second situational quadrant (S2.) are operating with "Some Competence and Low Commitment." These individuals do not respond well to a directive management style, but they have not yet attained a level of competence and commitment that is required to apply "supporting" and "delegating" approach. The best approach, therefore, is coaching.
In practice, it is impossible to box people into one single quadrant. People are constantly and consistently shifting between quadrants of the situational leadership matrix. Take the example of an engineer who is being asked to lead an infrastructure project. Technically, he/she might have the commitment and competence that places him/her in the "delegating" quadrant. At the same time, however, he/she might lack confidence in his/her management, budgeting and facilitation skills. Consequently, his/her manager should clearly delegate with regard to technical issues and assume the role of coach on issues that concern management, budgeting and facilitation.

"So, what does a coach do"? In his book "Effective Coaching", Marshall Cook (1999) challenges readers to reflect on when they are first learning to ride a bike. As a parent, your role is to serve as a coach, "running beside the wobbling bike, shouting encouragement, your fist tightly clutching the handle bars and then gradually loosening your grip until finally, your heart in your throat, you let go, launching your child into the world." (p. 6)

The bicycle metaphor provides many useful insights into the role of a coach. Most importantly, we must continually recognize that coaching process is a relationship. It is only through working together that the coach and the individual (or team) can take an activity that at first seemed impossible, and make it become second nature. In this relationship, the coach provides the environment, support, feedback and encouragement. While the individual or team must be open and committed to change and improvement. The bicycle metaphor also points out that in an ideal world, successful coaches will keep creating situations where they are no longer needed. In its essence the coaching process is a relationship. Consequently, if somebody wants to identify
many of the attributes of a good coach, he/she should think of the qualities that describe a good friend or confidant: positive, supportive, trusting, observant, respectful, patient and assertive. Furthermore, it is also important that a coach be focused and clear.

To illustrate the attributes of a good coach, Marshall Cook (1999) developed a useful tool that compares and contrasts the traits of the archetypal "boss" with the ideal "coach."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Boss</th>
<th>The Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talks a lot</td>
<td>Listens a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells</td>
<td>Asks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixes</td>
<td>Prevents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumes</td>
<td>Explores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks Control</td>
<td>Seeks commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works on</td>
<td>Works with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts product first</td>
<td>Puts process first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants reasons</td>
<td>Seeks results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigns blame</td>
<td>Takes responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps distant</td>
<td>Makes contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list provides a useful profile of what an ideal coach would look like, but the question remains, "What is the work of a coach?" There is no single answer to this question, and numerous books, articles and workshops attempt to answer the question. In general, however, there are three principle themes that are repeatedly identified as central to the work of a coach.

1. Focus on Communication

As in all successful relationships, coaching requires a commitment to good communication. A good coaching session should have a clear purpose, have established ground rules, keep focused, be based on clear and simple communication, and depends on openness to new ideas. Furthermore, although there are many competing demands placed on a manager's time, effective coaching requires an open door policy. Exchanges should be positive in tone,
and special attention should be placed on modeling good behaviors and body
language.

2. Invest in Problem Identification

A frequently quoted adage states that the first step in getting
somewhere, is knowing where one wants to go. It is not uncommon for a
professional baseball coach or golf professional to review a player swing
hundreds or thousands of times. They recognize that effective problem
diagnosis is critical to improving performance. In a coaching relationship, this
diagnosis process should be carried out jointly.

Particularly important to effective diagnosis are listening skills. Coaches
must avoid the temptation of immediately rushing in and naming what they see
as the problem. Instead, should ensure that there are no distractions, should
avoid the temptation of leading the conversation, and coaches should practice
"active listening", a process through which the coach attempts to reflect the
thoughts and views back to the person being coached to ensure that he/she is
being correctly understood. A second skill set that is of particular importance to
effective coaches is the ability to develop good questions. Like a good
consultant, a coach must be able to develop the right questions that will help
you arrive at the objective of the coaching session.

3. Identify an Effective Problem Solving Strategy

As indicated earlier, effective coaches successful coaches keep creating
situations where they are no longer needed. It follows, therefore, that successful
coaches will not be spending their time checking up on or correcting workers.
Once again, Marshall Cook (1999) provides some simple, pragmatic insights
into solving problems by coaching. He prescribes a seven-step methodology for
coaching employees to solve problems. The methodology challenges the coach
and the person(s) being coached to "(1) define the opportunity (problems are
often opportunities in disguise), (2) define the goal, (3) create the action
statement, (4) create the action plan, (5) set the evaluation standard, (6) confirm
the understanding, and (7) plan the follow up."
It is important to establish monitoring systems and feedback systems to ensure that action plans are implemented. While coaching is a relationship, it is a relationship that should focus on achieving results, and follow up and evaluation are critical to ensuring that the relationship has the impact it aims to achieve.

While coaching by an employee's immediate superior usually focuses on job performance, mentoring is usually much broader and focuses on general career and personal development. The mentor role is usually filled by someone other than the immediate superior, and usually by a person of higher rank from outside the employee's department. Mentoring can be accomplished on a person-to-person basis, or the mentor can meet with a small group of four to six protégés, or in both group and one-and-one session. With the group approach, the group has the potential to evolve into a learning team whose members can coach each other. The OD consultant can provide valuable training, such as training in active listening or training in small-group process interventions, for example, for those involved in this process.

Mentoring, coaching, counseling, and consulting skills can be enhanced significantly by T-group experiences.

**Pros:**

- Coaching is not a therapy. It assumes that the client is healthy rather than suffering from some pathology.
- Coaching is future and action oriented rather than focusing on the past, as are many therapeutic models.

**Cons:**

- The limits of a coach's skills and abilities must be acknowledged.
- Sometimes people of the organization are unable to accept the coach.
T-Group:

**History**

In 1947, the National Training Laboratories Institute began in Bethel, ME. They pioneered the use of T-groups (Laboratory Training) in which the learners use here-and-now experience in the group, feedback among participants and theory on human behavior to explore group process and gain insights into themselves and others. The goal is to offer people options for their behavior in groups. The T-group is a great training innovation which provides the base for what we now know about team building. This is a new method that would help leaders and managers create a more humanistic, people serving system and allow leaders and managers to see how their behavior actually affected others. There is a strong value of concern for people and a desire to create systems that took people’s needs and feelings seriously.

**Objectives of T-Group Learning**

The T-Group is intended to provide the following opportunities:

- Increase individual’s understanding of group development and dynamics.
- Gaining a better understanding of the underlying social processes at work within a group.
- Increase individual’s skills in facilitating group effectiveness.
- Increase interpersonal skills.
- Experiment with changes in individual’s behavior.
- Increase individual’s awareness of his/her own feelings in the moment; and offer him/her the opportunity to accept responsibility for his/her feelings.
- Increase individual’s understanding of the impact of his/her behavior on others.
- Increase individual’s sensitivity to others’ feelings.
- Increase individual’s ability to give and receive feedback.
- Increase individual’s ability to learn from his/her own and a group’s experience.
- Increase individual’s ability to manage and utilize conflict.
Success in these goals depends, to a large extent, on the implied contract that each participant is willing to disclose feelings that she or he may have, in the moment, about others in the group, and to solicit feedback from the others about herself or himself. The focus is upon individual learning; some participants may learn a great deal in most of the above areas, others learn relatively little.

**Method**

One way of describing what may happen for a participant is -

1. Unfreezing habitual responses to situations -- this is facilitated by the participant's own desire to explore new ways of behaving and the trainer staying non-directive, silent, and providing little structure or task agenda.
2. Self generated and chosen change by the participant
   Experiment with new behaviors - Practice description not evaluation of
3. Reinforce new behavior by positive feedback, participants own assessment of whether what is happening is closer to what she/he intends, supportive environment, trust development

**Sources of Change in Groups**

- Self-observation - participants give more attention to their own intentions, feelings, etc.
- Feedback - participants receive information on the impact they have on others.
- Insight - participants expand self-knowledge.
- Self-disclosure - participants exposes more of themselves to others.
- Universality - participants experience that others share their difficulties, concerns or hopes.
- Group Cohesion - participants experience trust, acceptance and understanding.
- Hope - participants see others learn, achieve their goals, improve, and cope more effectively.
- Vicarious Learning - participants pick up skills and attitudes from others.
- Catharsis - participants experience a sense of release or breakthrough.
A **Description**

The T-group provides participants with an opportunity to learn about themselves, their impact on others and how to function more effectively in group and interpersonal situations. It facilitates this learning by bringing together a small group of people for the express purpose of studying their own behavior when they interact within a small group.

A T-Group is not a group discussion or a problem solving group.

The group’s work is primarily process rather than content oriented. The focus tends to be on the feelings and the communication of feelings, rather than on the communication of information, opinions, or concepts. This is accomplished by focusing on the 'here and now' behavior in the group. Attention is paid to particular behaviors of participants not on the "whole person", feedback is non-evaluative and reports on the impact of the behavior on others. The participant has the opportunity to become a more authentic self in relation to others through self disclosure and receiving feedback from others. The Johari-Window is a model that looks at that process.

The training is not structured in the manner one might experience in an academic programme or a meeting with an agenda or a team with a task to accomplish. The lack of structure and limited involvement of the trainers provides space for the participants to decide what they want to talk about. No one tells them what they ought to talk about. The lack of direction results in certain characteristic responses; participants are silent or aggressive or struggle to start discussions or attempt to structure the group.

In the beginning of a T-Group participants are usually focused on what they experience as a need for structure, individual emotional safety, predictability, and something to do in common. These needs are what amount to the tip of the iceberg in most groups in their back home situation. By not filling the group's time with answers to these needs, the T-Group eventually begins to notice what is under the tip of the iceberg. It is what is always there in any group but often unseen and not responsibly engaged. So, participants experience anxiety about authority and power, being include and accepted in the group, and intimacy.
Depending on forces, such as, the dynamics of the group, the past experience and competence of participants, and the skill of the trainers -- the group, to some extent, usually develops a sense of itself as a group, with feelings of group loyalty. This can cause groups to resist learning opportunities if they are seen as threatening to the group's self-image. It also provides some of the climate of trust, support and permission needed for individuals to try new behavior.

As an individual participant begins to experience some degree of trust (in themselves, the group and the trainers) several things become possible -

- The participant may notice that his/her feelings and judgments about the behavior of others are not always shared by others. That what he/she found supportive or threatening was not experience in that way by others in the group. That how one responded to authority, acceptance and affection issues different from that of others (more related to ones family of origin than to what is happening in the group). Individual differences emerge in how experiences are understood.

- The participant may begin to try on new behavior. For example, someone who has always felt a need to fill silence with noise and activity tries being quieter and still.

- Participants begin to ask for feedback from the group about how their behavior is impacting others.

- Participants may find that they are really rather independent and have a relatively low level of anxiety about what is happening in the group. They will exhibit a broader range of behavior and emotions during the life of the group. In fact their leadership is part of what helps the group develop.

The Role of the Trainers

- To help the group and individuals analyze and learn from what is happening in the group. The trainer may draw attention to events and behavior in the group and invite the group to look at its experience. At times the trainer may offer tentative interpretations.

- To offer theory, a model or research that seems related to what the group is looking at.
• To encourage the group to follow norms that tend to serve the learning process, e.g., focusing on "here and now" rather than the "then and there".
• To offer training and coaching in skills that tend to help the learning process, e.g., feedback skills, EiAG, etc.
• To not offer structure or an agenda. To remain silent, allowing the group to experience its anxiety about acceptance, influence, etc.
• To be willing to disclose oneself, to be open with the group. On occasion being willing to offer feedback and challenge a participant.
• To avoid becoming too directive, clinical, or personally involved.

Pros:

• People can learn invaluable lessons about how they handle interpersonal relations with others.
• Individuals learn a great deal about group dynamics, handling conflict, collaboration, competition, leadership styles, blind spots, hidden agendas, etc.
• Participants can learn a great deal about listening skills and how to process and respond to feedback from others.

Possible Problems:

• T-Group methods usually encourage self-disclosure and openness, which may be inappropriate or even punished in organizations. This was an early learning. When managers thought they could take the T-group method into the back home organization, they discovered that the methods and the assumptions of a T-group did not fit. T-groups consisted of participants who were strangers. They didn't have a history or a future together and could more easily focus on here and now behavior. Another issue was that in the organization there were objectives, deadlines and schedules related to accomplishing the work of the company or group. Groups with a task to accomplish could not take the same time that would be used in a T-Group. These difficulties helped led to the development of Organization Development and team building. What had been learned in T-Groups was combined with other knowledge and these new disciplines emerged as ways to address the values raised by the T-Group experience.
The T-Group experience can open up a web of questioning in a participant. Ways of behaving that the person has used for many years may be called into question by others in the group and oneself. This has in some cases brought the participant to question relationships in the family or at work. While this can be a very constructive process that leads to the renewal of relationships, sometimes also leads to the breakdown of a relationship. While such a breakdown may have, in time, come to the relationship without participation in a T-Group, it remains a painful and possibly damaging experience.

Participants being forced or pressured to attend, by an employer or other person with influence, are on the whole less likely to have a positive learning experience. Employers or others who want to require the participation of others may enhance the chance of having a productive outcome if -- they attend a lab themselves before sending others; they speak with the lab coordinator before the event to discuss what might realistically be expected and what the leader could do to assist in the learning process when the participant returns home.

Very rarely there have been situations in which a participant has a psychiatric problem. One report said "The possibility of negative psychiatric effects of ST, and especially its role in inducing psychiatric symptoms, is yet to be clarified." This reinforces the value of participation based on intrinsic motivation; a norm that discourages people in therapy from attending without the approval of their therapist; and trainers staying focused on the learning areas suited for T-Group experiences.

The Managerial GRID:

Robert R. Blake and Jane S Mouton worked together at the Psychology Department of the University of Texas during 1950s and 1960s. They are known primarily for the development of 'Managerial Grid' as a framework for understanding managerial behavior. They subsequently set up a company, Scientific Methods Inc., to disseminate their ideas on organization development and management effectiveness.
Blake and Mouton set out to apply the ideas of behavioral scientists such as Rensis Likert to the practice of management. They built on studies conducted at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan in the 1940s which attempted to identify the behavioral characteristics of successful leaders. Blake and Mouton identified two fundamental drivers of managerial behavior as concern for getting the job done, and concern for the people doing the work. They argued that, on the one hand, an exclusive concern for production at the expense of the needs of those engaged in production leads to dissatisfaction and conflict, thus adversely affecting performance, but that on the other hand, an excessive concern to avoid conflict and maintain good relationships is also detrimental to the achievement of goals and objectives.

In order to provide a framework for describing management behaviors, the two variables of 'concern for production' and 'concern for people' are plotted on a grid showing nine degrees of concern for each from 1 indicating a low level of concern, to 9 indicating a high level of concern. Five positions on the grid represent five differing managerial behavior patterns as shown in Figure 2.11.

**Figure 2.11: The Leadership Grid (Previously the Management Grid)**
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The bottom right corner of the Grid represents a 9,1 style of management—maximum concern for the efficient accomplishment of tasks, but minimum concern for human relationships. This pattern corresponds to the traditional authority-based style of command and control management. The 1,9 position at the top left, in contrast focuses on human relations at the cost of efficient production, and has been called the country-club style of management. 1,1—minimum concern for either production or people—is characterized by desire to avoid responsibility and exert minimum effort. The 5,5 manager attempts to make a balance between both concerns, but 9,9 management which integrates maximum attention to both people and production is put forward as the most effective approach.

As a further refinement to Grid theory, additional managerial styles, combining two or more of the basic styles are identified. For example paternalism is defined as 9, 1-1, 9 management where the manager swings between two extremes. There is a need to control and dominate and resistance is met with reprimand. At the other extreme compliance is reinforced with recognition and appreciation.

GRID OD:
While the Managerial Grid is considered useful in helping manager to understand their own behavior patterns it was recognized that only so much could be achieved through individual management development, and that problems are needed to be addressed at the work group and organizational level. Consequently Grid theory was used as a starting point for the development of organization development programmes designed to enhance managerial effectiveness, resolve conflict, and develop team work within the organization. The programmes follow a six phase approach:

1. Grid seminar.
2. Team development.
3. Inter-group development.
4. Goal setting and strategy development
5. Implementation
The Grid seminar generates awareness on how personal behaviors have an impact on others in the work place. Participants learn and practice specific skills in teams and engaged in a structured critique that measures activity results on several levels. The skills are commonsense ones in any work place and include, for example, the best way to take initiative, resolve conflict, or make sound decisions. Participants use Grid theory to clarify personal values and attitude regarding behavior, and then work in teams to complete structured activities under time and performance pressure. The seminar is over 90 percent experimental, placing the responsibility for learning, practice, and change into the hands of the participants. This level of team involvement and responsibility is found to make the learning effective and lasting.

Phase two and phase three focus on problem solving and conflict resolution, both within and between work groups. A major concern is to enable the teams to develop the ability to work together towards a common goal in a synergistic way. In phase four the focus moves to reaching agreement on broader, organization-wide goals. Planned changes are implemented in phase five and in the final phase progress is monitored, to ensure that the changes continue in the workplace, and are consolidated and stabilized. This programme is applied throughout the organization at all levels, and in large organization the process may take three to five years to complete. In the course of the programme the focus moves from the behavior of individual managers to the effectiveness of work groups and teams, and the involvement of the whole organization. For individuals GRID OD phase 1 is required.

Blake and Mouton also developed their own theories on how best to teach Grid theories and concepts in the work group context. These are described in the book Synorgogy published in 1984. The term Synorgogy was coined by Blake and Mouton, and describes a systematic approach to learning that leads team members to learn from each other in a cooperative and participative way. Synorgogy is defined as working together for shared teaching. Four Synorgogic learning designs were developed to provide a structure for the process of learning. The “Team Effectiveness Design” and the “Team Member Teaching Design” relate to the acquisition of knowledge. The “Performance Judging
Design" relates to the development of skills. Lastly the "Clarifying Attitude Design" concerns awareness and development of appropriate attitudes. Techniques include implied individual preparation, presentations and multiple choices, and true/false tests and team discussion. The role of the learning administrator is limited to making sure that the learning design is effectively implemented. These methods were first used by Blake and Mouton to teach university courses but were later adopted to work place training sessions.

In Perspectives

The Grid is regarded as one of the first attempts to define appropriate management behavior. It focuses on human behavioral processes rather than technological and structural aspects of organizations. The concept has helped the managers to gain acceptance and the influence is substantial in Europe, Asia, and North America. The development and promotion of Grid seminars represents a key stage in the history of promoting management ideas, and is a prime example of role packaging and branding. Scientific Methods Inc. successfully segmented the market for organization development with the application of the Grid principles in a variety of sectors.

The positive side of this intervention is that it gives a pathway to team effectiveness and improve people’s attitudes and behavior throughout an entire organization to the benefit of the organization. The negative side is that it lacks empirical evidence.

Work Redesign:

Hackman and Oldham (1980) have provided an OD approach to work redesign based on a theoretical model of what job characteristics lead to the psychological states that produce what they call 'high internal work motivation'. Their approach has OD characteristics in its use of diagnosis, participation, and feedback and particularly in applications to the redesign of group work where extensive use of the facilitator role in team development is recommended. According to them organizations analyze jobs using five core job characteristics as shown in Figure 2.12. These are:
Skill Variety (SV): The degree to which the job requires a variety of different activities so that the worker can use a number of different skills and talent.

Task Identity (TI): The degree to which the job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work.

Task Significance (TS): The degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of others.

Autonomy (A): The degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining procedures to be used in carrying it out.

Feedback (F): The degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job results in the individual obtaining direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his or her performance.

The first three are related to "experienced meaningfulness of the work". Job autonomy is related to "experienced responsibility for the outcomes of the work". Feedback from the job is related to the psychological state of "knowledge of the results of the work activities". The expected outcomes, in turn, are high work motivation, high satisfaction with the job and with one's growth on the job, and high work effectiveness. As shown in the figure some factors can minimize these outcomes. One factor is knowledge and skill. Deficiencies in either can lead to less than desirable performance and a sense of failure. Another moderating factor is the strength of a person's need to learn and develop. If this need is low, the presence of the core job characteristics is less likely to lead to high motivation and job satisfaction. A third factor is satisfaction with the context of the job. Dissatisfaction with such matters as pay, job security, co-workers, or supervision is likely to minimize the otherwise favorable consequences of designing more complex and challenging jobs.
The core dimensions can be combined into a single predictive index, called the Motivating Potential Score (MPS). It is calculated as follows:

\[ MPS = \left( \frac{SV + TI + TS}{A \times F \times 3} \right) \]

Jobs that are high on MPS must be high on at least one of the three factors that lead to experienced meaningfulness, and they must be high on both autonomy and feedback. If jobs score high on motivating potential, the model predicts that motivation, performance, and satisfaction are positively affected, whereas the likelihood of absence and turnover are lessened.
Gestalt OD:

It is a form of team building that focuses more on the individual than on the group. The major advocate of this orientation is Stanley M.Herman, a management and OD consultant. The approach rests on a form of psychotherapy developed by Frederick S. ‘Fritz’ Perls called Gestalt Therapy. This therapy is based on the belief that persons function as whole, total organisms. Each person possesses positive and negative characteristics that must be ‘owned up to’ and permitted expression. People get into trouble when they get fragmented, when they don’t accept their total selves, and when they are trying to live up to the demands of others rather than being themselves.

According to Robert Harman the goals of gestalt therapy are awareness, integration, maturation, authenticity, self-regulation, and behavior change.

Stanley Herman applies a Gestalt orientation to organization development, especially in working with leader-subordinate relations and team building. The primary objective is to make the individual stronger, more authentic and more in touch with the individual’s own feelings; and building a better team. But these are not the primary desired outcome.

The Gestalt OD practitioner fosters the expression of positive and negative feelings, encourages people to stay with transactions, structures exercises that cause individuals to become more aware of what they want from others, and pushes toward greater authenticity for everyone. He often works within a group setting, but the focus is usually on individuals.

The positive aspect of this intervention is its attempt to make the individual better functioning. The negative aspect is people might not choose to expose themselves. They may believe that they are being coerced into a therapeutic situation that they would prefer to avoid.

Behavior Modeling:

Behavior Modeling is a training technique designed to improve interpersonal competence, leading to better interpersonal relationships in the
organization. Based on Albert Bandura’s Social Learning Theory and utilizing procedures developed by Goldstein and Sorcher, behavior modeling has been shown to be an excellent way to make first-line supervisors more effective (Latham and Saari) and to improve organizational performance (Porras et al.).

Social learning theory focuses on the learning that occurs within a social context. It considers that people learn from one another, including such concepts as observational learning, imitation, and modeling. Among others Albert Bandura is considered the leading proponent of this theory.

**General Principles of Social Learning Theory**

1. People can learn by observing the behavior of others and the outcomes of those behaviors.

2. Learning can occur without a change in behavior. Behaviorists say that learning has to be represented by a permanent change in behavior; in contrast social learning theorists say that because people can learn through observation alone, their learning may not necessarily be shown in their performance. Learning may or may not result in a behavior change.

3. Cognition plays a role in learning. Over the last 30 years social learning theory has become increasingly cognitive in its interpretation of human learning. Awareness and expectations of future reinforcements or punishments can have a major effect on the behaviors that people exhibit.

4. Social learning theory can be considered a bridge or a transition between behaviorist learning theories and cognitive learning theories.

**How the Environment Reinforces and Punishes Modeling**

People are often reinforced for modeling the behavior of others. Bandura suggested that the environment also reinforces modeling. This is in several possible ways:
1. The observer is reinforced by the model. For example, a student who changes dress to fit in with a certain group of students has a strong likelihood of being accepted and thus reinforced by that group.

2. The observer is reinforced by a third person. The observer might be modeling the actions of someone else, for example, an outstanding class leader or student. The teacher notices this and compliments and praises the observer for modeling such behavior thus reinforcing that behavior.

3. The imitated behavior itself leads to reinforcing consequences. Many behaviors that we learn from others produce satisfying or reinforcing results.

4. Consequences of the model’s behavior affect the observer’s behavior vicariously. This is known as vicarious reinforcement. This is where in the model is reinforced for a response and then the observer shows an increase in that same response. Bandura illustrated this by having students watch a film of a model hitting an inflated clown doll. One group of children saw the model being praised for such action. Without being reinforced, the group of children began to also hit the doll.

**Behaviors that can be Learned through Modeling**

Many behaviors can be learned, at least partly, through modeling. Examples that can be cited are, students can watch parents read, students can watch the demonstrations of mathematics problems, or seen someone acting bravely and a fearful situation. Aggression can be learned through models. Much research indicates that children become more aggressive when they observed aggressive or violent models. Moral thinking and moral behavior are influenced by observation and modeling. This includes moral judgments regarding right and wrong which can in part, develop through modeling.

**Conditions Necessary for Effective Modeling to Occur**

Bandura has mentioned four conditions that are necessary before an individual can successfully model the behavior of someone else:

1. Attention: the person must first pay attention to the model.
2. Retention: the observer must be able to remember the behavior that has been observed. One way of increasing this is using the technique of rehearsal.

3. Motor reproduction: the third condition is the ability to replicate the behavior that the model has just demonstrated. This means that the observer has to be able to replicate the action, which could be a problem with a learner who is not ready developmentally to replicate the action. For example, little children have difficulty doing complex physical motion.

4. Motivation: the final necessary ingredient for modeling to occur is motivation, learners must want to demonstrate what they have learned. Since these four conditions vary among individuals, different people reproduce the same behavior differently.

**Effects of Modeling on Behavior**

- Modeling teaches new behaviors.
- Modeling influences the frequency of previously learned behaviors.
- Modeling may encourage previously forbidden behaviors.
- Modeling increases the frequency of similar behaviors. For example, a student might see a friend excel in basketball and he tries to excel in football because he is not tall enough for basketball.

**Self Efficacy**

People are more likely to engage in certain behaviors when they believe they are capable of executing those behaviors successfully. This means that they have high self-efficacy.

In general students typically have a good sense of what they can and cannot do; therefore they have fairly accurate opinions about their own self-efficacy. There are many factors which affect self efficacy. Some of these factors can be; previous successes and failures, messages received from others, and successes and failures of others.
Self Regulation

Self-regulation has come to be more emphasized in social learning theory. Self-regulation is when the individual has his own ideas about what is appropriate or inappropriate behavior and chooses actions accordingly. There are several aspects of self regulation:

Setting standards and goals

- Self observation
- Self judge
- Self reaction

Promoting self-regulation can be an important technique. This is usually done by teaching the individual to reward himself after doing the needed behavior. For example, a graduate student will tell himself to complete a certain chapter before taking a break and relaxing.

Self Instructions

An effective strategy is to teach learners to give themselves instructions that guide their behavior. There are five steps to achieve this goal:

- Cognitive modeling:
- Overt external guidance
- Overt self guidance
- Faded, overt self guidance
- Covert self instruction

Self Monitoring and Self Reinforcement

These are two ways that people can control their own behavior. First they monitor and observe their own behavior, sometimes even scoring behavior. Secondly, people are also able to change their behavior by reinforcing themselves, by giving and withholding reinforcement.

A simple problem-solving model underlies most behavior modeling training. Porras and Singh (1986) describe it as follows:
The problem-solving approach, a rather straightforward one consisting of three phases—problem identification, problem solving, and implementation, consisted of five behavioral skills:

- Behavior description: The ability to describe behavior of self or others in specific concrete terms and to avoid generalizations or inferences drawn from observed behaviors.
- Justification: The ability to clearly explain the impact of an observed behavior on the individual, the observer, or the organization.
- Active Listening: The ability to accurately reflect both content and feelings of an other’s communication.
- Participative Problem Solving: The ability to involve another, meaningfully and appropriately, in the process of solving a work-related problem.
- Positive Reinforcement: The ability to compliment another in sincere and authentic manner.

The Steps Involved in Behavior Modeling

- Determination of the most pressing problems facing a target group, say, first-line supervisors. These usually consist of such issues as counseling the poor performer, correcting absenteeism, encouraging the average performer, correcting unsafe work behavior, and so forth.
- Training modules for each of about ten problems are developed. At the training sessions the problem situation is announced and briefly discussed. Participants then observe a videotape in which a person (model) successfully solves the problem by enacting the specific behavioral skills.
- The trainees try to retain the behavioral skill.
- The trainees role play the situation receiving feedback from the group and the trainer on their performances. Role playing continues until each participant successfully masters all the specific skills. Participants then commit to practicing the new skills on the job in the coming week.
- At the beginning of the next session, participants report on how their new skills worked on the job. If necessary, additional practice is held to
ensure mastery of the skills. Then a new problem is addressed, the model is observed on videotape, and role-playing and feedback occur until all participants learn how to solve the new problem.

Interventions for Dyads/Triads:

The OD interventions available taking dyads/triads as the target group are as follows:

Process Consultation:

Process Consultation (PC) has its roots in the field of group dynamics developed by Kurt Lewin (1948). Derived from the concept of Action Research, process consultation is a technique for observation and intervention in group process with the objective of enhancing the effectiveness of its outcomes.

Professor Edgar Schein credited with the popularization of the term process consultation as well as its use as a consulting tool, viewed it as "a set of activities on the part of the consultant which help the client to perceive, understand, and act upon process events which occur in the client’s environment" (1969). According to Schein (1969), the paramount goal of process consultation is "to help the organization solve its own problems by making it aware of organizational processes, the consequences of these processes, and the mechanisms by which they can be changed. The process consultant helps the organization to learn from self-diagnosis and self-intervention. The ultimate concern of the process consultant is the organization’s capacity to do for itself what he has done for it. Where the standard consultant is more concerned about passing on his knowledge, the process consultant is concerned about passing on his skill and values". Some important organizational processes are communications, the roles and functions of group members, group problem solving and decision making, group norms and group growth, leadership and authority, and inter-group cooperation and competition. Schein (1969) suggested three main distinguishing characteristics of process consultation: Joint diagnosis of the process with the client, helping the client in learning the diagnostic skills, and the active involvement of the client in searching for a solution. In process consultation ‘a third party
(consultant) works with individuals and groups to help them learn about human and social processes and learn to solve problems that stem from process events.'

**Underlying Values**

Process consultants work with certain values, and it is necessary to make these clear to the client in the beginning. Thus the values made explicit are:

- Identification of client system: Process consultation can be more effective only if the client is identified. The client may be different at different stages. At each stage, it is profitable for the consultant to make it clear to himself and to the client system who the client is, at that stage—top executive or a group of top executives. However, in many cases, the consultant’s entry in the system may be at different points.

- Integration of work: Process consultation should get integrated with the regular work of the client. It is necessary to build process consultation as a help to the task which the group is performing. If process consultation is seen as an extra input, the client system may not be prepared in the long-run to invest its energy in it. The more the process consultation is a part of the regular task, the more effective and integrated it is likely to be.

- Psychological contract: The psychological contract of the consultant should be very clear from the beginning, and he should restrict himself only to process consultation. In other words, the consultant should make it clear from the beginning that his contract would not include intervening and influencing decision-making on substantial issues.

- Group work: The process consultant should help build the skills of group work in the client system. From the beginning, the consultant should plan to wean away the system from the help needed from him. The more the process skills are developed in the system, the more successful the consultant will be. These skills include the skills of group work, using process analysis in the decision-making, analyzing, and confronting with the problem, coping with stresses and conflicts.
• Involvement of client systems: One of the goals of process consultation is to increase the general involvement of the members of the client system in what they are doing. This would mean increasing wider participation of the members, so that their commitment to the decisions made and to the process of arriving at decisions is greater. For this, the more diffused the leadership functions can be made, the more effective the process consultation will be. This would mean that such process skills will be used not only by the top group but shared by more of the members of the system.

Types of Process Interventions

Schein (1969) identifies four types of interventions that process consultants often employ in working with groups:

(a) Agenda-Setting Interventions: It consists of:
- Questions which direct attention to interpersonal issues.
- Process-analysis periods.
- Agenda review and testing procedures.
- Meetings devoted to interpersonal process.
- Conceptual inputs on interpersonal-process topics.

(b) Data Feedback Interventions:
- Feedback to groups during process analysis or regular work time.
- Feedback to individuals after meetings or regular work time.

(c) Coaching or Counseling Interventions:
- Counseling may often required during or after a feedback session. For example, if the process consultant observes dysfunctional behavior in a group member and gives feedback in the group, it may become necessary to counsel the individual to ensure that his/her behavior is suitably modified.

(d) Structural Interventions:
- Pertaining to group membership.
- Pertaining to communication or interaction patterns.
- Pertaining to allocation of work, assignment of responsibility, and lines of authority.
**General Strategy**

The general strategy of process consultation takes into account the consultant as well as the client. It is necessary to think of consultant-client relationship in terms of compatibility. It is necessary to think of consultant-client relationship in terms of compatibility. A client's need to influence may be high or low. There are some clients who are highly involved and who like to influence most of the situations. There are other clients whose need to influence is low and who like to consult the consultant on most matters. It may also depend on the client's self-confidence. Usually the client with high self-confidence is likely to have high need for power or influence.

Similarly, the consultant's style is an important factor in this relationship. The consultant may use either direct or indirect influence. The consultant who uses direct influence tends to prescribe solutions, and work out details of various matters to be attended to. On the other hand, the consultant who uses indirect influence helps the client take decisions, generate alternatives, raise questions but refuses to prescribe solutions.

The interaction between the consultant's style and the client's need, and its relationship to compatibility is shown in Figure 2.13.

**Figure 2.13: Consultant-Client Compatibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant's Style of Influence</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incompatible (advising and directing role leading to mutual rejection)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Incompatible (catalyst role leading to client dependence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatible (supporting role leading to client's autonomy and proactive behavior)</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Incompatible (catalyst role leading to mutual dissatisfaction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, if a client, who has a high need for power, works with the consultant who uses direct influence style, incompatibility may result, and there may be mutual rejection. Similarly, if the client's need to influence (or his self-confidence) is low and the consultant has indirect influence style, this may also result in incompatibility. The consultant may try to be a catalyst with the genuine hope that this role helps the client to become more independent and encourage him to exercise his influence in the situation. However, the client having low need for power, and concomitant low self-confidence, may therefore, lead to dissatisfaction on the part of both the client and the consultant. Compatibility, therefore, arise out of complimentarity of the consultant and the client, such as the client's high need to influence and the consultant's style of using indirect influence. Similarly, complimentarity is also between the client's low need to influence and the direct influence style of the consultant, who may provide guidance to the client, and both may have a satisfying experience. However, this kind of compatibility may not be productive and may not lead to the client's growth. It may lead to, and result in, dependency on the part of the client. Compatibility can therefore, be either productive or unproductive.

The strategy of process consultation, therefore, should be aimed at maturation of the client. There should be movement from more active role of the consultant to a more active role of the client. In order to help the client mature in using the process skills, it is necessary that the consultant reinforces the client's use of these skills. There are four stages in the development of process consultation as shown in Figure 2.14.

**Figure 2.14 Development Role of Process Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant's Behavior</th>
<th>More Active</th>
<th>Less Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Resources</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Mutuality and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>Independence(Working on own)</td>
<td>Creativity(innovating Plans and decisions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These stages can be understood from the point of view of the client. When the client asks for help of an outside process consultant, naturally, he wants to use other's (outsiders') expertise. Client's perception of the necessity of an outside consultant may be a reality. However, the client should move from this position to the position of using his own resources. The first movement is from a dependent relationship, where the consultant is very active and responds to the client's needs, to a position where the client begins to work on his own, using his own resources and the consultant reinforces the client's success by giving him necessary feedback, encouraging him to play more active role. The next movement occurs when the consultant decreases his active role, and progressively withdraws himself from the scene so that the client may be able to use his resources fully. It has to be a planned and deliberate withdrawal, so that the client feels both self-confident and free to use his judgment and influence the decisions. This gives enough self-confidence to the client. The client becomes more creative, takes decisions on his own and derives pleasure in doing this. Unless the consultant cooperates by deliberately and systematically refusing in influencing client, this phase is difficult to achieve. When the client has gained enough confidence in managing process matters, he is ready to take the next step, namely, using other people's expertise and distributing decision-making more widely in his own group. This is the stage of maturity of the group and client. This is achieved when the client tests out the ability of other members of his group to play effective roles in decision-making, and when he feels confident of the support extended by members in the group. This movement is difficult, but it is a necessary condition for a successful termination of the consultant-client relationship. If the relationship is terminated without achieving this level of maturity, the top executive in the client system are likely to use their own resources and confine decision-making at their own level. Although the role of the consultant is passive at this stage, he continuously helps the client examine whether it would not be more rewarding for him to use resources available in his own group.

The consultant is very active in the beginning in establishing certain norms, giving feedback, raising questions, helping the client decide on the designs of sessions and the methodology to be adopted in accelerating
decision-making, etc. As time passes, the consultant starts withdrawing himself from influencing the situation, and the client group (the top team) is in a way forced to talk more among themselves, take decisions, and then check with the consultant. The consultant increasingly insists on members discussing the matters among themselves first and if there is any need for him to make any comments; he would feel free to do so. This puzzles the client group in the beginning, but they respond very well by using their own resources and by becoming active as the time passes on. There are clear signs of this movement, as the conference proceeds, more and more members play the process analysis rule and influence decision-making. The decisions on the design of the programme taken in the meetings of the top team and the feedback received from them as well as from other members of the conference show clearly that this strategy works very well. There has been increasing satisfaction on the part of the members in being able to take part in decision-making and using their influence as the conference proceeded.

Third-Party Peacemaking Intervention:

It has been devised by R.E Walton. A consultant is usually asked to help in resolving issues when two individuals who have critical functions in an organization are not working well together and are having major conflict or disagreement. Because the conflict has grown to a level where the two parties cannot remain objective enough to resolve the conflict themselves, a third person or party becomes a mediator in the process to achieve resolution, who skillfully manages issues. The basic steps in this is confrontation (the two parties must be willing to confront the fact that conflict exists and it has consequences for the effectiveness of the two parties involved), diagnosis (the third party must be able to diagnose conflict situations. Walton presents a diagnostic model of interpersonal conflict based on four basic elements: the conflict issues, the precipitating circumstances, the conflict-relevant acts of principals, and the consequences of conflict), and direct or indirect intervention by the third party in facilitating dialogue between the principals.
Pros:
- In some cases team cannot progress because of the poor relationship of two key people. This is an excellent intervention to clear up that key relationship prior to the entire team engaging in team building.
- A win-win outcome leads to a tremendous release of positive energy toward productive gains, not just for the parties involved, but for all other co-workers as well.

Cons:
- The parties are sometimes not ready emotionally and mentally to resolve the issues and show counterproductive behaviors.
- At times the third party may be perceived as not being objective enough or taking sides.
- One or both of the parties may have a hidden agenda that throws the process off course and keeps it from being successful.

Role Negotiation Technique (RNT):
It has been developed by Roger Harrison in 1971 for improvement in the working of people and team. The technique rests on the basic assumption that most people prefer a fair negotiated settlement to a state of unresolved conflict, and they are willing to invest some time and make some concessions in order to achieve a solution. The process of RNT is as follows:

Contract Setting
Consultant sets the climate and establishes the ground rules. This step consists of individuals negotiating with each other to arrive at a written contract of what behaviors each will change.

Issue Diagnosis
Individuals think about how their own effectiveness can be improved if others change their work behaviors. Then each person fills out an issue diagnosis form for every other person in the group, where the individual states that he or she would like the other to do more of, do less of, or maintain unchanged, which then exchanged among all members. The messages received by each person are written on a chalkboard or newsprint for all to see.
**Influence Trade or Negotiation Period**

Here two individuals discuss the most important behavior changes they want from the other and the changes they are willing to make themselves.

**Pros:**

RNT helps the organization in bringing about positive improvement in a situation where power and influence issues are working to maintain an unsatisfactory status quo. It improves team functioning.

**Cons:**

Sometimes people are selfish and do not want to change their behavior.

**Gestalt OD:** It has been explained earlier in this chapter.

**Interventions for Teams and Groups:**

*Coming together is a beginning, staying together is progress, and working together is success,*

  - Henry Ford

Twenty-five years ago, when companies like W.L. Gore, Volvo, and General Foods introduced teams into their production processes, it made news because no one else was doing it. Today, it's just the opposite. It is the organization that doesn't use teams that has become newsworthy. Currently, 80% of Fortune 500 companies have half or more of their employees on teams. 68% of small U.S. manufacturers are using teams in their production areas. The evidence suggests that teams typically outperform individuals when the tasks being done require multiple skills, judgment, and experience. As organizations have restructured themselves to compete more effectively and efficiently, they have turned to teams as a way to use employee talent better. Management has found that teams are more flexible and responsive to changing events than are traditional departments or other forms of permanent grouping. Teams have the capability to quickly assemble, deploy, refocus, and disband. Collaborative management of the work team culture is a fundamental emphasis of organization development programmes.
It is important to make a distinction between a 'work group' and a 'work team'. A work group is a group that interacts primarily to share information and to make decisions to help each group member perform within his or her area of responsibility. There is no positive synergy that would create an overall level of performance that is greater than the sum of the inputs. In a work group, members usually report to a common superior and have some face-to-face interaction, who have some degree of interdependence in carrying out tasks for the purpose of achieving organizational goals. A work team is a group whose individual efforts result in a performance that is greater than the sum of individual inputs. It generates positive synergy through coordinated effort. Work team has some characteristics in greater degree than ordinary groups, including a higher commitment to common goals and a higher degree of interdependency and interaction. According to Jon Katzenbach and Douglas Smith 'A team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, set of performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable'.

There are various kinds of teams that are helpful in organization development. These are as follows:

**Cross-Functional Teams**

These types of teams are widely used in organizations, and OD approaches have great utility in the formation and ongoing functioning of these teams. These teams are typically comprised of individuals who are of same hierarchical level, but from different work areas, who meet regularly to solve ongoing challenges requiring input from a number of functional areas. Such teams might be permanent, but temporary teams can be created to solve short-term problems such as planning a product change over or solving a key customer problem. Large companies such as Motorola, Ford, 3M, and General Electrics, as well as many small and medium-sized organizations, have used cross-functional teams.
Effective Teams

According to Rensis Likert organizations are best conceptualized by systems of interlocking groups connected by linking pins—individuals who occupy membership in two groups by being a boss in one group and a subordinate in another. Through these interlocking groups the work of the organization gets done. Since individuals in organizations function not so much as individuals alone but as members of groups or teams, the individual to function effectively, a prerequisite is that the team must function effectively. According to David Mc.Gregor some of the characteristics of well-functioning, effective teams are:

1) The atmosphere tends to be relaxed, comfortable, and informal.
2) The group’s task is well understood and accepted by the members.
3) Good communication and task-relevant discussion among the members.
4) Members express their feelings and ideas.
5) Conflict and disagreements are centered around ideas and methods, not personalities and people.
6) When actions are decided upon, clear assignments are made and accepted by the members.

Many writers and researchers have built on the work of Mc.Gregor, Likert, and others to specify the dimensions of team effectiveness. As per Glenn Parker, the characteristics of an effective team are: Clear purpose, Informality, Participation, Listening, Civilized disagreement, Consensus decision-making, open communications, Clear roles and work assignments, External relations, Style diversity, and Self-assessment.

High-Performance Teams

These teams have the same characteristics but to a higher degree. According to Katzenbach and Smith strong personal commitment to each other, commitment to the others’ growth and success distinguishes high-performance teams from effective teams.
Teams and work groups are considered to be the fundamental units of organizations as well as the key leverage points for improving the functioning of organizations.

**Major Team-Building Interventions:**

Team-Building interventions play a vital role in organization development. Some interventions focus on the intact work team composed of a boss and subordinates, which is called as the formal group, whereas other interventions focus on special teams such as start-up teams, newly constituted teams due to mergers, organization structure changes, or plant startups; task forces; cross-functional project teams; and committees. Figure 2.15 shows different types of team-building interventions.

*Figure 2.15: Different Types of Team-Building Interventions*

- **Formal Groups**
  - (Intact Work Teams)

- **Special Groups**
  - (Start-up Teams, Special Project Teams, Cross-Functional Teams, Parallel Learning Structures, etc.)
Formal Groups
(Intact Work Teams)

Diagnostic Meetings

Team Building
Focused on:

- Task accomplishment, including problem solving, decision making, role clarification, goal setting, etc.
- Building and maintaining effective interpersonal relationships, including boss-subordinate relationships and peer
- Understanding and managing group processes and culture.
- Role analysis technique for role clarification and definition.
- Role negotiation technique.

Special Groups (Start-up Teams, Special Project Teams, Cross-Functional Teams, Parallel Learning Structures, etc.)

Diagnostic Meetings

Team Building
Focused on:

- Task accomplishment, especially special problems, role and goal clarification, resource utilization, etc.
- Relationships, especially interpersonal or interunit conflict, and underutilization of each other as resources.
- Processes, especially communications, decision-making, and task allocations.
- Role analysis technique for role clarification and definition.
- Role negotiation technique.
The Formal Group Diagnostic Meeting:

The main aim of this meeting is to conduct a general analysis of the performance of the group, that is to find out 'where the group is going' and 'how the members are doing' and to uncover and identify problems so that they may be worked on. This technique allows the work group to get away from the work itself to gather data about its current performance and to formulate plans for future action.

Steps

1. Preliminary meetings are held with the manager, team members, and the consultants if one is involved. In some specific cases, the specific agenda items are determined in these advance meetings so the team members have more time to prepare their thoughts for the diagnostic meeting.

2. The diagnostic team building meeting is held. Typically, it is one day in length. The meeting may be unfolded in the following manner:

   • The manager makes a few opening remarks, including an overview of the meeting, the purpose, ground rules, and roles. The manager then acts as the meeting facilitator or turns the time over to the consultant to facilitate meeting.

   • If it has not been done previously, the team is now given on a flip chart a few questions that are answered by the team, such as "what are the things we are doing well as a team"? etc.

   • The team is given time to answer the questions. This can be done in any of several different ways. Options A or B are recommended in order to get maximum involvement and ownership in the process:

     A. The total group can answer the questions together.
     B. The group can be subdivided into smaller groups to address the questions.
     C. The group can be divided into pairs to come up with answers.

   • The group (or subgroups/pairs) discusses the data: clarifying, categorizing, and prioritizing the areas that need to be addressed.
• The final step is to set up some plan of how action is taken to address the issues. This usually entails more extensive team building meeting(s) later on to resolve the issues.

3. At least one follow-up meeting is set up to bring closure if plans have not already been made to create action teams to address the issues. Several ways are available to make the diagnostic data public. These are:

• A total-group discussion that involves everyone making individual contributions to the total assemblage.

• Sub grouping is another method, which involves breaking down the group into smaller groups in which more intensive discussions can take place and then the subgroups report back to the larger group.

• Another method is a pairing of two individuals discuss their ideas with each other. Each pair then reports back to the total group.

After the data have been made public, the issues identified are discussed and are grouped in terms of the themes (say planning problems, interdepartmental problems, goal ambiguity problems etc). Then action plan is developed by the group. The primary objective of the formal group diagnostic meeting however is to bring to the surface problems and issues that need to be addressed. Taking specific action usually is reserved for subsequent meetings.

The strengths of these interventions are: this is a good way to get everyone involved in the process of identifying what barriers are impeding the group’s performance, to get an overview of the entire scope of problems with which the team may have to deal, and to lead up to a team building session. It’s less risky, because the only thing is identifying the problems and making some recommendations on how to go about solving them. It’s a good way to prepare for team building or other interventions that may require more personal energy, time, and maturity. The weaknesses are: first time around this type of intervention may be overwhelming because there is a backlog of problems to deal with. For groups that don’t have good processes in place to diagnose and address problems, this may figuratively open the floodgates. This is just the
beginning of the process of problem solving for the team. There is still a lot of work ahead to achieve performance successes.

**Formal Group Team-Building Meeting:**

This occurs with a permanent work group, a management team, or a temporary project-type team. It is one of the most widely used OD interventions. The main aim of this meeting is to improve the team’s effectiveness through better management of task demands, relationship demands, and group processes. The team development process involves helping the group learn to identify, diagnose, and solve problems with the help of an OD practitioner. The problem may involve the tasks or activities the group must perform the process by which it accomplishes the tasks or interpersonal conflict between two or more team members. According to French and Bell team development is ‘an inward look by the team at its own performance, behavior, and culture for the purposes of dropping out dysfunctional behaviors and strengthening functional ones’.

The first intervention is to gather data through the use of questionnaires or, more commonly, through interviews. The nature of the data gathered varies, depending upon the purpose of the team-building programme, the consultant’s knowledge about the organization and its culture, other OD effort taken place in the organization, and the people involved. The consultant already may have obtained a great deal of data by sitting in as a process observer at staff and other meetings. The data usually include information on leadership styles and behavior; goals, objectives, and decision-making processes; such variables of organizational culture as trust, communication patterns, and interpersonal relationships and processes; barriers to effective group functioning; task and related technical problems.

In order to ensure that, the organization members have freedom of choice, the data gathering stage is initiated only after the manager and his group have agreed that team development is a process in which they wish to engage and have set of data for an off-site meeting. This happens frequently but not always and the data-gathering stage is conducted as close to the actual
meeting as possible. The offsite meeting may last from a day and half to a week, with the average being about three days. The meeting is held away from the organization to reduce the number of interruptions and other pressures that might inhibit the process.

When the meeting starts, the consultant feeds back the information that has been collected. This information usually is categorized by major themes. Based on his knowledge of the data and the group, the consultant helps in setting the agenda or acts solely as a process observer, feeding back to the group his observations of what the group is doing. The primary role of the consultant is to assist the group in learning to identify, diagnose and solve its own problem. According to Beer, the consultant can play several different roles during the team-development meeting. One role is that of process consultant, helping the group to understand and diagnose its own group process. The consultant also may function as a resource person, offering expertise as a behavioral scientist, or as a teacher, giving information about areas such as group dynamics, conflict resolution, and leadership.

During the meeting, the group examines and discusses the issues, ranks them in order of their importance, examines the underlying dynamics of the problems, begins to work on solutions to the problems, and establishes some action steps to bring about the changes deemed desirable. It is necessary to have follow-up meetings to determine whether the action steps that were outlined were taken and to determine whether those steps had the desired effects. Generally the team building involves deciding on action steps for remedying problems and setting target dates for 'who will do what when.' A series of meetings is needed to ensure permanent change.

The Manager's Role in Team-Building

It is the manager who is responsible for group functioning, although this responsibility must be shared by the group itself. Hence, it is the task of the management to develop a work group, which should regularly analyze and diagnose its own effectiveness and work process. With the group's involvement, the manager must diagnose the group's effectiveness and take appropriate
actions to eradicate operating difficulties or stress faced by the group. The issue of who should lead a team-building session is a function of managerial capability, because many managers have not been well trained to handle the session.

The initial use of a consultant is advisable. The role of the consultant is to work closely with the manager and the members of the unit to a point at which the manager is capable of engaging in team-development activities as a regular and ongoing part of overall managerial responsibilities. The two should work together as a team in developing the initial programme, keeping in mind that the manager ultimately is responsible for all team-building activities, even though the consultant's resources are available and the consultant's presence is only to help the manager to learn to continue team-development processes with minimum consultant help or without ongoing help of the consultant. Thus initially the consultant might be much more active in data gathering, diagnosis, and action planning, particularly if a one- to three-day off-site workshop is considered. In later stages, the consultant takes a much less active role and the manager takes a more active role and serves as both manager and team developer.

Applicability of Team Building

Team building is applicable in a large number of situations, from starting a new team, to resolving conflicts among members, to revitalizing a complacent team. According to Lewis, the conditions best suited to team building are:

- Pattern of communication and interaction are inadequate for good group functioning.
- Group leaders desire an integrated team.
- The group's task requires interaction among members.
- The benefits outweigh the costs of team building.
- Team building must be congruent with the leader's personal style and philosophy.
Techniques and Exercises Used in Team Building:

Various techniques and exercises are used in team building to make the
team's performance more effective. These should be used after a careful
diagnosis to know that the technique is appropriate. These are as follows:

**Interdependency Exercise**

It is a useful intervention, when team members express desire to
improve cooperation among themselves and among other units. This exercise
plays a vital role in assisting people in getting better acquaintance in surfacing
problems that may be latent and not previously examined, and in providing
useful information about current challenges being forced in others' areas of
responsibility. It works well with up to approximately ten people, but can become
too cumbersome and time consuming if more than that number is involved.

**Appreciative Inquiry**

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) has been developed by David Cooperrider and
Suresh Srivastava in 1986. It is a theory of organizing and method for changing
social systems is one of the most significant innovations in action research in
the past decade. Those who created action research in the 1950s were
concerned with creating a research method that would lead to practical results
as well as the development of new social theory. It was hoped that action
research would be an important tool in social change. A key emphasis of action
researchers has been on involving their "subjects" as co-researchers. Action
research was and still is a cornerstone of organization development practice.

While always controversial as a scientific method of inquiry, action
research has recently come under criticism as a method of organizational
change and as a process for developing new theory. In their seminar paper
Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) criticized the lack of useful theory generated
by traditional action research studies and blamed both the method of action
research and implicit theory of social organization. The problem is that most
action research projects use logical positivistic assumptions (Sussman and
Evered, 1978), which treat social and psychological reality as something
fundamentally stable, enduring, and "out there". Appreciative inquiry, however,
is a product of the socio-rationalist paradigm (Gergen, 1982, 1990) which treats social and psychological reality as a product of the moment, open to continuous reconstruction. Cooperrider and Srivastva argued that there is nothing inherently real about any particular social form, no transcultural, everlasting, valid principles of social organization to be uncovered. While logical positivism assumes that social phenomena are sufficiently enduring, stable and replicable to allow for generalizations, socio-rationalism contends that social order is fundamentally unstable. "Social phenomena are guided by cognitive heuristics, limited only by the human imagination: the social order is a subject matter capable of infinite variation through the linkage of ideas and action". (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987, p.139). Socio-rationalists argued that the theories they hold, their beliefs about social systems, have a powerful effect on the nature of social "reality". Not only do they see what they believe, but the very act of believing it creates it. From this point of view, the creation of new and evocative theories of groups, organizations, and societies, are a powerful way to aid in their change and development.

Like most post-modernists, Cooperrider and Srivastva argued that logical positivistic assumptions trap us in a rear-view world and methods based on these assumptions tend to (re)create the social realities they purport to be studying. Further, they argue that action researchers tend to assume that their purpose is to solve a problem. Groups and organizations are treated not only as if they have problems, but as if they are problems to be "solved". Cooperrider and Srivastva contended that this "problem-oriented" view of organizing and inquiry reduces the possibility of generating new theory, and new images of social reality, which might help us transcend current social forms. What if, instead of seeing organizations as problems to be solved, we saw them as miracles to be appreciated? How would our methods of inquiry and our theories of organizing be different?

Appreciative inquiry "refers to both a search for knowledge and a theory of intentional collective action which are designed to help evolve the normative vision and will of a group, organization, or society as a whole" (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987, p.159). Cooperrider made the theory of change embedded in appreciative inquiry explicit in a later paper on the affirmative basis of organizing
(Cooperrider, 1990). In this paper Cooperrider proffered the "heliotropic hypothesis" - that social forms evolve toward the "light"; that is, toward images that are affirming and life giving. In essence his argument is that all groups, organizations, communities or societies have images of themselves that underlay self-organizing processes and that social systems have a natural tendency to evolve toward the most positive images held by their members. Conscious evolution of positive imagery, therefore, is a viable option for changing the social system as a whole.

One of the ironies Cooperrider helps us to see is that the greatest obstacle to the well-being of an ailing group is the affirmative projection that currently guides the group. To affirm means to 'hold firm' and it "...is precisely the strength of affirmation, the degree of belief or faith invested, that allows the image to carry out its heliotropic task". When groups find that attempts to fix problems create more problems, or the same problems never go away, it is a clear signal of the inadequacy of the group's current affirmative projection. Groups, therefore, do not need to be fixed; they need to be affirmed and "...every new affirmative projection of the future is a consequence of an appreciative understanding of the past or present" (Cooperrider, 1990).

Appreciative inquiry, as a method of changing social systems, is an attempt to generate a collective image of a new and better future by exploring the best of what is and has been. These new images, or "theories", create a pull effect that generates evolution in social forms. The four principles Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) articulated for an action research that can create new and better images are that research should begin with appreciation, should be applicable, should be provocative, and should be collaborative. The basic process of appreciative inquiry is to begin with a grounded observation of the "best of what is", then through vision and logic collaboratively articulate "what might be", ensuring the consent of those in the system to "what should be" and collectively experimenting with "what can be". One significant published research study that used an appreciative inquiry methodology looked at the processes of organizing that are used by international non-governmental organizations (Johnson and Cooperrider, 1991).
Appreciative inquiry represents a drastic shift in the positive direction for organizational strategies. Instead of diagnosing problems and working on past-driven change, AI works on potential capacities and is a future-driven strategy. It helps leaders to understand and build upon the best of the past and maximise utilization of existing possibilities in their organizations through inquiry into their 'positive core' like collective wisdom, knowledge and capabilities etc. An appreciative inquiry intervention consists of four phases (otherwise called as 4-D model), which are Discovery, Dream, Design, and Delivery. The discovery and dreams phases generate and expand the organization’s images of itself. The design and delivery phases ask members to make choices for the organization.

Appreciative Inquiry has been effectively applied in the following ways:

- Building common vision where one is currently lacking.
- Creating openness and rapport between people and groups who don’t trust each other,
- Developing new approaches to human resource issues that will be well accepted by organizational members and lead to positive change.
- Creating a positive work climate where a negative one previously prevailed.
- Discovering, understanding and amplifying the positive forces already existing in organizations.
- Accelerating the development of new teams.
- An alternative to conventional team building processes for existing teams.
- Community development in various ways.

**Responsibility Charting**

It has been developed by Richard Beckhard and Reuben Harris, to help to clarify who is responsible for what on various decisions and actions.
The process is as follows:

1. Constructing a grid.

2. Deciding the types of decisions and classes of actions that need to be taken in the total area of work under discussion to be listed along the left-hand side of the grid.

3. Finding out the actors who might play some part in decision making on those issues are identified across the top of the grid.

4. Then a behavior is assigned to each of the actors opposite each of the issues. The four classes of behavior are responsibility (R), the right to veto (V), support(S), inform and non-involvement of a person with the decision (I).

The positive aspects of this technique are that it is usually done in a work team context and an important intervention to improve the task performance of a work team. It quickly identifies who is to what on new decisions as well as the reasons of failure of old decision. The negative side of this technique is that it requires certain conditions for effective implementation.

**Role Negotiation Technique**: It has been presented earlier in this chapter.

**Role Analysis Technique (RAT)**

It has been developed by Ishwar Dayal and John Thomas in 1969 for clarifying the roles of top management in an organization. The process of RAT is as follows:

The role incumbents in conjunction with team members define and delineate role requirements, which are called as the focal role.

1. The first step is to analyze the focal role initiated by the focal role individual.

2. The second step is to examine the focal role incumbent's expectations of others.

3. The third step is to analyze others' expectations and desired behavior of the focal role.
4. Preparation of a role profile by the role incumbents, which consists of above three steps.

The written role profile is reviewed at the following meeting before another focal role is analyzed.

Role analysis helps the organization to
- Bring role clarity for the role occupants.
- Bring clarity across functions between the related roles in the organization.
- Build trust, collaboration, team spirit and internal customer orientation.
- Set clear objectives for planning of work, its monitoring and review.
- Give and receive objective feedback on performance.
- Facilitate realistic identification of training and development needs.
- Aid potential appraisal, career planning, and succession planning.

The Appreciation and Concern Exercise

The appreciations and concerns exercise is appropriate if interview data suggest that one of the deficiencies in the interactions of members of a group is lack of expression of appreciation and there is avoidance of confronting concerns and irritations. Basically it is conducted as follows:

1. The facilitator asks each member of the group to jot down one to three appreciations for each member of the group.

2. Each member is also asked to jot down one or two minor irritations or concerns relative to each person that may be interfering with communications, getting the work done effectively, and so on.

3. Along with the assignment, the facilitator may make some suggestions to the members. Raising concerns in a team setting can provide an opportunity for others to validate what is being perceived or to provide another perspective.

4. Someone is asked to volunteer to be the first person to listen to members of the group. Each group member mentions both the appreciations and
concerns about the volunteer who hears from all of the group members before responding, with the exception that questions of clarification are encouraged after each person mentions his or her items.

5. Each group member listens, in turn, either through volunteering to be next or through the simple procedure of rotating clockwise or anticlockwise from the first person.

**Visioning**

It has been developed by Ronald Lippit. It is used for an intervention in which group members in one or more organizational groups develop and/or describe their vision of what they want the organization to be like in the future. The time frame may vary from present six months to five years in the future.

According to Weisboard, Lippit began to tape-record planning meetings in 1949 and found that “people’s voices grew softer, more stressed, depressed, as problems were listed and privatized. You could hear the energy drain away as the lists grew longer”.

In 1950s Lippit, Ronald Fox, and Eva Sclinder Rainman began referring to ‘images of potential’ rather than to problems as starting points for change.

By 1970s they involved people in workshops visualizing "preferred futures".

The technique of visioning is as follows:

- On notepaper, the participant writes down the characteristics he/she likes to see the organization have one and then two years from now in various categories like product, customer, supplier relationships etc. This step lasts for 90 minutes.

- Using a marking pen, the participant makes the characteristics visible on flipchart paper and display on the wall.

- Then the participant reports to the group and prepares to answer questions pertaining to clarification without any debate.
During a half-hour break, a subgroup of three people extracts the themes from the individual reports and prepares to report them to the total group for discussion.

Various forms of visioning or the use of mental imagery or the development of cognitive maps are extensively used in strategic planning and future search conferences.

Other techniques and exercises used in team building are Force-Field Analysis and Process Consultation, which have been explained earlier in this chapter.

Team MBO:

To be congruent with the OD effort, goal-setting and performance review process should have a team thrust and should be both participative and transactional, where in goal setting, subordinates should have meaningful ways to provide inputs; and in reviewing performance, a collaborative examination of the major significant forces in the situation needs to be made, including the superior's and the team's impact of the subordinate's performance, not just an appraisal of the subordinate's performance. MBO involves setting specific measurable goals with each employee and then periodically reviewing the progress made.

The team MBO refers to a comprehensive and formal organization-wide goal setting and appraisal programme consisting of six steps:

- Setting the organization's goals: Establishing, based on the firm's strategic plan, an organization-wide plan for next year and setting specific company goals.
- Setting departmental goals: Department heads take these company goals and with their supervisors jointly set goals for their departments.
- Discussing departmental goals: Department heads discuss the department's goals with all subordinates, often at a department-wide meeting. They ask employees to set their own preliminary individual goals.
- Defining expected results: Department heads and their subordinates set short-term individual performance targets.
- Performance review: Department heads compare each employee's actual and targeted performance.
- Providing feedback: Department heads and employees discuss and evaluate the latter's progress.

Likert and Fisher described a participative, team approach to MBO in use in a retail division of a consumer products organization and in an automobile plan. They reported impressive increases in contribution to corporate profits in the retail sales division and substantially increased productivity and reduced scrap and rejects in the automobile plant. They called the approach Management by Group Objectives (MBGO)

The strengths of this technique are: it sharpens the planning process, helps in developing effective control, and encourages employees' commitment. It is a result-oriented, practical and rational management philosophy.

The weaknesses are: it is time-consuming. Sometimes it suffers from unclear, immeasurable objectives. Setting objectives with the subordinates sometimes turns into a tug-of-war.

**Socio-Technical Systems**: It has been presented earlier in this chapter.

**Quality of Work Life (QWL) Programmes:**

It has been applied to a wide variety of organizational improvement efforts. "It is an attempt to restructure multiple dimensions of the organization" and to "institute a mechanism which introduces and sustains changes over time" (Goodman, 1980). The goal is the creation of more involving, satisfying and effective jobs and work environment for people at all levels of the organization. QWL include four essential elements:

- The programme seeks to promote human dignity and growth.
- Employees work collaboratively.
They determine work changes anticipatively.

The programmes assume compatibility of people and organizational goals.

The major factors that affect the QWL are pay, benefits, job security, alternative work schedules (flexi-time, staggered hours, compressed workweek, autonomous work groups), occupational stress, worker participation, union involvement, availability of skill training, increased response to employees by supervision, social integration and work and total life space etc.

The QWL Council consists of a steering committee and other departmental committees. The main purpose of creating QWL Councils is to improve the QWL of people working at various levels in the organization by redesigning organizational work and systems.

The positive aspects are: it is cooperative rather than authoritarian. It is evolutionary and open rather than static and rigid. It is informal rather than rule bounded. It is impersonal rather than mechanistic. The negative aspects are: sometimes difficulties arise in sustaining or expanding the process beyond a few years. Major resistance from supervisors frequently occurs when top management pays insufficient attention to issues of job security and role definition for people.

Quality Circle:

Quality is conformance to the claims made. A quality circle is a volunteer group composed of workers who meet together to discuss workplace improvement, and make presentations to management with their ideas. Typical topics are improving safety, improving product design, and improvement in manufacturing process. Quality circles have the advantage of continuity; the circle remains intact from project to project.

Quality Circles have been extensively used in Japan since the introduction of quality control techniques there in the 1950s and 1960s by W.Edwards Deming, Joseph Juran, and A.W. Feigenbaum. Kaoru Ishikawa of Tokyo University integrated these techniques with the theories of American
behavioral scientists such as Maslow, McGregor, and Herzberg, and thus, the quality circle was born. Prof. Ishikawa, who believed in tapping the creative potential of workers, innovated the Quality Circle movement to give Japanese industry that extra edge in creativity. The movement in Japan was coordinated by the Japanese Union of Scientists and Engineers (JUSE). The Lockheed Missisile and Space Company appeared to be the first American firm to study the emerging Japanese approach and to implement an extensive programme. By 1995 it was estimated that over 90 percent of the Fortune 500 companies were utilizing quality circles, including such firms as Honeywell, Digital Equipment, TRW, and Westinghouse. In India, some of the companies where the QC movement has found its way include BHEL, TELCO, Baja Auto, SBI, HMT etc.

A Quality Circle is a small group of employees (10-12) from the same work area who voluntarily meet at regular intervals to identify, analyze, and resolve work related problems. This can not only improve the performance of any organization, but also motivate and enrich the work life of employees.

Prior to the formation of quality circles, those supervisors who have volunteered to participate are trained by quality control experts and facilitators in such matters as quality control concepts, including the necessary statistical tools, in leading participative group discussions, and in group dynamics and communications skills. In turn, the supervisors, with the help of facilitators, train those subordinates who volunteer to participate. The facilitator also helps each circle in its linking with other groups and with the overall coordinating committee. Groups are encouraged to use experts from within the organization when their specialties are relevant and are frequently authorized by management to make changes without higher authority whenever feasible. Once or twice a year, a member of higher management meets with each group.

Favorable results have also been reported through the use of cross-functional (or multifunctional) quality circle teams at such organizations as Ford and IBM. The latter has an extensive programme using “process improvement teams” whose members are drawn from multiple functions.
The use of Quality Circles in many highly innovative companies in the Scandinavian countries has been proven. The practice of it is recommended by many economist/business scholars.

The strengths of quality circle are: the use of quality circle has been one of the central aspects in the evolution of total quality management, a much broader intervention strategy. It meets the psychological needs of the workers (self-expression, participation, recognition, etc). The weaknesses are: it suffers from various structural problems. Sometimes the concept has not been well understood by managers, supervisors and workers.

**Self-Managed Teams:**

Self-managed teams are groups of employees (typically 10 to 15 in number) who perform highly related or interdependent jobs and take on many of the responsibilities of their former supervisors. Typically, this includes planning and scheduling of work, assigning tasks to members, collective control over the pace of work, making operative decisions, taking action on problems, and working with suppliers and customers. Fully self-managed work teams even select their own members and have the members who evaluate each other's performance. As a result supervisory positions take on decreased importance may even be eliminated.

![Figure 2.16 : Model of Self-Managed Work Teams](image)
As shown in Figure 2.16 the elements necessary for creating self-managed work teams are task differentiation, boundary control, and task control.

Task differentiation involves the extent to which the team's task is autonomous and forms a relatively self-completing whole. High levels of task differentiation provide an identifiable team boundary and a clearly defined area of team responsibility.

Boundary control involves the extent to which team members can influence transactions with their task environment—the types and rates of inputs and outputs. Adequate boundary control includes a well-defined work area; group responsibility for boundary-control decisions, such as quality assurance (which reduces dependence on external boundary regulators, such as inspectors); and members sufficiently trained to perform tasks without relying heavily on external resources.

Task control involves the degree to which team members can regulate their own behavior to provide services or to produce finished products. It includes the freedom to choose work methods, to schedule activities, and to influence production goals to match both environmental and task demands. It relies heavily on team members having the power and authority to manage equipments, materials, and other resources needed for task performance. This work authority is essential if members are to take responsibility for getting the work accomplished. Task control enables self-managed work teams to observe and control technical variances as quickly and as close to their resources as possible.

Inter-Group and Third-Party Peacemaking Interventions:

The interventions those have been developed to improve inter-group and interpersonal relations are as follows:

**Inter-Group Team-Building Interventions:**

The main focus of these interventions is to improve inter-group relations, through increase in communications and interactions between work-related groups. They also help in reducing amount of dysfunctional competition,
replacing a parochial independent point of view with an awareness of the necessity for interdependence of action calling on the best efforts of both groups.

Organization development methods provide ways of increasing intergroup cooperation and communication through the above intervention mechanism. One set of activities developed by Blake, Shepard, and Mouton is widely applicable to situations where relations between groups are stained or overtly hostile.

**Steps**

1. The process starts with someone seeing that things aren't working well between two units and the managers of the two teams believe that things could be better and together they discuss ways to improve the working relationships. If the consultant is involved she or he is brought in at this point in the process. They discuss how and when to set up the intervention meeting.

2. The manager then meet with their respective teams to get input and give them some idea regarding the accomplishment and the time of holding the meeting.

3. The meeting is held and goes as follows:

   - The managers of the department give a brief introduction and outline for the meeting. Either the consultant or the managers conduct the meeting. The meeting facilitator begins by laying down a few ground rules.
   - The facilitator introduces a few key questions for each team to answer.
   - The teams are given flip chart paper and sent into separate rooms to answer the questions.
   - Then they return with their answers and each read out their answers with others asking question for doubt clarification.
The teams return to their room and do two things—first, to discuss what they have learned about how they are perceived; second, to build a list of issues that need to be resolved on priority basis.

Then they return and share their lists once again with each other and work together to prepare a combined list of issues that need to be addressed on priority basis. Then they set up action plans, make assignments, and set deadlines for resolution of issues.

Finally, teams set up a follow-up meeting.

4. A follow-up meeting is held to assess how things are going and to make any course corrections to stay on track until goals are achieved.

**Pros:**

- This is a good way to get people from different teams working together to improve the performance of both teams.

- It can eliminate miscommunications, misperceptions, and misunderstandings that may have caused barriers to successful operations.

- It is a good way to get the team focusing on competition outside of the organization instead of between themselves.

- It can do a great deal to empower everyone rather than leaving the burden of responsibility to only the managers.

**Cons:**

- A skilled consultant is needed if the groups are extremely hostile and also have weak conflict-resolution skills.

- Be sure to allow enough time to resolve and work through the issues. Cutting the discussion too short may be unhealthy and leave things unresolved.

- If you don't follow-up and complete the action plans, you may lose credibility, and the intervention could be counterproductive.
Organization Mirror Interventions:

The organization mirror is a set of activities in which a particular organizational group, the host group gets feedback from representatives from several other organizational groups about how it is perceived and regarded. It works as follows:

- An organizational unit that is experiencing difficulties with units to which its work is related may ask key people from those other units to come to a meeting to provide feedback on how they see the host unit. The consultant often interviews the people attending the meeting before the meeting takes place in order to get a sense of the problems and their magnitude, to prepare the participants, and to answer any questions that the participants may have.

- After opening remark by the manager of the host group, the consultant feeds back to the total group information from interviews. The outsiders “fishbowl” to discuss and explore the data presented by the consultant (The fishbowl is a group seating and talking configuration in which there is an inner circle of chairs for people who talk and an outside circle of observers and non interactors). The fishbowl allows the invited participants to talk about the host unit in a natural, uninterrupted way while the host group members listen and learn.

- Then the host group members fishbowl and talk about what they have heard, ask for any clarification and generally seek to understand the information they have heard. At this point, a general discussion can ensure that everyone understands what is being said, but at this time these participants do not start to work on problems that have been recovered.

- Subgroups composed of both host group members and invited participants are formed. The subgroups are asked to identify the most important changes that need to be made to improve the host unit’s effectiveness.

- After the small groups have identified the key problems, the total group convenes to make a master list to work out specific action plans for
bringing about the changes deemed most important. The total group hears a summary report from each subgroup.

- Action plans are firmed up, people are assigned tasks, and target dates for completion are agreed upon.
- A follow-up meeting is held to assess progress and to review action steps.

The positive aspects of this intervention are: in short period of time an organizational unit can get feedback it needs to improve its relations with significant work-related groups; this intervention plays a vital role in improving the relationships between groups and increases the inter-group work effectiveness. The negative side is sometimes the host group is not mentally ready to accept the feedback.

**Partnering:**

In situations in which two or more organizations are likely to incur unnecessary conflict and cost overruns such as owner-contractor relationship in a large construction project, an intervention called partnering can be productive for both parties. The objective of this intervention is to form an effective problem-finding/problem-solving management team composed of personnel from both parties, thus creating a single culture with one set of goals and objectives for the project. It has been used in the private sector—such as Fluor Daniel and Du Pont—and in military and government construction.

In a typical partnering project involving the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and a contractor, interventions included the following steps:

- The Corps of Engineers selected the consultants.
- A retreat was scheduled at a neutral site, lasting from two and one-half to four and one-half days. The participants were key managers from home offices, site managers from both the Corps and the contractor, and the consultants.
The workshop focused on team-building, action research, and planning including advanced conflict resolution methods, developing a shared vision, and strategic planning with “break the ice” and to demonstrate the utility of group decision making. Lists were developed and shared showing both “strengths” and “problems” of the Corps and the contractor. Mixed groups, comprised members from both parties, selected one or more of the problems to diagnose further, identified and evaluated possible courses of action, and made recommendations to the total group.

At the workshop, mutual commitment to team work, equitable problem solving and open communication was made.

A follow-up workshop was held three months after construction began.

At six months, “on-site data-gathering visits were conducted with follow-up two day workshops involving all key players”.

While partnering did not solve all of the problems that surfaced during the life of the various projects, high success rates have been reported and participants tended to report “better results than on previous non-partnered projects”. As a result, partnering has been used on several other large government projects involving the Air Force, Navy, and NASA, and their contractors.

Other interventions like Process Consultation, Third-party Peacemaking at Group Level, and Grid OD Phase-3 have been explained earlier in this chapter.

Survey Feedback:

An important and widely used intervention for organization development rests on the process of systematically collecting data about the system and feeding back the data for individuals and groups at all levels of the organization to analyze, interpret meanings, and design corrective action plans. These activities— which have two major components, the use of a climate or attitude survey and the use of feedback workshops—are called survey feedback. This
approach is based on the Systems 1-4T ‘management system’. Survey feedback has been recognized as a potential OD tool for a long time.

An attitude survey as depicted in Table 2.1, if properly used, can be a powerful tool in organization improvement.

**Table 2.1: Survey Feedback/OD Approach to the Use of Attitude/Climate Surveys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collected from:</th>
<th>Everyone in the system/subsystem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data reported to:</td>
<td>Everyone who participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of data are worked on by:</td>
<td>Everyone in work teams, with workshops starting at the top (all superiors with their subordinates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party intervention strategy:</td>
<td>Obtaining concurrence on total strategy, design and administration of questionnaire, design of workshops, appropriate interventions in workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action planning done by:</td>
<td>Teams at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable extent of change and improvement:</td>
<td>High.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the research at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, the survey to be optimally useful should follow the following steps as shown in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2: Steps of Survey Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Organization members at the top of the hierarchy are involved in the preliminary planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Data are collected from all organization members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Data are fed back to the top executive team and then down through the hierarchy in functional teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Each superior presides at a meeting with his/her subordinates in which the data are discussed and in which subordinates are asked to help interpret the data, plans are made for making constructive changes, and plans are made for the introduction of the data at the next lower level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Most feedback meetings include a consultant who has helped prepare the superior for the meeting and who serves as a resource person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pros:

➢ Survey feedback has been shown to be an effective change technique in OD as it gets the entire unit/organization involved in the improvement process.

➢ In a longitudinal study evaluating the effects of different change techniques in 23 different organizations, survey feedback was found to be most effective change strategy when compared with interpersonal process consultation, task process consultation, and laboratory training. It is a cost effective means of implementing a comprehensive programme.

➢ When everyone gets involved from the top on down, there can be an immediate and major impact on the performance of the organization.

Cons:

➢ Ambiguity of purpose: Managers and staff groups responsible for the survey feedback process may have difficulty reaching sufficient consensus about the purposes of survey, its content and how it will be fed back to participants. Such confusion can lead to considerable disagreement over the data collected and paralyzes about doing anything with them.

➢ Distrust: High levels of distrust in the organization can render the survey feedback ineffective. Employees need to trust that their responses remain anonymous and that management is serious about sharing the data and solving problems jointly.

➢ Unacceptable topics: Most organizations have certain topics that they don’t want examined. These can severely limit the scope of the survey process, particularly if the neglected topics are important to employees.

➢ Organizational disturbance: The survey feedback process can unduly disturb organizational functioning. Data collection and feedback typically infringe on employee work time. Moreover administration of a survey can call attention to issues with which management is unwilling to deal, and can create unrealistic expectations about organizational improvement.
OD Interventions for the Whole Organization:

When the total organization is the target entity then the OD interventions that are used are as follow:

Socio-Technical System: It has been explained earlier in this chapter.

Parallel Learning Structures:

These are specially created organizational structures for planning and guiding change programmes.

Dale and Zand introduced this concept in 1974 under the label collateral organization and defined it as "a supplemental organization coexisting with the usual, formal organization". The purpose of the collateral organization is to deal with "ill-structured" problems the formal organization is unable to resolve. Considerable experimentation with collateral organizations occurred in the 1970s and 1980s.

Bushe and Shani (1991) summarized and extended the work on this connection in their comprehensive treatment titled Parallel Learning Structures. Parallel Learning Structures are a mechanism to facilitate innovation in large bureaucratic organizations where the forces of inertia, hierarchical communication patterns and standard ways of addressing problems inhibit learning, innovation, and change. In essence, parallel structures are a vehicle for learning how to change the system, and then leading the change process.

Bushe and Shani (1991) offered the term "parallel learning structures" as a generic label to cover interventions where

- a structure (that is, a specific division and coordination of labor) is created
- that operates ‘parallel’ (that is, tandem) with the formal hierarchy and structure and
- has the purpose of increasing an organization’s ‘learning’ (that is the creation and/or implementation of new thoughts and behaviors by employees).
Parallel learning structure consists of a steering committee and a number of working groups that study what changes are needed, make recommendations for improvements, and monitoring the change efforts. One or more top executives should be members of the steering committee to give the parallel structure authority, legitimacy, and clout. Use is made of the facilitator role, data gathering, data feedback, and process consultation. Sometimes within the steering committee, other groups also exist. These are idea groups, action groups, or implementation groups. These groups serve specific functions designated by the steering committee.

The parallel structure should be a microcosm of the larger organization, that is, it should have representatives from all parts of the organization.

Parallel structures help people break free of the normal constraints imposed by the organization, engage in genuine inquiry and experimentation, and initiate needed changes. They are a foundation of OD because they are prevalent in so many different OD programmes. The quality of work life programmes of the 1970s and 1980s used parallel structures composed of union leaders, managers, and employees. Most socio-technical systems redesign efforts and open system planning programmes use parallel structures. High performance organizations often use parallel structures to coordinate self-directed teams.

MBO (Participating Form): It has been presented earlier in the chapter.

Large-Scale Change and High-Performance Systems:

When a number of OD and other interventions are combined to create major changes in the total culture and operations of an organization, it is called large-scale system change. The creation of oh high-performance systems, high-performance organizations, high-involvement organizations, or self-designing organizations usually involve a broad array of interventions. It features extensive member participation and involvement. Changes in job design and workflow, staffing procedures, training, and compensation are usually combined with such interventions.
**Transorganization Development:**

Transorganizational Development (TD) is seen by Cummings to be an important form of organizational change process for Transorganizational Systems (TSs). Cummings has referred to groups of organizations that have joined together for a common purpose, including alliances and networks, as trans-organizational systems. TSs are functional social systems existing intermediately between single organizations on the one hand and societal systems on the other. These multi organizational systems can make decisions and perform tasks on behalf of their member organizations, although members maintain their separate organizational identities and goals. This separation distinguishes TSs from mergers and acquisitions.

As per Cummings (1993), there are three phases in typical TD practice.

**Stage 1: Identification**

This stage involves identifying potential member organizations best suited to achieve their collective objectives. TD practitioners assist early members in forming a steering committee, establishing criteria for membership, and serving as brokers to introduce potential partners to each other.

**Stage 2: Convention**

Representatives from member organizations are brought together, sometimes in a search conference, to assess the desirability and feasibility of creating a TS. These conferences permit members to share perceptions and ideas, to negotiate equitable benefits, and to develop action plans.

**Stage 3: Organization**

This involves developing the structures and mechanisms that promote communication and interaction among members and that direct joint effort to the task at hand. TD practitioners help members create the roles, structures, and mechanisms needed to coordinate the collaborative efforts of TS members. Practitioners need to play more of an activist role than is traditionally seen in OD. Also it is required that practitioners should maintain a neutral role. They should not align with particular member organizations or people.
Stage 4: Evaluation

This involves assessing the performance outcomes, quality of interaction among the members, and satisfaction of members. Members need feedback so that they can identify problems and begin to resolve them. This is done by the interviews or survey of member organizations by change agents.

Beckhard’s Confrontation Meeting:

It is a one day meeting of the entire management of an organization in which they take a reading of their own organizational health.

In a series of activities, the management group generates information about its major problems, analyzes the underlying causes, develop action plans to correct the problems, and set a schedule for completed remedial work. This intervention is appropriate where

- There is a need for the total management group to examine its own workings.
- Very limited time is available for the activity.
- Top management wishes to improve the conditions quickly.
- There is enough cohesion in the top team to ensure follow-up.
- There is real commitment to resolve the issues on the part of top management.
- The organization is experiencing, or has recently experienced, some major changes.

Steps
1. The meeting leader (usually someone from top management), begins the meeting, stating the goals and objectives. He also lays out ground rules, such as encouraging open discussion without fear of reprisal.
2. The large group is divided into smaller subgroups of five to eight people, each group consists of members from various parts of the organization. Top management is a separate subgroup.
3. For about one hour the subgroups identify the required things both personally and professionally to improve organization's health. The list of items is summarized by each group on a flipchart, and someone from the group reports the results in the next session.

4. All the subgroups reconvene into one large group and report back their list of problems and issues, with the meeting leader categorizes the lists into several major categories, followed by break while time is taken to duplicate the lists for everyone at the meeting.

5. The larger group is divided into subgroups composed of functional departments or area which is lead by the functional manager of the area. Each group is given the following charges:

- Discussion of the problems and issues related to the area and prioritize them and determine the action plans.
- Identify and prioritize the problems and concerns of top management.
- Set up a plan to communicate and involve those members of the organization who are not present at the meeting.

6. The group reconvenes to report back to the main group their answers and action plans.

7. The meeting leader and other top management give their initial reactions to the plans. They set up a follow-up meeting with the entire group.

8. Top management meets to set up plans of action to address the issues raised in the meeting. Functional groups also meet to ensure that follow-up action is being achieved.

9. Four to six week later a follow-up meeting is held with the entire group to report progress on each action plan and to make course correction as needed.

**Pros:**

1. This is a quick way to improve the organization's health.
2. It improves communication at all levels of the organization.
3. It maximizes ownership and commitment to organization improvement.
**Cons:**

1. This method backfires if plans are not carried out.
2. It is thwarted if top management doesn’t support the process and follow-up actions.
3. It may be hard and costly to get everyone together at the same time and place, if members are spread out geographically.

**Visioning:** It has been presented earlier in this chapter.

**Strategic Management Activities:**

OD must develop outward-looking interventions directed toward environmental analysis and strategic planning to ensure that the organization is in synchrony with its environment.

According to Schendel and Hofer, strategic management process consists of six major tasks, which are goal formulation, environmental analysis, strategy formulation, strategy evaluation, strategy implementation, and strategic control. Several OD interventions directed toward strategic planning are Goal-setting activities, Beckhard’s confrontation meeting, Future search conferences, and Phases 4, 5, and 6 of Grid OD.

Charles E. Summer’s strategic management activities consist of four questions:

- What is your present strategy?
- What are the opportunities and threats to that strategy?
- What are your strengths and weakness to meet those threats and opportunities and
- What kind of future policies must you adopt to avoid the threats and maximize your strengths?

A top management team works for six months to a year answering these four questions.

OD practitioners need to become experts in strategic management processes and need to have a thorough knowledge of strategic management content.
Real Time Strategic Change:

It has been devised by Robert Jacob. It is congruent with search conferences and strategic management activities. Some aspects of this intervention have been derived from the work of Ronald Lippitt. Real time is the simultaneous planning and implementation of individual, group, or organization wide changes.

A critical mass of organizational members, sometimes hundreds come together for a three day meeting to discuss organization wide issues. The assumptions underlying this event are:

- A leadership team decides that its organization needs a new strategic direction based on drivers for change either from inside or outside their own organization;
- A draft strategy is developed by a leadership team prior to the event;
- The leadership group is open to feedback on the strategy by participants, and to revising it based on this feedback; and
- The participants in this event comprise the entire organization, or a critical mass of people from a larger organization.

Jacob(1994) has described six key steps for developing strategy:

- Identifying and clarifying the basic, important issues facing the organization as a whole.
- Agreeing on an overall purpose for the change effort.
- Deciding which people need to be involved in the change effort and how.
- Determining how much influence these people need to have over the development of this strategy.
- Clarifying the information people need to do quality work and make wise decisions regarding their collective future.
- Exploring the methods, processes, and approaches that boost people in making real time strategic changes.
The setting includes flipcharts, break tables set with refreshment and snacks, and a podium and microphone. While most of the participation is in small groups with maximum diversity of function and level (called max-mix groups), on the third day participants self select themselves into action planning groups focusing on a subpart of the overall strategy that is of the most interest to them. After that participants work in their "back home" work groups for planning next action steps. Throughout the process, participants are asked to react to material that has been generated by voting on items as "glads", "sads", and "mads", or posting gold stars or red rots. This process requires a great deal of planning and a great deal of facilitator assistance. Extensive follow-up back on the job, of course, is essential. Implementation plans need to be made and leaders continuously need to keep the broader system in mind so that plans and implementation occur both within and across units.

The organization that have used this intervention are Boeing, Marriott Hotels, METRO (Seattle), Health and Hospitals Corporations (New York City), United Kingdom's Employment Service etc.

Other interventions used for the whole organization are; GRID OD Phase 4, 5, 6, Interdependency Exercise, Survey Feedback, and Appreciative Inquiry have been explained earlier in this chapter.

Search Conferences and Future Search Conferences:

Procedurally these two interventions are same but different from each other is due to their place of origin. Search conferences emerged with consulting practices in Great Britain, Europe, and Australia, while future search conference emerged in United States. Merrelyn Emery and Ronald Purser in their book The search Conference have distinguished between these interventions. According to them the basic design of the search conference consists of three phases i.e. environmental appreciation (changes in the world around us and desirable and probable future), system analysis (history of the system, analysis of the present system, and desirable future for the system) and integration of system and environment (dealing with constraints and strategies and action plans). In the US, Marvin Weisbord has written extensively about future search conferences.
Quality of Work Life Programmes: It has been presented earlier in this chapter.

Stream Analysis:

It has been developed by Jerry Porras. It is a valuable model for thinking about change and for managing change. It is a system for graphically displaying the problems of an organization, examining interconnections between the problems, identifying core problems (those with many interconnections), and graphically tracking the corrective actions taken to solve the problems.

Porras (1987) categorized the important features of organizational work-setting (the environment in which people work) into four classes of variables such as: Organizing arrangements (include such things as goals, strategies, structure, administrative policies and procedures, administrative systems, reward systems, and ownership), Social factors (include culture, management style, interaction processes, informal patterns and networks and individual attributes), Technology (includes tools, equipment, and machinery, information technology, job design, workflow design, and technical systems), and Physical setting (includes space configuration, physical ambience, interior design, and architectural design).

Steps

- A thorough diagnosis of the organization's problems and barriers to effectiveness is performed, via brainstorming sessions, interviews, questionnaires, and other methods.

- A task force of representatives from all parts of the organization reviews the problems and barriers, discusses them until reaching agreement on what they mean, and categorizes each problem into one of the streams. Four columns are drawn on paper; the column headings are labeled “organizing arrangements”, “social factors”, “technology”, and “physical setting”.

- The interconnections between the problems are noted; problems that have many interconnections are identified as core problems.

- Action plans are developed to correct the core problems. The action plans and their results are tracked on stream charts.
The action plans are OD interventions directed solving the core problems. The OD programme systematically addresses and resolves the issues identified, and by so doing correct dysfunctional aspects of the four classes of variables that make up the organizational work setting. OD programmes modify organizing arrangements, social factors, technology, and physical settings, which in turn precipitate changes in individuals' on-the-job behaviors, leading to organizational improvement.

**Systems 1-4 T:**

Much of the early work by Rensis Likert was the development of a 105-item intervention survey that focused on a variety of organizational climate variables such as leadership, communication, decision making, job satisfaction, and peer relations.

The survey assesses four overall styles of participative leadership and organizational climate on a continuum from 1 to 4 as shown in the Table 2.3.

**Table 2.3 : Likert's Management Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System 1: Exploitive authoritative</td>
<td>Management uses fear and threats; communication is top down with most decisions taken at the top; superiors and subordinates are distant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2: Benevolent authoritative</td>
<td>Management uses fear and threats; communication is top down with most decisions taken at the top; superiors and subordinates are distant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3: Consultative</td>
<td>Management offers rewards, occasional punishments; big decisions come from the top whilst there is some wider decision making involvement in details and communication is downward whilst critical upward communication is cautious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 4: Participative group management</td>
<td>Management encourage group participation and involvement in setting high performance goals with some economic rewards; communication flows in all directions and is open and frank with decision making through group processes with each group linked to others by persons who are members of more than one group called linking pins; and subordinates and superiors are close. The result is high productivity and better industrial relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A manager and supervisor should always adapt behavior to take account of actual employees, adapting general principles to expectations, values and skills they have. Organizations should generate the conditions which encourage every manager to deal sensitively with them.

Whilst it is possible to have job centered, tough management, that can achieve high productivity through systems of control there will still be unfavorable them and us attitudes amongst employees towards work and management, with a higher labor turnover and greater labor and management conflict.

Social scientists help obtain objective measurements in organizations of such variables as:

- Members' loyalty to the organization
- How individuals' goals interact with the organization's goals
- Motivation
- Trust and Confidence between different hierarchical levels
- Communication and whether each manager/supervisor is correctly informed of the expectations, obstacles, problems, reactions, and failures of employees
- How each manager/supervisor provides assistance to employees based on understood expectations

This is the interaction-influence system (between employees and organization), and why it is improving or deteriorating and what is required to improve matters. Objective information, the authority of facts has to come from the social scientist's tools, so that an enhanced human behavior based law of the situation (originally Mary Parker Follett) is revealed for the purposes of action.

An organization should have an integrative unity where what happens matters to the individual and what matters to the organization are as one. This is System 4.
Total Quality Management (TQM):

Total Quality Management (TQM) is a management strategy aimed at embedding awareness of quality in all organizational processes. TQM has been widely used in manufacturing, education, government, and service industries, as well as NASA space and science programmes.

Total Quality provides an umbrella under which everyone in the organization can strive and create customer satisfaction. TQM is a people focused management system that aims at continual increase in customer satisfaction at continually lower real costs.

As defined by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO): "TQM is a management approach for an organization, centered on quality, based on the participation of all its members and aiming at long-term success through customer satisfaction, and benefits to all members of the organization and to society."

In Japan, TQM comprises four process steps, namely:

1. **Kaizen** – Focuses on Continuous Process Improvement, to make processes visible, repeatable and measurable.

2. **Atarimae Hinshitsu** – The idea that things will work as they are supposed to (e.g. a pen will write.).

3. **Kansei** – Examining the way the user applies the product that leads to improvement in the product itself.

4. **Miryokuteki Hinshitsu** – The idea that things should have an aesthetic quality (e.g. a pen will write in a way that is pleasing to the writer.)

TQM requires that the company maintains this quality standard in all aspects of its business. *The following features tend to characterize TQM. This list is largely based on total quality conferences held in the United States and abroad by the Conference Board and on a special issue of Business Week entitled 'The Quality Imperative'.*
Primary emphasis on customer
The development of an organizational culture in which employees at all levels, including the CEO, give paramount treatment to customer needs and expectations.

Daily operational use of the concept of internal customers
Emphasis on the concept that work flow and internal interdependencies require that organizational members treat each other as valued customers across functional lines as well as within units.

Emphasis on measurement using statistical quality control and statistical process control techniques
Statistical quality control is a method of measuring and analyzing deviations in manufactured products; statistical process control is a method of analyzing deviations in manufacturing processes.

Competitive benchmarking
Continuous rating of the company's products and practices against the world's best firms, including other organizations in other industries.

Searching of defects
Continuous search for sources of defects with a goal of eliminating them entirely. The Japanese call it Kizen.

Participative management
It includes extensive delegation and involvement and a coaching, supportive leadership style.

Emphasis on teams and teamwork
The typical vehicle for such a focus is self-managed teams. Cross-functional and multilevel task forces are also used extensively.

Emphasis on continuous training
Learning new and better ways of doing things and adding new skills are essential. In many organizations training is reinforced by changes in the reward system, for example, the introduction of skill-based or knowledge-based pay.
Top Management Support on an Ongoing Basis

Long-term perspective and a long-term commitment are required on the part of top management.

Because of the emphasis on creating an organizational culture that features extensive participation, an emphasis on teams and teamwork, cooperation between teams and units, the generation of valid data, and continuous learning, TQM appears to be highly congruent with OD approaches and values.

TQM as Large-Scale Systems Change

TQM is at first glance seen primarily as a change in an organization's technology, its way of doing work. In the human services, this means the way clients are processed, the service delivery methods applied to them, and ancillary organizational processes such as paperwork, procurement processes, and other procedures. But TQM is also a change in an organization's culture, its norms, values, and belief systems, about how organizations function. And finally, it is a change in an organization's political system: decision making processes and power bases. For substantive change to occur, changes in these three dimensions must be aligned: TQM as a technological change will not be successful unless cultural and political dimensions are attended to as well (Tichey, 1983).

Many (e.g., Hyde, 1992; Chaudron, 1992) have noted that TQM results in a radical change in the culture and the way of work in an organization. A fundamental factor is leadership, including philosophy, style, and behavior. These must be congruent as they are presented by a leader. Many so called enlightened leaders of today espouse a participative style which is not, in fact, practiced to any appreciable degree. Any manager serious about embarking on a culture change such as TQM should reflect seriously on how she or he feels and behaves regarding these factors. For many managers, a personal programme of leadership development (e.g., Bennis, 1989) may be a prerequisite to effective functioning as an internal change agent advocating TQM.
Other key considerations have to do with alignment among various organizational systems (Chaudron, 1992 and Hyde, 1992). For example, human resource systems, including job design, selection processes, compensation and rewards, performance appraisal, and training and development must align with and support the new TQM culture. Information systems are needed to be redesigned to measure and track new things such as service quality. Financial management processes may also need attention through the realignment of budgeting and resource allocation systems. Organizational structure and design are different under TQM: layers of management may be reduced and organizational roles certainly change. In particular, middle management and first line supervisors are operating in new ways. Instead of acting as monitors, order givers, and agents of control they serve as boundary managers, coordinators, and leaders who assist line workers in getting their jobs done. To deal with fears of layoffs, all employees should be assured that no one is going to lose employment as a result of TQM changes: jobs may change, perhaps radically, but no one will be laid off. Hyde (1992) has recommended that we "disperse and transform, not replace, midlevel managers." This no layoff principle has been a common one in joint labor management change processes such as quality of working life projects for many years.

Another systems consideration is that TQM should evolve from the organization's strategic plan and be based on stakeholder expectations. This type of planning and stance regarding environmental relations is receiving more attention but still is not common in the human services. As it is discussed below, TQM is often proposed based on environmental conditions such as the need to cut costs or demands for increased responsiveness to stakeholders. A manager may also adopt TQM as a way of being seen at the proverbial cutting edge, because it is currently popular. This is not a good motivation to use TQM and will be likely to lead to a cosmetic or superficial application, resulting in failure and disappointment. TQM should be purpose oriented: it should be used because an organization's leaders feel a need to make the organization more effective. It should be driven by results and not be seen as an end in itself. If TQM is introduced without consideration of real organizational needs and conditions, it leads to skepticism on the part of both managers and workers.
**Implementation Principles and Processes**

Specifics of TQM implementation can be discussed in two ways. First, a model for organizational transformation through visionary leadership is presented. A full implementation of TQM represents a significant change in the culture and political economy of an organization, and a comprehensive change strategy is therefore required.

**Current Reality and Preconditions**

A preliminary step in TQM implementation is to assess the organization’s current reality; relevant preconditions have to do with the organization’s history, its current needs, precipitating events leading to TQM, and the existing employee quality of working life. If the current reality does not include important preconditions, TQM implementation should be delayed until the organization is in a state in which TQM is likely to succeed. The force field analysis discussed above is one of the useful tools in reviewing the current situation.

If an organization has a track record of effective responsiveness to the environment, and if it has been able to successfully change the way it operates when needed, TQM becomes easier to implement. If an organization has been historically reactive and has no skill at improving its operating systems, this leads to employee skepticism and a lack of skilled change agents. If this condition prevails, a comprehensive programme of management and leadership development may be instituted. A management audit (Sugarman, 1988) is a good assessment tool to identify current levels of organizational functioning and areas in need of change. An organization should be basically healthy before beginning TQM. If it has significant problems such as a very unstable funding base, weak administrative systems, lack of managerial skill, or poor employee morale, TQM would not be appropriate.

However, a certain level of stress is probably desirable to initiate TQM; people need to feel a need for a change. Kanter (1983) addresses this phenomenon by describing building blocks which are present in effective organizational change. These forces include departures from tradition, a crisis or galvanizing event, strategic decisions, individual “prime movers,” and action vehicles. Departures from tradition are activities, usually at lower levels of the organization, which occur when entrepreneurs move outside the normal ways of operating to solve a problem. A crisis, if it is not too disabling, can also help
create a sense of urgency which can mobilize people to act. In the case of TQM, this may be a funding cut or threat, or demands from consumers or other stakeholders for improved quality of service. After a crisis, a leader may intervene strategically by articulating a new vision of the future to help the organization to deal with it. A plan to implement TQM may be such a strategic decision. Such a leader may then become a prime mover, who takes charge in championing the new idea and showing others how it will help them get where they want to go. Finally, action vehicles are needed: mechanisms or structures to enable the change to occur and become institutionalized. TQM processes and models of employee participation are such mechanisms.

Essential or desirable preconditions may be identified in two areas: macro and micro. Macro factors include those which are concerned with issues such as leadership, resources, and the surrounding infrastructure. Micro issues have to do with internal issues such as employee training and empowerment and organizational processes such as quality assurance. These are listed in the Table 2.4 below.

Table 2.4: Macro and Micro Issues in TQM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions Supportive of Change</th>
<th>MACRO</th>
<th>MICRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Top management support</td>
<td>Customer focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders championing new ideas</td>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td>Long-term strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of political leadership</td>
<td>Employee recognitions and training</td>
<td>Employee empowerment and teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy civic infrastructure</td>
<td>Employee recognitions and training</td>
<td>Measurement and analysis of products and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key leaders having shared vision and goals</td>
<td>Employee empowerment and teamwork</td>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust among those in power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the macro level, Osborne and Gaebler (1992, 3267) have listed several "factors supportive of fundamental change" which showed up in their research on "reinventing government". These factors, summarized in Table 2.4, are consistent with research cited earlier about effective organizational change. It should be noted that Osborne and Gaebler researched governmental organizations only; but several factors, including leadership and a long-term perspective, are relevant in not-for-profit settings as well. The first factor, a crisis, was also identified by Kanter as a driving force for change. Next, Osborne and Gaebler noted the importance of leadership. Such leaders are usually at the executive level of the organization, where they can champion new ideas and protect risk takers. At the political level, a continuity of leadership is desirable: a long-term commitment is necessary, and politicians are often not willing to adopt this perspective. A healthy civic infrastructure is also valuable: an organization in a community with citizens, community organizations, and businesses committed to the public welfare is more likely to be able to engage in large-scale change. Furthermore, key leaders in the community having a shared vision and goals, and a level of trust among those in power (e.g., executives and union leadership), are valuable. Outside resources, in the form of help from foundations, consultants, civic organizations, or other governments are necessary. Finally, while there is no one best way to implement particular change efforts, it does help to have models to follow: other organizations who have implemented change can offer useful guidance and reassurance that change is possible. At least half of these factors were present when "wholesale reinvention" occurred. Many of these factors are present in successful case studies of TQM and other large-scale change.

On the micro level, the US Federal Quality Institute identified several key factors related to successful TQM. First, as many researchers have noted, top management support is necessary. This is typically represented partly through strategic planning regarding TQM. Second, a customer focus is an important precondition, since TQM often involves improving quality from a customer's point of view. Employees or their representatives (i.e., unions) must be involved early, particularly in addressing employee training and recognition and employee empowerment and teamwork issues. Attention to these issues is
important in changing the organization's culture in the direction of teamwork and a customer and quality focus. The measurement and analysis of products and processes and quality assurance are final elements which need attention (cited in Hyde, 1992). Assessing these factors and private sector applications, Hyde (1992) listed the following implications regarding TQM implementation in the public sector. First, basic quality measurement systems have to be developed. These need to be accessible to all levels, and, in fact, must be designed and implemented with employee involvement. More specifically, any unions in the organization must be substantively involved. Consistent with a systems perspective, budgeting and resource allocation systems are needed to be realigned to fit with the TQM culture; TQM cannot be used as a mechanism to simply cut costs or rationalize cutbacks. The same is true of human resource management systems: work may be redesigned to implement self directed work teams; performance appraisal and compensation systems may be changed to reward team based performance; and massive training for managers, supervisors, and workers are necessary. Finally, thoughtful attention needs to be paid to the ways in which customer feedback is used.

**Visionary Leadership**

With these principles and preconditions in mind, the following implementation steps are discussed: using leadership to articulate a vision of the future for the organization and how TQM fits into it, designing a comprehensive change process, implementing TQM and related new systems, and ensuring institutionalization.

As was emphasized earlier, leadership is a key element in successful implementation of large-scale change (Norman and Keys, 1992): the leader shows the need and sets the vision, defining the basic purpose, goals, and parameters or requirements of TQM. The leader needs to take a long-term perspective, and must be able to motivate others to stick with the process during early stages when resistance and obstacles may seem insurmountable. The preferred leadership style would be a participative one, so that staff may be involved in the design of the specific system elements. This may seem in contradiction to the earlier stated preference for an "intervention" approach as opposed to traditional participative decision making. In the former, the leader is,
in fact directive regarding the big picture and overall goals, i.e., establishing PDM. Once that strategic direction has been determined, a participative style may be used on implementation details. Prior to this decision, of course, the manager should study TQM, talk to others who have used it, and perhaps attend a preliminary training session. This is important in order for the manager to accurately assess the fit between TQM and her/his style. This is necessary in establishing an organizational culture which is compatible with TQM, nurturing and reinforcing continuous quality improvement (Cohen and Brand, 1993, 118).

In designing a comprehensive change process, the leader must acknowledge the existing organizational culture (norms and values, managers' leadership philosophies and styles at all levels) to ensure a good fit. TQM also needs to be congruent with or aligned with other organizational processes, including reward systems, financial and information systems, and training systems.

Implementing TQM essentially involves organizational transformation: beginning to operate in new ways, developing a new culture. This also includes redesigning other systems, as has been described above. Such change, while difficult, is possible in the public sector, in spite of Swiss's (1992) reservations (Packard and Reid, 1990).

**Steps in Managing the Transition**

Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) have outlined the basic steps in managing a transition to a new system such as TQM: identifying tasks to be done, creating necessary management structures, developing strategies for building commitment, designing mechanisms to communicate the change, and assigning resources.

Task identification would include a study of present conditions (assessing current reality, as described above); assessing readiness, such as through a force field analysis; creating a model of the desired state, in this case, implementation of TQM; announcing the change goals to the organization; and assigning responsibilities and resources. This final step would include securing outside consultation and training and assigning someone within the organization to oversee the effort. This should be a responsibility of top management. In fact, the next step, designing transition management structures, is also a responsibility of top management. In fact, Cohen and Brand (1993) and Hyde
(1992) assert that management must be heavily involved as leaders rather than relying on a separate staff person or function to shepherd the effort. An organization wide steering committee to oversee the effort may be appropriate. To communicate the change, mechanisms beyond existing processes are needed to be developed. Special all staff meetings attended by executives, sometimes designed as input or dialog sessions, may be used to kick off the process, and TQM newsletters may be an effective ongoing communication tool to keep employees aware of activities and accomplishments.

Management of resources for the change effort is important with TQM, because outside consultants will almost always be required. Choose consultants based on their prior relevant experience and their commitment to adapting the process to fit unique organizational needs. While consultants are invaluable with initial training of staff and TQM system design, employees (management and others) should be actively involved in TQM implementation, perhaps after receiving training in change management which they can then pass on to other employees. A collaborative relationship with consultants and clear role definitions and specification of activities must be established.

**Institutionalization of TQM**

Ledford (cited in Packard and Reid, 1990) has proposed a model including four processes which are forces which determine whether a change persists through the phases of institutionalization. These processes are concerned with congruence among these variables: the change (TQM) with the organization, the change with other changes initiated at the time, the change with environmental demands, and with the level of slack resources in the organization. TQM needs to be congruent with the organization's current culture, and with other changes occurring in the organization. In this period of diminishing resources, organizations are likely to be trying to cope, by downsizing or other methods. In some organizations there are increasing demands for quality or client service improvements. Many such changes are likely to be driven by environmental demands, and TQM may be more likely to be successful than at times of less environmental pressure. Unfortunately, the fourth element, slack resources, is less likely to be present: under current conditions, extra resources (money and staff time) are less likely to be easily
available. The challenge is to find a way to make the initial investment outlay to start a process which will pay off in the long term.

Institutionalization may also be enhanced by staff learning to do the things in an effective manner. Leaders help staff developing their own visions and align these with the organization's vision of quality.

Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) emphasized top management commitment to the change, and Cohen and Brand (1993) apply this specifically to TQM by recommending finding and nurturing a core group which is interested in organizational change. They also emphasize the importance of personal leadership and example: managers need to apply TQM in their daily work and to get people to think about and use the concepts and tools. Ongoing monitoring, and action research to make changes as needed, are required. And, once again, the systems perspective must be noted: TQM must be built into other systems, particularly those involving planning and rewards. Leaders should expect a long term process, including a transition period. They will need to be persistent, using constant reinforcement, for example, through continuous training. Cohen and Brand suggest that TQM should eventually be made an "invisible" part of the organization, permeating all areas and the responsibility of everyone. TQM may be instituted organization wide or started in one unit or programme and then expanded. Diffusion occurs as TQM is spread from its initial application to other units. Dynamics of resistance mentioned earlier will have to be addressed at this stage.

From Problem-Faced to Problem-Solved

The PDCA Cycle is a checklist of the four stages which one must go through to get from 'problem-faced' to 'problem solved'. The four stages are Plan-Do-Check-Act, and they are carried out in the cycle illustrated in Figure 2.17 below:
The concept of the PDCA Cycle was originally developed by Walter Shewhart, the pioneering statistician who developed statistical process control in the Bell Laboratories in the US during the 1930's. It is often referred to as 'the Shewhart Cycle'. It was taken up and promoted very effectively from 1950s by the famous Quality Management authority, W. Edwards Deming, and is consequently known by many as 'the Deming Wheel'.

The PDCA Cycle is used to coordinate continuous improvement efforts. It both emphasizes and demonstrates that improvement programmes must start with careful planning, must result in effective action, and must move on again to careful planning in a continuous cycle.

The PDCA Cycle diagram is used in team meetings to take stock of what stage improvement initiatives are at, and to choose the appropriate tools to see each stage through to successful completion.

How to use the PDCA Cycle diagram to choose the appropriate tool is explained below.

*Plan-Do-Check-Act*

What should be done for each stage of the Cycle:
• **Plan** to improve operations first by finding out what things are going wrong (that is to identify the problems faced), and come up with ideas for solving these problems.

• **Do** changes designed to solve the problems on a small or experimental scale first. This minimizes disruption to routine activity while testing whether the changes will work or not.

• **Check** whether the small scale or experimental changes are achieving the desired result or not. Also, continuously check nominated key activities (regardless of any experimentation going on) to ensure that one knows what the quality of the output is at all times to identify any new problems when they crop up.

• **Act** to implement changes on a larger scale if the experiment is successful. This means making the changes a routine part of activity. Also Act to involve other persons (other departments, suppliers, or customers) affected by the changes and whose cooperation is needed to implement them on a larger scale.

This completes the cycle to arrive at 'problem solved'. Again it is required to go back to the Plan stage to identify the next 'problem faced'.

If the experiment is not successful, it is required to skip the Act stage and going back to the Plan stage to come up with some new ideas for solving the problem and go through the cycle again. Plan-Do-Check-Act describes the overall stages of improvement activity, but how is each stage carried out? This is where other specific quality management, or continuous improvement, tools and techniques come into play. Figure 2.18 below lists the tools and techniques which can be used to complete each stage of the PDCA Cycle.
This classification of tools into sections of the PDCA Cycle is not meant to be strictly applied, but it is a useful tool to help to know what to do at each critical stage of the improvement efforts.

**Structural Interventions:**

These interventions are required to improve organizational effectiveness through changes in the task, structural, technological, and goal processes in the organization. This class of interventions includes changes in how the overall work of the organization is divided into units, who reports to whom, methods of control, the spatial arrangements of equipment and people, work flow arrangements, and changes in communications and authority.

The various interventions like; Socio-Technical System, Self-Managed Teams, Work Redesign, MBO and Appraisal, QWL Programmes, Parallel Learning Structures, Quality Circles, and Total Quality Management have been explained earlier in this chapter.
Large-Scale Systems Change and Organizational Transformation:

This indicates organizational change that is massive in term of the number of organizational units involved, the number of people affected, the number of organizational subsystems altered, and/or the depth of the cultural change involved. For example, a major restructuring with objectives including a reduction in hierarchical levels from eight to four and shifting to a more participative leadership style might involve every unit of the organization, affect the responsibilities of every employee at every level, and would require changes in such aspects of work flow, reporting relationships, job descriptions and titles, compensation, and training programmes.

When OD approaches are used in large-scale change efforts, multiple types of OD interventions are utilized.

There is no doubt that all these OD interventions described above are necessary to enhance the performance of organizations. This requires a collaborative effort between the client organization(s) and the consultant(s) in both diagnosis and intervention.
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CHAPTER-2(B)
Organization Development:
Literature Overview
A total of sixty studies by different authors on organization development area have been reviewed and the main findings of some important studies are presented below. These findings have implications on this research work.

The study by Bartram and Casimir (2007) revealed that the effects of transformational leadership on in-role performance of follower are mediated by empowerment and trust in the leader, whereas the effects of transformational leadership on satisfaction are partially mediated by trust in the leader. Piotrowski (2006) outlined an OD intervention strategy that addressed organizational issues that could reduce turnover in special academic setting. Sisaye (2006) stressed on the objective to apply organizational systems perspectives to discuss the three types of organizational development and management control system: normative, coercive and remunerative-instrumental (utilitarian) that affect the operating performance of teams. Herzig and Jimmieson (2006) suggested that during organizational change, at the pre-implementation stage, uncertainty focuses on the strategic concept of the change, whereas at implementation, uncertainty is related to the appropriate procedure to implement. Middle manager's uncertainty management is found to be important in assisting their employees in the change transitions.

Jeffery (2005) addressed the adaptation of a quality improvement procedure called six sigma that OD practitioners include their repertoire of analytic tools and interventions to support the analysis and improvement of organizational processes. He argued in favor of inherent compatibility of OD and six sigma. As an OD tool, six sigma is best suited in the diagnosis and improvement of processes. OD practitioners could implement six sigma to perform more technical analyses of processes to support techno structural interventions. Pech and Oakley (2005) argued that organizations that endure and survive a serious disruption to homeostasis may as a consequence be better equipped to survive further and more devastating attacks. They found that hermetic effects may occur in an organization just as it does in a biological entity following exposure to a life-threatening disruption, inoculating it against potentially more lethal recurrences. Schraeder, Tears and Jordan (2004)
revealed that training and leading by example can serve as effective methodologies for promoting culture awareness and bringing about culture change in organizations. Avolio, Zhu, Koh and Bhatia (2004) outlined on hierarchical linear modeling analysis which revealed that psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. Structural distance between the leader and follower moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. Waldersee and Griffiths (2004) distinguished between two change implementation approaches i.e. participative implementation and unilateral implementation. He stressed that unilateral implementation approach is more effective than that of participative. While employee support is related to change success, it is the function of change type not participative implementation. Behavioral-social change types generate more support than technical-structural changes.

Fitzgerald, Murrell and Newman (2002) considered Appreciative Inquiry (AI) as a novel approach to organizational change work. According to Cooperrider and Whitney (1999), Appreciative Inquiry is the cooperative search for the best in people, their organizations, and the world around them. The five underlying principles (constructionist, simultaneity, poetic, anticipatory, and positive) come to life through the design of basic AI process, which is typically presented as a cycle of four phases known as 4-D cycle: Discovery, Dream, Design, and Delivery/Destiny.

Malon (2001) suggested coaching as the best way to enable the five self-efficacy strengthening approaches i.e. self thought, mastery experiences, modeling, social persuasion, and psychological states. Rao and Vijaylakshmi (2000) explained how Indian organizations adopt OD to make them more effective and efficient. They concluded that learning in today's competitive and fast changing environment is not a mere desirable luxury but a frequent necessity. Wetzel and Buch (2000) described a change process based on a structural model of differentiation and integration. The process consists of five steps which are: building mental models, analyzing structural trends, analyzing structural gaps, analyzing structural interventions, and closing structural gap.
Bate, Khan and Pye (2000) stressed that by bringing design and development together it is possible to blend structure and culture together into a single cultural form, thereby realizing significant organizational change. Cacioppe (2000) described a new vision for leadership and development of organizations which integrates emerging perspectives from the fields of science, transpersonal psychology, eastern philosophy and management. Spirituality is seen as important in helping human beings experience the fundamental meaning and purpose of their work.

Burke (1997) addressed the efficacy of reengineering and downsizing and articulate a current and future agenda for OD practitioners with respect to these techniques, by considering six additional intervention domains i.e.: community, the employer-employee social contact, employability, trust, culture clash, and corporate power. Fox (1995) revealed that the Socio-Technical Systems (STS) approach is devoted to the effective blending of both the technical and social systems of an organization.

Hall (1993) addressed fundamental elements to implement and manage change successfully to achieve a new vision. He stressed that creating a new vision of an organization can be accomplished unilaterally by the CEO or by a multidiscipline and multilevel taskforce. Communication and translation of the vision should be taken place. Covin (1992) found out some common packages or combinations of OD techniques utilized by companies attempting to implement large-scale changes. He stressed that several identifiable OD techniques that are being utilized across many different types of organizations and industries for a variety of the interventions would be categorized as multifaceted and there is not a simple relationship between types of techniques utilized, the number of techniques utilized, or change process time frame and perceived change process effectiveness.

Nielsen, Nykodym and Brown (1991) stressed that the field of organization change is extremely value-laden. Clients, practitioners and researchers come into change projects with both individual and organizational values. Porrás and Silvers (1991) suggested a model of planned organizational change, which consists of four identifiable, interrelated components : (a) a
change intervention that alters, (b) key organizational target variables that can impact, (c) individual organizational members and their on-the-job behaviors resulting in changes in (d) organizational outcomes. Schein (1990) gave the historical overview of organizational culture by identifying several different research streams that today influence how we perceive the concept of organizational culture.

Gracia and Haggith (1989) tried to find out the procedure to make OD intervention effective in the organization and also to find out the reason for failure of OD interventions. They revealed that OD failures are associated with poor diagnosis of the organization, lack of understanding about the OD process by participants, inattention to task, technology and structure, culture based resistance, inadequate management support and poor practitioner/client relationships. Managers should avoid these problems to succeed in the future.

Plunkett (1988) suggested that creativity can be actively promote in an organization, increasing participation commitment can lead to increased creativity in an organization and organization development intervention is a viable method to increase the creative output of an organization, and to do so in a short time. They also found that the effects of the intervention seem to be lasting.

Martine (1986) revealed that no single intervention is suitable to deal with the intent to leave; rather multifaceted interventions are required. Randolph and Posner (1982) stressed that inter-group development interventions can be effective at any stage, but the impact will be felt in different outcome measures and perceptual measures of organizational processes. Greater attention tends to be given to life cycle stage and past history when conducting OD in any organization and also when assessing the impact of an intervention. Nicholas (1982) assessed the impact of three classes of OD interventions (Human processual intervention, Techno-structural intervention, and Multifaceted intervention) based on 65 empirical studies. They found that no one change technique or class of techniques works well in all situations. Terpestra (1982) conducted a study to assess comparatively the state of the art of evaluation of four major organization development intervention types - laboratory training, survey feedback, team-building, and process consultation and it was concluded
that only through better and more methodologically sound evaluation practices can the field of OD achieve the degree of respectability critical for continued growth and development.

Lindell and Drexler (1980) revealed that an accurate report of an actual change in behavior or a response scale recalibration could (but not necessarily would) produce a change in factor structure. They concluded that a change in factor structure would not uniquely identify the presence of any of the three types of change i.e. alpha change, beta change and gamma change. Tichy, Hornstein and Nisberg (1976) stressed that developing Emergent Pragmatic Theory (EPT) is one way to counter the problem, the organizations face while working together to change and improve an organization and having multiple vision creating problems such as disagreement over diagnosis and uncertainty about change priorities.

Bowers and Franklin (1972) emphasized on survey feedback as an important OD intervention and suggested several general propositions regarding certain basic assumptions of OD, change processes and the change agent's role and activities. Argyris (1970) revealed that the basic requirements for intervention activity are generation of valid and useful information; free, informed choice; and the client's commitment to the choices made. Hence these three things are considered to be the integral parts of any intervention activity, no matter what the substantive objectives are. These three processes are called primary intervention tasks.

Reason and McArdle found that action research is not a methodology, but an approach that shapes methodological practices. As such it is full of choices: rather than thinking in terms of 'getting it right or wrong', action researchers must endeavor to make appropriate choices in different situations. Action research and organization development are close cousins. Blake, Mouton, Barnes and Greiner stressed that managerial and team effectiveness can be taught by managers with outside assistance and this type of educational strategy can help to make significant contributions to organizational effectiveness.
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