Emerging Trends in Organizational Development

By

Jonathan Mozenter

Boston University Graduate School of Management
OB888

Independent Study

Supervised by Prof. Kathy Kram

6/22/99

87 Brighton Ave #1
Allston, MA 02134
617-254-9796
954-212-8221 (fax)
jonathan.mozenter.1999@alum.bu.edu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following paper is intended to help Organizational Development (OD) practitioners to understand what macro forces are currently effecting organizations and how these forces will impact the future trends in OD. The paper walks the reader through the process I took to determine the five biggest new trends in the field. It begins with an introduction explaining my investment in researching this topic. Next, I describe my hypothesis and methodology. The majority of the paper is a discussion of the chosen macro forces (changes in technology, constant change, partnerships and alliances, changes in structure of work, increase diversity in the work force, shifting age demographics, globalization, and mergers and acquisitions) that result in the following five emerging trends in OD:

(1) Expanding the use of OD

(2) Combing traditional "hard" business competencies and OD

(3) Creating whole system change- organizational design and culture change

(4) Using OD to facilitate partnerships and alliances

(5) Enhancing constant learning

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

According to Warren Bennis, Organizational Development (OD) (1969) "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." Some of the more common OD interventions include: change management, coaching, organizational design, visions, missions, values, and teambuilding. For a more complete listing, view the quantitative survey I used in my research (See Appendix B).

Since I plan to enter the field of OD after graduation, I was anxious to know more about the different applications of OD. I wanted to understand how the field of OD would change in the future so that I can proactively position myself within it for future growth. I wanted to become acquainted with different firms, their approaches, their challenges and their clients. I was also hoping to get a feel for what it is like to do research as that is something I am considering doing in the future.

This project helped me understand the complex process it takes to interpret the macro forces that influence the future trends of OD. Although the process is difficult, it is necessary in this rapidly changing environment.

Participating in this project had many benefits beyond discovering the trends in the field. Among the benefits of my project were the new relationships I made with interesting people in the business community. Another benefit was learning about new types of interventions in the OD field that I previously had little or no knowledge of.

CHAPTER I

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS AND METHODOLOGY

Hypothesis

The hypothesis for my research is based on the assumption that OD is driven by organizational challenges. Thus, I had to identify the macro forces, which serve as catalysts for organizational challenges, before I could identify the future OD trends. My belief was that the main force would be constant change causing the major OD trends to be learning organizations, knowledge management, organizational redesign, and change management. My rational was that a climate of constant change challenges companies to be constantly learning as well as creating organizational designs that are more flexible in order to meet the demands of this environment.

Methodology

Based on my hypothesis, I decided the best way to gather the necessary data was to do a combination of library research and qualitative and quantitative surveys completed during interviews with professionals in the business community. I wanted to obtain a sample that included multiple perspectives, therefore I gathered information from four different groups in the business community: line mangers, external OD consultants, internal OD consultants, and other business minds such as management consultants and business professors (See Appendix A). The survey used was custom designed based on library research. One potential bias of this sample is that the majority

of the line managers interviewed were currently in or had graduated from Boston University's Executive MBA program.

The quantitative survey focused on two areas: what OD interventions are being used today vs. what will be used in three years, and how much effect are the macro forces having today vs. how much perceived effect they will have in three years. I created this survey based on library research, which indicated the OD interventions that I perceived were currently in use and the macro forces that appeared to effect organizations. The categories are measured using a Likert scale from one to five (See Appendix B).

The qualitative surveys focused on acquiring data on current organizational challenges vs. perceived challenges in three years and the current effects of the macro trends on the organization vs. in three years. This survey consisted of open-ended questions answered by the interviewees (See Appendix C).

Approximately two thirds of the quantitative surveys were completed in conjunction with the qualitative interviews. The remaining third were completed independently. A different form of the qualitative survey was used for each of the four professional groups. Two forms of the quantitative survey were used, one for those with an external perspective on organizations (external OD practitioners and other business minds) and one for those with an internal perspective of organizations (line mangers and internal OD practitioners). All the interviewees' names remain anonymous for the purpose of confidentiality. In addition to the surveys, I collected more qualitative data through informal conversations with OD practitioners, conferences, and E-mail topic specific discussion groups to further support my research.

After all the data was gathered and coded, I analyzed the material. All quantitative data except for the data from the other business minds group were analyzed using an one-tail t-test with a 95% confidence level to determine if the perceived changes in use of specific OD interventions were significant (See Appendix D). I did not complete a t-test for the other business minds group because of the small sample size of this group and the variance of positions with in the group. This analysis also included understanding which OD interventions are currently being used so that I could determine the new trends. My research revealed that the most common OD interventions used today included, but are not limited to, mission and vision statement creation, strategic planning, reward and recognition, change management, leadership, team building, and facilitation. Although these interventions will all remain constants in the world of OD and may be referred to, my focus in this paper will be on the following five emerging trends:

(1) Expanding the use of OD

(2) Combing traditional "hard" business competencies and OD

(3) Creating whole system change- organizational design and culture change

(4) Using OD to facilitate partnerships and alliances

(5) Enhancing constant learning

CHAPTER II

DISCUSSION OF THE MACRO FORCES

<u>Measured Macro Forces</u>

The following section describes the macro forces that were quantitatively

measured and how they are effecting organizations today and how they are perceived to

effect companies in the future. These forces (changes in technology, constant change,

partnerships and alliances, changes in structure of work, increase diversity in the work

force, and shifting age demographics) set the stage for the emerging OD trends.

<u>Changes in Technology</u>

In today's world technology is evolving at a faster rate than any other time in

history. For example Intel, the world's biggest supplier of computer chips, tries to double

the speed of its chip every eighteen months (Willis, 1997). Organizations constantly

have to adapt to new technology.

According to the quantitative surveys, changes in technology was seen as the

force that is perceived to have the biggest current and future impact on organizations

relative to the other macro forces. The average for all interviewees was 4.4 now and 4.52

in three years. The biggest disparity between the groups was between internal and

external OD practiioners. External practitioners clearly saw changes in technology as

having the biggest impact scoring a 4.71 now and 4.78 in the future while the internal

consultants scored it 4.27 now and then decreasing to 4.09 in three years. These results

likely occurred because external OD practitioners usually deal with companies that are

unable to cope with changes in technology and therefore see changes in technology as having a larger effect than internal practitioners (See Appendix E).

My findings are consistent with previous research. PricewaterhouseCoopers did a research study on CEO's titled "Inside the Mind of the CEO in 1998" (Schiro, 1998). In this report, 79% of the CEOs felt technology would either shape or significantly effect their industry. The Wall Street Journal (November 16, 1998) recently asked organizational experts how technology would change the workplace over the next 10 years. "They talked of a convergence of work and life, the death of geography, a return of the telecommuter to the office, the depersonalization of email, and jobs made routine by technology."

Changes in technology are seen by most interviewees as not only the biggest macro force, but also the cause of many of the other forces, particularly constant change and change in the structure of work. Whole new industries, companies, markets, and distribution channels are forming as a direct result of changes in technology. Some jobs will disappear and others will appear. For example, call centers will replace some of the face to face customer service interaction (Cairncross, 1997).

Michael Dertouzos (1998), head of MIT Laboratory of Computer Science, believes that technology will bring together three powerful elements: massive automation, virtual proximity capabilities, and customization. Technology is allowing new relationships to form that would have never happened before. The Internet and Intranet are changing the way we do work and the way we interact with the customer and with each other. Companies will use the Internet to improve their processes and to communicate with their suppliers. They will have online auctions with suppliers for

goods and save 5-20% on the cost of goods sold. Suppliers and distributors all will become a seamless electronic network. These changes create a need for new competencies such as strong computer skills, strong communication skills, a need to be more customer friendly, and a need to react to everything much faster (Dertouzos, 1998).

Changes in technology have also caused problems such as creating physical barriers between workers, and creating distracters like e-mail, which contributes to work avoidance. Many companies install new technology, but do not prepare the people and the systems for the appropriate changes. Strategies and cost structures need to be rethought, and employees and customers need to be much more computer savvy. The success of every technology initiative depends on overcoming resistance to change (Puccinelli, 1998).

<u>Constant Change</u>

As opposed to the past, organizations can no longer depend on what they do today to be successful tomorrow. Organizations are facing changes on many frontiers such as increased competition and more complex business models.

The people interviewed viewed constant change as having a great effect now and in the future. The average rating for all interviewees was 4.12 now and 4.21 in the future. Those interviewed with an external perspective of the company saw constant change as having a much bigger impact on employees than those with an internal perspective both now (4.5 vs. 3.82) and in the future (4.59 vs. 3.9). These results may have occurred because external consultants and other business minds usually deal with companies that are unable to cope with constant change and therefore view constant change as having a

larger effect than internal consultants and line managers, who work with companies where constant change may not always be a problem (See Appendix E).

Again, my results are consistent with previous research. According to Peter Drucker (speaking, 1998), the fifth business challenge for managers is dealing with the uncertainty resulting because we cannot predict the future in a constantly changing environment. James Champy (1997), chairman of CSC Index, feels business will change quickly. He states, "Processes will be redesigned, new opportunities and strategies will emerge, organizational structure and relationships will shift both inside and outside of the company, new information technology infrastructures will be required, the work of managers will change, and will require new behaviors from our people" (p. 9-10).

Constant change is a derivative of all of the other macro forces. Technology has linked the world so that companies are not geographically confined. Therefore, companies are now dealing with increased competition from a global market. Technology is enabling companies to compete in nontraditional markets, which further increases competition. This competition has made it so companies have to be continually changing to keep up with the times. One way of accomplishing this is by taking advantage of economies of scale by merging and acquiring other companies. The chaos created by merging companies is also a cause of constant change. In order for companies to stay competitive, they must also continually adapt their products and services to meet the ever-changing evolving needs of the customer.

Companies are dealing with increased competition by using non-traditional business models, which are also contributing to constant change. Companies are finding new distribution and marketing channels for their products and services, such as the

Internet. Changes in technology are also enhancing internal processes in the form of information technology. For example Enterprise Resource Planning systems, like SAP and Oracle, link geographically dispersed business units in a way that allows corporations to instantaneously track internal procedures, such as accounting and inventory, collectively. Companies are now structuring their business models to focus on core competencies and capabilities instead of products in order to improve efficiencies (Stalk, Evans, and Schulman, 1992). Thus, companies are forming partnerships, alliances, and outsourcing relationships to ascertain the necessary non-core competencies and/or capabilities. For example, Nike has core competence in marketing and product design, but not in production, which they outsource (Hamel and Prahalad, 1994).

Constant change not only influences companies on the organizational level; it also has ramifications on the employee level. The employee will no longer serve a singular function. Rather, the employee will move from project to project to mirror the changes in the company. The constant change often causes the employee to burn out, and hence stay with the organization short term as opposed to the traditional business model of life long employment and job security. Retention and recruiting are current big issues for companies.

Daryl Connor, president and founder of Organizational Development Resources Inc. in his book "Managing At The Speed of Change," believes that employees in environments of constant change will suffer from future shock. He states, "Essentially, future shock occurs when people are asked to absorb more disruption than they have the capacity to take in" (cited by Pierce, 1996). Connor suggests some of the symptoms of

future shock include: poor employee relations, physical and emotional discomfort, and low morale.

Companies are trying to cope with all the issues caused by constant change by attempting to learn both individually and as an organization. They are trying new ways to attract and retain employees. They need to empower their employees. They also need to have a diverse workforce in order to compete in today's world. Companies need to be flexible to be able to constantly adapt. Managers need to focus on how to develop strategy in uncertainty (Drucker speaking, 1998). Howard H. Stevenson and Jeffery L. Cruikshank (1998) write about how companies might deal with constant change in their book Do Lunch or Be Lunch. The main point of the book is that in order to be successful in a constantly changing environment one needs to be predictable. The book makes a compelling argument that management needs to be predictable to both their employees and their customers in order to build trusting relationships. Employees must know what is expected of them. Customers need to know that they can depend on the company to provide satisfactory products and services. He also states "you can't assume permanence in your predictions. You take your best shot, and you commit to a constant cycle of observation, calculation, prediction, and action. Over the long run prediction is a process of perpetual recalibration albeit with deep roots" (p. 137).

Partnerships & Alliances

As previously explained the business models for competition is dramatically changing. Companies are realizing that it is not efficient or profitable to own all of the stages in their value chain. Thus, companies are forming new types of relationships with each other to obtain stages of the value chain that they choose not to own. Partnerships

and alliances are two of these types of relationships. Partnerships and alliances are temporary relationships between two or more companies with the goals being to share risk, learn from each other, leverage each other's strengths, and/or gain a competitive advantage.

Partnerships and alliances were seen as having a significant influence both now and in three years. The average rating for all of the interviewees was 3.98 now and 4.32 in three years (See Appendix E). Companies of today and tomorrow "can't do it by themselves" claimed one professor (interview, November 19,1998). Many of the people interviewed where currently involved or thinking about joining a partnership or alliance with others in their value chain in the near future, while others still confused partnerships and alliances with mergers and acquisitions. Interviewees claim they participate in partnerships for a variety of reasons such as sharing risk, saving money, accessing knowledge and technology they don't have or can acquire in swift manner, as well as accessing markets they are not involved in quickly.

Partnerships and alliances are becoming increasingly common these days as the boundaries between collaboration and competition are becoming blurry. One line manager claimed that his company is thinking of doing a partnership with their biggest competitor (interview, December 4, 1998). Another person interviewed claimed their whole business model was about partnering with other companies who have a specific application for their technology (interview, October 22, 1998). Those who have been involved with partnerships claim that the key to having productive alliances is successfully managing all the consequent relationships. Other interviewees' claim they do not know how to make partnerships work. However, most people agreed that a new

set of management competencies is needed to create successful partnerships. These new competencies include dealing with ambiguity, as these relationships can change with out warning and are not permanent. Therefore, managers most constantly ask if they should continue relations.

Partnerships and alliances present many challenges to companies. Cultural integration, whether integrating two different company cultures or two companies with different nationalities, was mentioned the most as the biggest challenge in making alliances work. Thus, it is crucial to choose "the right" partner. In order to do this; one must have a clear sense of their own business and the essential drivers for success.

In managing partnerships there are many boundary issues such as who owns the project and how do you prevent each partner from stealing each other's secrets. Other challenges would include governance, the ability for people to work together from different companies, virtual teams, and constant communication. Drucker (speaking, 1998) sees making partnerships and alliances work as the fourth biggest management challenge. He believes that they will happen more often in the future, but currently most companies are doing them inadequately. He feels even hierarchies will have to adapt to this new competitive environment and partnerships and alliances in foreign countries are needed as part of the globalization movement. He claims that the biggest challenge in making the relationships work is finding the correct partners. One partnership that he sights as working well is between Toshiba and Corning Glass.

Changes in Work Structure

Changes in work structure, like constant change, is a byproduct of other forces including changes in technology, globalization, mergers and acquisitions, and constant

change. It refers to the effects these forces have on how organizations structure their work processes.

Most interviewees felt that changes in the work structure are a direct result of changes in technology. Companies are redesigning their process around information technology. Examples of this include Enterprise Resource Planning packages like SAP, Oracle, and Peoplesoft. Many people are now using technology so that they can work from their home (telecommuting). Other companies do not have physical locations and have their work force spread out across the globe. These companies stay in touch via technology such as telephone, e-mail, fax, ... etc. They are commonly referred to as Virtual Organizations. Gunn Partners, a management consulting firm, and Charter Oaks, an OD consulting firm are two such examples (interviews, October 29, 1998 and November 13, 1998).

Mergers, acquisitions, and downsizing are causing firms to rethink the way they work. Some firms are radically changing their structure because they are outsourcing products they once did.

In addition, the macro force, constant change, is effecting how employees are being organized. Functions are disappearing and being replaced by lines of business and project work. People are working together in teams instead of by themselves and often these teams are cross-functional in nature. All this is driven by a new customer centered attitude meaning that work and the structure of work changes with customer needs. Work structure is also changing on the supply side as supply chains are now forming around a single project and disassembling when the project ends. Manufacturing capacity is now being bought and sold on an open market, as opposed to a traditional

manufacturing model in which the manufacturing plant was owned by the organization (Malone and Laubacher, 1998).

The people interviewed were consistent in ranking changing work structure as having the fourth biggest impact now and in the future by giving it a slightly above average ranking of 3.58 now and 3.77 in three years. Of the four groups interviewed, external consultants gave this force the highest rating giving it a 3.71 now and 4.11 in three years. While the line managers saw no future growth for this force rating it 3.55 now and 3.5 in three years (See Appendix E).

Diversity

Diversity in the workforce is an organization's ability to successfully recruit and mange a diverse workforce in order to increase productivity, improve morale, heighten creativity and enhance decision-making. (Estey, Griffin, and Hirsch, 1995). R. Roosevelt Thomas Jr. (1997), founder and president of the American Institute for Managing Diversity, states that diversity refers to any collective mixture (people (race, gender, sexual orientation, education, ... etc.), systems, functions, lines of business, ... etc.) characterized by similarities and differences (p. 329).

Increased diversity in the workforce is seen as having a medium impact by the people interviewed currently with an average rating of 3.09 and is one of the lowest of the six macro forces. However, people saw this trend increasing tremendously in the future with an average rating of 3.54, which is 15% growth, and represents the highest growth of any of the trends (See Appendixes D and E). I found it interesting that this force is perceived to have and will have in the future a considerably stronger influence by

those outside of the organization than by those with an internal perspective (3.29 vs. 2.94 now and 3.92 to 3.35 in three years) (See Appendix E).

I found it surprising that many of the people interviewed still see diversity as an affirmative action issue instead of seeing it as a potential strategic advantage. This is consistent with what Miller found in his research in 1994 (cited by Bond and Pyle, 1998). Most people felt diversity was going to be an issue due to globalization in that businesses will be dealing with different countries and different cultures. Very few people mentioned diversity between different ethnicity in the United States as a concern.

Clearly, the experts see that managing diversity in the workforce is important. Drucker (speaking, 1998) stated that the third biggest management challenge is facilitating a new work force that is not heterogeneous. Thomas (1997) feels that being able to manage diversity is an important competency for managers to have in the organizations of the future. He has developed his own "Diversity Management Framework", which can be found in detail in his book titled <u>Redefining Diversity.</u> (Thomas, 1997).

<u>Changes in Demographics</u>

As we move towards the millennium, societal demographics are changing in a significant manner that is having major ramifications on organizations. Changing demographics is becoming a powerful macro force due to the following factors: the serious decline in birth rates around the world, the aging baby boomer generation moving into leadership positions and retirement, the values of younger generations conflicting with those of their predecessors, and the rise of ethnic minorities into leadership positions.

Drucker (1998) points out that the population has been shrinking in developed countries due to reduction in birth rates. The population of young people is going down while the population of old people is going up. Not only will this cause the well-publicized problem of social security, but it will effect organizations as well. He sees people working longer and the retirement age moving up to seventy-five. Further, he sees the elderly remaining in the workforce as part-time workers and contract workers. In his opinion, this will continue and even if birth rates suddenly increase it will not undo what has happened already as it will take 20 years before this increase has an effect.

Jay Conger (1997), the chairman and executive director of the Leadership Institute at the University of Southern California, writes about the baby boomers as leaders. Compared to earlier leadership styles, Conger views the baby boomers as being more informal; using team based leadership; sharing more responsibility; communicating more frequently; and challenging hierarchies. Compared to the baby boomers, Conger views the Generation Xers as being more independent, less loyal, and more disrespectful to formal authority. In order for these generations to work cohesively, baby boomers need to manage the new generation of workers by emphasizing work life balance and using a mentoring/coaching style of management as opposed to the traditional authoritarian management style.

Some people interviewed agreed with Conger's view on generational conflicts. Others focused on different issues related to the effects of changing demographics on organizations. They saw that the decline of the Caucasian population combined with growth of minority groups will necessitate the breaking of the perceived "glass ceiling" that in the past prevented non-white males from entering leadership positions.

Interviews indicated that this force effects certain industries more than others. People in finance claim changing demographics is having a big impact on investments. Baby boomers are expected to inherit seven to ten trillion dollars, much of which will be reinvested (interview, November 4, 1998). At the same time, people in healthcare and pharmaceuticals claim it is effecting them because as the elderly population increases there is a greater need for their products (interview, November 13, 1998). People in the grocery industry also explain that the changing demographics is greatly effecting them in that older people tend to buy healthier products (interview, November 13,1998).

Interviewees see changes in demographics as having the smallest impact relative to the other macro forces being measured. The average rating for all interviewees was 3.08 currently, which represents a medium effect. Three years from now people see this impact growing by 12%, which is the second highest percentage increase of the six macro forces with an average rating of 3.45. However, this is still the lowest average rating relative to the other six-measured macro forces (Appendixes D and E).

There was a sharp contrast between the answers of those interviewees with an internal perspective and those interviewees with an external perspective. People inside the company perceived changing demographics as having a much bigger effect now, with an average rating of 3.21, than those outside the company, whose average rating was 2.9. However, the groups switched perspectives when considering the force's future impact. Those outside the company saw this force as being a bigger factor three years from now, with an average rating of 3.7, as opposed to those inside the company whose average rating was 3.35. Thus, those with an external perspective see the effects of changes in

demographics as growing by 28%, which is significantly higher than the 4% growth viewed by those with an internal perspective (Appendixes D and E).

<div align="center">**<u>Non-measured Macro Forces</u>**</div>

The research indicated that other major macro trends where effecting business today and in the future that where not measured quantitatively by me. The two most commonly mentioned forces where globalization and mergers and acquisitions.

<u>Globalization</u>

More and more companies are selling their products and services on a global basis. Changes in technology, such as the Internet, freer international trade laws, and competition are some of the primary factors driving globalization. Drucker (1998) feels globalization is crucial and that even medium sized companies need to be based on a global economy (speaking, 1998). He feels regions will become like free trade systems as they were before 1914 due to the European Monetary Union (speaking, 1998). Due to the evolving interconnectedness, the world is slowly becoming a single economy. As a result of globalization, brand identity is becoming multinational. Many companies are using partnerships and alliances to enter foreign markets.

As companies become global, they become more susceptible to growing interdependencies. The Communist block break up, China moving toward a diversified economy, the ending of the Cold War, the Asian economic crisis, Japan's decreased economy, and the European union among other global political and economical changes are having a ripple effect across the world. For example, Mitre Corp went from a weapon provider to an information provider with the end of cold war and the rise of technology (interview, October 30, 1998).

<u>Merger and Acquisitions</u>

Mergers and acquisitions are when multiple companies financially combine and are then owned by the same shareholders. Drucker (speaking, 1998) thinks mergers are a defensive maneuver for those companies in declining industries who want to take advantage of economies of scale.

Many people interviewed mentioned that they felt that companies would continue to be involved with mergers and acquisitions in the future. They also felt that in the future mergers and acquisitions would occur more between companies of different nationalities. Regardless of who is merging the big challenge is making the merger work. Most people feel successfully combining the different company cultures is a significant factor in determining the success or failure of the merger. In fact, Cathy Walton and John McBride (1998) write that the biggest cause of failed mergers is due to the mixing of two cultures. In addition, Joseph A. DeAngelis, PHD (interview, December 12, 1998) writes in a research paper entitled "Mergers and Acquisitions: Why the Beat Goes On" that his research indicated 80% of mergers and acquisitions do not meet financial goals and that 50% are outright failures. He later states that his most recent research concludes the two biggest factors in making mergers work is the culture compatibility of the two organizations and the way the integration is managed.

<div align="center">**<u>Summary</u>**</div>

In this chapter, I described the many challenges today's organizations face due to the macro forces. The main challenges include: dealing with increased competition and customization, the need to be flexible and cope with uncertainty, the ability to create an environment of constant learning, adapting to new technology and globalization, and

developing new management competencies. In the next chapter, I will describe how these challenges will affect the profession of OD.

CHAPTER III

DISCUSSION OF THE TRENDS

The following section describes the five emerging trends in OD that evolved after a careful analysis of common themes in the collected data. The trends are:

(1) Expanding the use of OD

(2) Combing traditional "hard" business competencies and OD

(3) Creating whole system change- organizational design and culture change

(4) Using OD to facilitate partnerships and alliances

(5) Enhancing constant learning.

The section is divided by trend. I begin each description by defining the trend. Then I justify it with supporting data and finally, explain its implications.

Trend #1: Expanding the Use of OD

The easiest of the trends to predict is that OD is rapidly becoming more accepted as necessary to enhance the productivity and profitability of organizations and is consequently expanding.

An indication of the growth of OD now and in the near future is the increase in the number of research articles and books written about OD related topics. One OD practitioner, who learned his trade in the 70's, commented that back when he began his work at Harvard there were only two or three books a year on OD. Now, this self-proclaimed "ferocious reader" claims, "there are so many OD books that I can't keep up" (interview, January 8, 1999). He further stated that even executives are reading these

books. Harvard Business Review, which is often considered the journal that sets the

trends in industry and that many universities who offer the MBA degree base their

programs around, has given much attention to OD related topics for at least the past 10

months. On average about six out of the eleven articles included in the journal were

related to OD issues/interventions (See Appendix F).

In order to deal with many of the challenges created by the macro forces more OD

is necessary. Constant change is forcing companies to become more competent at change

management. This constant change is also burning employees out, which is forcing

companies to focus on the quality of work life in order to retain their best employees.

The level of competition is at an all time high due to changes in technology and

globalization. Since companies can quickly access the same information through

technology and benchmarking, often the competitive advantage rests in the ability of an

organization's employees to analyze, utilize, and capitalize on information (Dertouzos,

1998). Maximizing employee performance is accomplished by a number of OD

interventions including but not limited to following three interventions:

(1) Aligning the following organizational dynamics: vision, organizational design,

culture, compensation, and strategy.

(2) Providing the tools and climate that induce constant learning.

(3) Helping employees obtain strong interpersonal skills so that they can work on

teams, network, and manage conflict with all portions of the value chain.

Michael Porter (1998) believes that in tomorrow's business environment

competitive advantage lies increasingly in knowledge, relationships, and motivation that

distant rivals can not replicate. Similar to Porter, Charles Handy (Drucker et al, 1997)

believes that in the future corporations need to focus on making the lives of their employees better, having the willingness to change, and developing self-confidence in their people.

Drucker (speaking, 1998) refers to the need for organizations to maximize employee performance as developing the "knowledge worker." Dertouzos (1998) calls it mastering the human asset, which includes the ability for employees to work in teams. He claims teamwork is important on an international scale. For example, In Japan, teamwork is described as "hummanware" and in France, it is referred to as "Toyotism." Another factor related to a need for enhanced interpersonal skills is the gap in values created by the macro force changing demographics.

The September 1998 International Data Corporation (IDC) report forecasts change management as the fastest-growing consulting activity. Between now and 2001 the report suggests change management will increase by 18.6% per year. The report suggests that consulting firms' view change management as one of their top competencies. It is often packaged together with other types of consulting like technology implementation such as installing Enterprise Resources Planning systems (ERP). The report reveals a strong demand for change management services across all industry sectors; the growth has been especially robust in the telecommunications, manufacturing, and financial service sectors. Government, health care, retail, and utilities follow these industries.

In the 1999 Winter edition of <u>Leader to Leader,</u>, there is a study comparing low and high users of total quality management, reengineering, and employee involvement. The study measured each intervention by the percent return to the investors. The results

revealed that companies that were high users of the employee involvement intervention lead to the highest returns at 45%. High users of the reengineering intervention at 34% and total quality management interventions at 28% followed in returns. The study also revealed the gap between high and low users of each intervention to be the highest for employee involvement with a 23% gap. This is significantly higher than the others, a 5% gap for reengineering and a 4% gap for total quality management. The data clearly indicates that high use of OD interventions, particularly the employee involvement intervention, reveals high returns to investors (p. 48).

Organizations are being exposed to OD principals more than in the past because many of their new employees are being taught these principles in graduate school. One line manager interviewed claimed that he hires engineers from Carnegie Mellon, Purdue, and MIT who have all brought in and implemented OD concepts (interview, December 4, 1998). For example, one employee from MIT connected the MIT learning lab with his organization to execute a 2-day off-site retreat with a team of 80-135 significant employees. The goal of the retreat was to work out plans on a new project. Interventions used on the retreat-included team building, making a process road map, and assigning roles and responsibilities. The line manager claimed it was very successful because the retreat provided the project team with the key elements to succeed: teamwork, a positive outlook from its people, and employee buy in.

The survey data further supports the need for more OD in the future. The data for all interviewees indicates that the use of OD interventions will increase by approximately 20%. Thirty of the thirty-one interventions measured showed an increase in use over a three-year period. The only intervention that showed a decrease was re-engineering,

which was predicted to decrease by 2%. Nineteen of the thirty-one OD interventions are perceived to grow by 20% or more in three years. Only two of the interventions, vision/mission statement and facilitation, were predicted to grow by less than 9%. This can be understood because mission and vision statements was rated as the most used OD intervention now with a score of 3.92. Thus, its growth to 4.01 is insignificant because its use is currently widespread. The lack of perceived growth in facilitation can possibly be explained because executives need to be competent in facilitation hence there is less of a need for OD practitioners to provide this skill. This will be explained further in the next trend combining traditional "hard" business competencies and OD (See Appendixes D and E).

The most telling signal that OD is expanding is that the group that perceived the greatest growth in the use of OD, at 27.72%, were the line managers. I feel this group is the least biased pro-OD, and therefore I would have predicted them as having the lowest growth rate of the four groups. In addition, since line mangers see the day to day operations, they have an invaluable sense of an organization's immediate and future needs. Line managers are key decision-makers as to the amount of OD used in their organization. The internal OD consultants, who also see the day to day operations of organizations, had the second biggest increase in growth rate at 24.25%. External OD consultants saw an 18.30% growth. External OD consultant's lower growth rate can at least partially be explained because they perceive a higher current use of OD. This perception is obviously biased because the majority of the companies they are exposed to are their own clients (See Appendix E).

OD is also successfully spreading into other types of organizations. The educational system is a prime example. Rover Elementary School in Tempe Arizona uses OD in running the school as well as teaching OD to students. Rover administration believes that adults have trouble with conflict, leadership, teamwork and change because they were not given opportunities to become proficient in these skills as children (Horne, 1/18/99). Thus, Rover Elementary school used visioning, participative design with all stakeholders, partnerships, core competency identification and value based feedback loops to design their curriculum. This new curriculum teaches the students directly skills in facilitation, leadership, teambuilding, consensus-based problem solving, vision development, and effective feedback/conflict resolution skills (McClelland, 1998).

The Rover vision is "The rover family will be a community of lifelong learners who are caring, productive, global citizens, emotionally sensitive and giving to others" (Rover Elementary, pamphlet). The program has been in place for five years. The success of Rover's program can been seen by the hundred plus requests from out of town parents to have their children attend the school and the resounding endorsements from the Center of Resilience Studies in both Arizona and Texas.

Another example of OD expansion can be seen in management consulting. In November of 1997, an article in Management Consulting by Jay Berry, noted one of the big trends in the consulting industry was that consulting firms are using change management consultants to implement their recommendations. In the past consulting firms just made recommendations and left the implementation to the company or to untrained amateurs. In addition, one professor claimed that recently the "big five consulting/accounting firms" have frequently been acquiring OD consulting firms

(interview, November 19, 1998). PricewaterhouseCoopers' Management Consulting

Services East Strategic and Organizational Change (MSC East S/OC) unit just recently

expanded their change management/organizational development practice. Previously it

had been primarily used as a complementary service to the strategic and technology

consulting units. Now, MCS East S/OC will seek projects on its own and in conjunction,

the unit is doing massive hiring.

Human Resources is also incorporating more OD interventions. In January of

1998, Personnel Journal included an article, which made sixty Human Resource

predictions for the year 2008. The journal predicted that HR departments will focus their

time on: creating collaborative cultures in the workplace, enhancing lifelong learning,

evaluating employees by their competencies, and focusing on organizational

performance. Charles D. Spencer and Associates, Incorporated (1997) also did a research

study on HR. They surveyed 1,700 HR professionals on Human Resource Trends. The

data revealed work in organizational change and involvement with senior management in

business strategy development are greater contributors to an organization than traditional

HR administrative or employee relation's activities. When asked to name the one skill

that has increased most in its importance in the HR profession, 26% of the HR

professionals surveyed cited change management skills.

Trend #2: Combining Traditional "Hard" Business Competencies and OD

Combining traditional "hard" business competencies and OD is another emerging

trend exhibited by the research. Business managers need to manage and lead their units

on a day to day basis using OD skills such as implementing an active mission, vision and

value system, managing change, and providing an atmosphere for continuous learning

and employee empowerment. OD is also influencing the traditional management consulting process. This has created a great opportunity for OD practitioners to transfer their competencies through coaching and training, in addition to the existing collaborative consulting approach. Simultaneously OD practitioners are beginning to use hard business skills in their work. OD practitioners of the future are going to need to measure their interventions in bottom line metrics and all OD interventions will need to be aligned with business goals and strategies.

<u>OD Skills needed by Managers and Management Consultants</u>

The successful companies of tomorrow will be driven by their aspired vision, mission, and values. It is up to company leaders to develop these guiding forces and for the managers to implement them. A useful vision, mission, and value system is visible and put into action on a day to day basis. These guiding forces provide stability in a constantly changing environment and allow people to link their personal purpose to corporate purpose (Somerville and Mroz, 1997).

Managers of tomorrow need to implement these guiding forces by creating the appropriate culture. This is accomplished by modeling and creating policies that are in alignment with the forces. Managers also need to hire people who fit into the company's culture by using behavioral related competencies to help decide who to hire (Hanaka and Hawkins, 1997).

Since change happens so quickly, mangers often do not have the time to bring in specialists to help with the adaptation process. Thus, managers will have to mange change themselves (Champy, 1997). Drucker (speaking, 1998) believes that not only do managers need to be able to manage changes, but they also need to view these changes as

opportunities for improvement. This he feels is the definition of innovation. One of the biggest factors and most difficult challenges in making positive change is convincing employees to abandon their old habits. Under performers are those people who keep alive yesterday. French psychologist Claude Bernardt put it best, "It is what we think we know already that often keeps us from learning." (cited by Easton, 1999).

C.K. Prahalad (1997) believes mangers of the future will have to juggle various types of change simultaneously. They must learn to adapt quickly in order to fend off competition, as product life cycles are much shorter. They have to motivate their employees to think outside of their usual mental model because now companies are competing in new industries. Managers need to adjust to having direct access to the customer and the supplier via e-commerce. They need to help their employees learn to manage outsourcing relationships. All of these changes make it necessary for managers to learn and think strategically. Managers need to listen to their employees and customers in order to make accurate changes. They also need to understand how they are contributing to a situation and change appropriately by reflecting and obtaining feedback from their colleagues (Shearman, 1998).

Managers need to support an environment of continuous change by matching it with a culture of continuous learning. The manger needs to make sure he models desired behaviors as well as invests in knowledge infrastructures and learning laboratories (Drucker et al, 1997). Iain Somerville & John Edwin Mroz (1997) refer to one type of knowledge infrastructure as "promoting knowledge networking." This infrastructure consists of actively managing and capturing knowledge through company research and development, operations, logistics, marketing, customer service, and other day-to-day

activities. This knowledge is transferable and becomes a foundation for growth, hence it is a strategic asset to the company. The steps involved in the knowledge life cycle are modeled after the discipline of library science: acquisition, classification, valuation, storage, access, use, improvement, and retirement. This constant search for knowledge must not be limited to internal activities. It is critical for today's mangers to search the globe for ideas (p. 65-78).

Drucker (speaking, 1998) feels that the number one skill that the managers of tomorrow need is continuos learning. He suggests managers can accomplish this in part by job swapping. When an employee is out for a vacation, it should be the manager who fills in. Then the manager can learn the competencies associated with that position. Prahalad (1997) feels that part of being a continuous and extensive learner means that managers must use system thinking.

Companies of tomorrow need leaders at all levels not just at the top. It is the manager's role to build the self-esteem of his/her employees and empower them to be leaders through support and encouragement rather than controls and punishment (Somerville and Mroz, 1997).

Today's employee needs to be a strong person who can not only survive, but also thrive in an environment of constant change by being a continuous independent learner. This means there is a greater need for self-management and the capacity to exercise initiative. In order for this to occur, employees must have high self-esteem. Nathaniel Branden (1997), a well-known psychotherapist and organizational consultant, describes the six pillars of self-esteem (See Appendix G). Branden suggests that leaders can help

employees develop each pillar of self-esteem, but first leaders must develop each pillar in themselves.

The key to empowerment is motivating employees to make decisions and work on their own without given directions (Hanaka and Hawkins, 1997). In order for a company to successfully empower its employees many things need to be aligned including a strong vision, mission and value system; a culture that rewards independence and risk taking; clear polices and procedures; and a reward system. To help discover gaps in the alignment of the above factors, it is critical for company leaders to ask themselves the following questions: to what degree do we believe empowered people perform better, how well do actions match belief, what attitude needs to be changed in order to close the gap, and which of our polices promote empowerment and which limit it (Harmon, 1997). In addition, managers need to approach employees by using active listening, and encouragement.

MBA programs teach many traditional OD competencies in order to prepare their students to cope with the challenges of the real world. For example, Boston University's Graduate School of Management's core classes emphasize teamwork, reflection as a tool for constant learning, and empowering employees. In addition, they offer electives in change management, facilitation, leadership, and process consultation.

One company that has actively, inserted OD into their management practice is CH2M Hill. CH2M Hill is a global construction company with 150 offices in 25 countries. They use an OD model in project management. This new model is drastically different and significantly more effective than their previous traditional approach. The new model is process driven in that it embraces the following ideologies: the customer is

an integral part of the process; quality is checked continuously; change is a necessary aspect of a successful project; problems are viewed using a systemic approach; reflection is utilized to enhance learning; knowledge is captured for further use; and appropriate closure is reached with all stakeholders. This approach has been so successful that CH2M Hill sells the model to other corporations (VanDeusen, 1999).

Increasingly traditional management consulting is starting to use OD competencies in their work. Management consultants are collaborating with their clients in tackling problems rather than using an expert approach. They are trying to transfer the knowledge over to the client to avoid dependencies. This requires the management consultant to act as more of a coach and a facilitator than an expert and a presenter. Management consultants are also taking a systemic approach to their consulting rather than just dealing with symptoms.

The change management director at one of the big five consulting firms told me his goal is to make change management a competency of all the management consultants in his firm (interview, November 17, 1999). This transference is accomplished when OD practitioners and management consultants collaborate. The IDC reports, "in an effort to integrate change management with all their service offerings, a growing number of companies are ensuring that change management is one of the critical core competencies in their firms" (p. 1).

Traditional Business skills needed for OD practitioners

One of the interviewees stated, "In OD which is also called OE (organizational effectiveness), the only way to be effective is to focus on the business. Too many OD people are doing work with out making links to business" (interview, January 8, 1999).

Surprisingly this quotation represents the opinion of many other interviewees as well.

Apparently, there is some negative stigma attached to the term OD. The interviewees

tended to associate OD people as "soft types" who care to help people, but add little

value to an organization because they know little about how make business run better.

Even some people who I considered OD practitioners put down the field claiming that

they were different. Instead, they choose different titles for their work such as Business

Psychology, Organizational Effectiveness, Organizational Transformation, and Change

Enablement. The following are quotations from successful OD Practitioners and OB

(Organizational Behavior) Professors which further express and explain the negative

perception of OD:

> "OD has had the same struggle for 50 years : trouble becoming accepted or
>
> legitimate. OD is too "soft." It needs the business side" (interview, November 9,
>
> 1998).
>
> "OD is dying and it should. There is a transformational shift/need to combine the
>
> hard and soft side of business" (interview, October 26, 1998).
>
> "OD is dead fundamentally. It needs to help companies deal with strategic issues.
>
> It needs to deal with the bottom line, and needs to measure interventions and
>
> show how we save companies millions of dollars" (interview, November 18,
>
> 1998).
>
> "Practitioners need to articulate results by measuring OD in business terms"
>
> (interview, November 11, 1998).
>
> "OD people tend to look at things in isolation. Many do not have the necessary
>
> business experience, but it is shifting. 60% of OD practitioners focus on OD and

business and 40% don't focus on business issues at all" (interview, January 8, 1999).

It is obvious that people in the business community feel that successful OD practitioners need to have a firm understanding of the goals, strategies, metrics, and language associated with business. Ultimately, the goals of any OD practitioner should be to enhance a company by saving money, making it more efficient, and increasing revenues. They must choose metrics that are meaningful to the client to prove this success.

The research indicated that OD practitioners should have several business competencies. These competencies are needed so that they can understand the client system that they work with, sell their services, and manage their own practice. Along with understanding these competencies, it is vital for OD practitioners to understand the appropriate business language. Using this language will allow the OD practitioner to relate to the decision-makers and hence attract and retain customers. Companies want practitioners who will understand them. Too many practitioners explain themselves in terms meaningful only to other practitioners instead of presenting themselves in terms that resonate with the customer. One practitioner explained that he/she tries to avoid explaining their work as "soft skills." He states, "I use the phrase 'tough stuff.' Decision-makers seem to love the idea that there might be some hardness to what OD is, some concreteness, and "tough" does that. And, after all, what we do really is tough because it involves change, growth, and development" (e-mail, May 29, 1999). Another practitioner said, "Usually, decision makers are most interested in results produced, as measured in time, effort, and money. Decision-makers are only secondarily, if ever,

interested in our processes. Unless they think they will get the results they want, they won't care about process" (e-mail, May 28, 1999).

Glenn H. Varney, Ph.D. and Arthur L. Darrow, Ph.D. (1998) did a research study on master's level graduate programs in OD and change. As part of that study, the people interviewed were asked to comment on the courses and skills that were necessary to create the ideal graduate program. The comment that was most frequently mentioned by a two to one margin was that programs should include business courses such as MBA introductory courses, especially a course on financial management. Based on my research data, I have compiled the following list of main "hard" business competencies that OD practitioners should have:

1. Finance- skills include: a basic understanding of finance, profit and loss, return on investment/sales, balance sheet and income statement analysis, fixed and variable cost of doing business, overhead, profit margins, and cash flow analyses.

2. Business Management- skills include: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, controlling, reporting, budgeting, and strategy.

3. Operations – skills include: a basic understanding of manufacturing, call center operations, customer service, and Total Quality Management.

4. Program evaluation – skills include: how to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of programs, performance management, productivity and quality.

5. Information Systems – skills include: a basic understanding of information systems and decision support systems which assist organizations with decision making and problem solving.

6. Sales and Marketing – skills include: a basic understanding of distribution channels and market research.

7. Human Resources – skills include: a basic understanding of reward and recognition and labor relations

8. Statistics – skills include: statistical analysis, standard deviation, correlation analysis, and t- tests.

Several practitioners commented that measuring OD is something that is needed to help the field of OD evolve. One practitioner stated it best when he said,

> "Measurement is an area of weakness for the OD field. We tend not to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of our work. Often we use interventions because they "feel" good instead of using interventions with measured effectiveness. I believe that in the 21st century OD must incorporate evaluation methods in order to justify the continuation of the field" (e-mail, May 29, 1999).

The author Warner Burke (1982) summarizes the main reasons why it is important for OD practitioners to evaluate their interventions. The following is his list of reasons:

1. An evaluation forces the definition of change objectives.

2. An evaluation forces the clarification of the change outcomes that are expected.

3. An evaluation forces specificity with respect to how certain procedures, events, and activities will be implemented.

4. An evaluation helps to signal many of the problems and obstacles to be anticipated in the OD effort.

5. An evaluation facilitates planning for the next steps and stages of organizational improvement and development. (p. 330)

Quality Progress and Metrus Group's research on how, how much, and how successful management uses people metrics in their organization, demonstrates how measuring interventions on people can be successfully done. The results showed that most companies use people metrics, but only 30% used them strategically. The research further indicated that this small group of companies where much more financially successful than those who do not use people metrics in a strategic manner with higher 5-year rates of return of 146% vs. 97% for those companies who did not use them strategically. Organizations who used their people metrics strategically also were found to be twice as likely to be industry leaders and more likely to be linking people metrics to customer satisfaction and financial performance measures (Morgan & Schiemann, 1999).

There are two types of OD measurement. One is called implementation feedback. The purpose of this form of measurement is to see if the intervention is going as planned. The second is evaluation feedback, which is done at the end of the intervention to see if the intended goals were achieved (Cummings and Worley, 1993).

OD Practitioners are starting to be creative in how they measure their interventions. One OD firm, Strategic Systems Resource Group, uses the concepts from Robert S. Kaplan and David P Norton's book The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action to measure their interventions (interview, May 16, 1999). Another firm, Performance Resources Organization, offers a class on how to measure return on investment (ROI) in human resource development programs. American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) offers many books on their webs site about measuring development programs including Return on Investment in Training and

Performance Improvement Programs: a Step-by-Step Manual for Calculating the

Financial Return by Jack J Phillips (e-mail, 6/11/99).

Trend #3: Creating Whole System Change-

Organizational Design and Culture Change

Many of the practitioners interviewed mentioned that they have moved their

practice from one that worked on symptoms of problems by doing isolated interventions

to one that looks at root causes and therefore changes the whole system. The backbone

of any company is its organizational design and culture; thus, these are the major

components of a whole system change intervention. Whole system change projects take

longer and are more expensive, but the results are more effective and longer lasting. The

process involves understanding the strategic business model of the company and making

sure the organizational design, culture, and compensation are all in alignment.

Drucker (1997) agrees that organizational design and culture will be important to

the strategic success of companies. While every organization is different, there are some

common challenges for most companies that can be dealt with through similar

organizational designs and cultures. These organizational designs include maximizing

flexibility, retention, globalization, empowerment, implementability, and learning (refer

to learning organizations under trend #5). This aligning of strategy, organizational

design, and culture also needs to be done during mergers and acquisitions. In meeting

each of these common challenges, the organization is enhancing its ability to serve the

customer and improve its own bottom line. The quantitative data supported growth in

this area with all people interviewed feeling culture change would grow by 25% and

organizational design by 14% (See Appendixes D and E).

<u>Maximizing Flexibility</u>

In order for companies to adapt to the world of constant change, they need to make their organizations more flexible. Champy (1997) feels nimbleness and agility will be principal designing criteria for organizations. Like Champy, Doug Miller (1997), CEO of Norrell Corporation, believes organizations need to act like chameleons, always adapting to their environment to compete in the future. He believes this type of organization has five important characteristics: flexibility, strong core competencies, commitment to the individual, superior use of teams, and a taste for diversity. The flexibility comes from what Handy (1989) refers to as the shamrock organization in his book, <u>The Age of Unreason</u>. A shamrock organization has a small strong core staff with knowledge and expertise of the company and fills in the rest of the staff with part time workers, contract workers, outsourcing, and partnerships. These temporary relationships allow the company a great deal of flexibility.

In shamrock organizations there is a great need for the non-core workers to show commitment to the people in the core by proactively giving them training that helps them develop the constantly evolving skills needed to do their jobs. This simultaneously motivates the employees to keep working with the organization because each party is invested in personal growth. One skill all employees in the core need is the ability to work effectively in teams as the chameleon organization consists of many constantly changing self-organized teams (Miller, 1997).

Jay Galbraith (1997), a faculty member at the International Institute for Management Development in Lausanne, Switzerland, also believes companies need to be flexible, but has a different approach than Miller. He calls his approach the

reconfigurable organization. This organizational design can constantly reconfigure itself to stay in alignment with the constantly changing environment. Like Miller, Galbraith believes that constantly changing cross-functional teams are a crucial component to the organizational design as well as to partnerships. Galbraith feels that partnerships are needed to secure the companies strategic capabilities (the behavioral aspects of strategy that cover a process across the entire value chain) (Stalk, Evans, and Shulman, 1992). Employees will need to have extensive networking skills internally to make the cross function team concept work and have them externally to make the partnerships work. In addition, the company must supply an internal pricing system for the rotating employees, a market where employees can formulate teams, and market like devices to coordinate the various changing teams.

In order to support this concept, information and goal-setting policies such as accounting systems, data structures and planning processes need to be flexible as well. Each one needs to operate as a mini-business, needs a strong management team to over look and manage conflict, and strong internal price policies. The human resources department also needs to have flexible policies to support a reconfigurable organizational design. Human resources should help create a culture that influences employee behaviors and mind sets that support reconfigurability by training employees to be cross-functional and creating cross-functional networking opportunities. Human resources also helps by hiring people who like to work in teams, solve problems, handle conflict, and who have the desire and potential to learn new skills and have cross functional assignments and careers. These employees need to be continuously developed by receiving frequent automated 360 feedback and continuous training. Salaries are based on a person's skill

rather than on the job. Raises are based on how much learning is done during the year with a one-time bonus (Galbraith, 1997).

Hewlett-Packard (HP) is a company who has their own process for dealing with constant change called patching. Patching is a process where executives re-map business units to match the current and future demand. It allows HP to quickly move from a product with declining sales to a new high potential line. HP employees believe organizational structure is inherently temporary. Unlike most companies, strategy does not drive the business, the right business opportunities do and strategy emerges from them (Eisenhardt and Brown, 1999).

The elements necessary to make the patching concept work are keeping the business units small, and making frequent changes, which are quickly implemented. Company infrastructure also needs to be in alignment by having modular business, metrics that are fine grained and complete, and consistent company compensation (Eisenhardt and Brown, 1999).

<u>Retention</u>

One result of the macro forces is that organizations rely on the people who work in them more than ever. Thus, it is crucial to design organizations that can successfully recruit, retain, and develop employees.

Anthony Smith and Tim Kelly (1997) have their own theory on how to accomplish retaining quality employees. In order to be a company that attracts the right employees you need have a reputation of being a company that can develop a portfolio of transferable skills, give appropriate compensation and recognition, and are honest and straight forward with employees. This company must be very proactive in training and

developing its employees. Recognition and compensation must go beyond salary and benefits and include things like no seniority, and helping employees find meaning in their work and opportunities for leadership and advancement. Being open and honest with the employee means that organizations need to be loyal by ensuring no lay-offs. They must use open book management by disclosing executive compensation, the amount of hours in a typical workweek, mission, values, and the probability of advancement.

When recruiting, it is important be aware of diversity as good talent comes in many different forms. It is also crucial to screen for emotional intelligence as all leaders need emotional intelligence to succeed in their work (Goleman article, 1998).

Human resources should be strategic in nature and all development programs should be aligned with the company strategy. Employee development should include induction and socialization programs that use powerful orientation programs rather than let culture just happen by trial and error. Organizations should ensure that teams are well functioning by providing the appropriate support. Effective teamwork accelerates development, and enhances performance and fun. Employees should receive real-time feedback and coaching to help them change behaviors that would improve their performance. All expectations should be clear, measured and followed up with feedback and consequences.

Retaining good people is a competitive advantage. Microsoft and Disney are prime examples of companies who successfully retain their quality employees. In order to retain the best employees leaders must be credible exhibiting conviction, character, care, courage, composure, and competence. The culture, environment, mission, values and vision aspired must be realized. Corporations need to continually survey their

organization to find out how close they are to their benchmarks and design programs that will make them move towards them (Smith and Kelly, 1997).

Globalization

A challenge facing today's companies is to think globally by taking advantage of economies of scale and the countless synergies that exist in a large cooperation while acting like a small company that has intimate relations with its local customer. Asea Brown Boveri (ABB), a twenty-five billion-dollar global company that is made of approximately twelve hundred small companies, has constructed an organizational design and culture that meets this challenge (Taylor, 1991). The company uses a multifaceted matrix system. At the top of the company there is an executive committee consisting of thirteen people that is responsible for ABB's global strategy and performance. Each of the thirteen people has two types of managers below them, one who manages a business segment and one who manages a geographical area. General managers of individual companies within ABB have two supervisors, one for their business unit and one for their geographic area. The business unit manager helps the company act globally by taking advantages of economies of scale and synergies. The geographic manager helps the local company have intimate relations with customers by customizing the products and services to corresponding nationalities.

In order to accomplish the strategy of simultaneously acting globally and locally, ABB develops their global managers. They look for people who are extremely open-minded, who are not ethnocentric, and who are willing to push the limits of a culture's comfort zone. These global mangers must also be creative, generous, and patient and speak English articulately. The company trains these managers by rotating them from

one managerial position to another around the world, have them work in multinational teams, and force them to create personal alliances across borders (Taylor, 1991).

Each local company has well defined sets of responsibilities and clear accountability for both the geographic and business unit managers, but within those guidelines the managers have complete freedom as to the methods they will use to meet the prescribed goals. Each small unit in this sense acts autonomously and is accountable for their gains and losses. This decentralization helps the company adapt to its local environment (Taylor, 1991)

Empowerment

"A fully empowered organization is one in which everyone feels they can influence the organization for its own good," states Gervese Bushe (1998), an independent OD consultant (p. 43). An empowered organization begins with an appropriate culture that emphasizes openness and honesty. Empowered work systems are typically less hierarchical and hence the incentive for people to desire promotion is nonexistent. Instead, people play one of three main roles in an empowered organization. Ninety percent of the employees play the role of producer meaning that they are the people who actually produce the goods and services which includes making decisions about how the work is done. Eight percent of employees are integrators who are responsible for the coordination of people and systems. The remaining two percent of employees are shapers who are people that develop the guiding forces and supporting structures of the organization such as clear role definitions, and appropriate feedback metrics which are aligned with the compensation (Bushe, 1998). These forces and

structures empower other employees to fulfill and exceed the expectations of their respective roles.

One company that has an empowered workforce is AES Corporation, a global electric company. This company is value driven. Its four core values are: fairness, social responsibility, integrity, and fun. At AES, fun is defined by total responsibility for decision making and accountability for results. This fully engages their employees by giving them a sense of ownership for their work (Wetlaufer, 1999).

There is no hierarchy at AES. The organization is structured in small teams. The company has no formal functional areas such as human resources. The company tries to provide individuals who have various functional expertise within each team. Despite the expertise, all of the team members act as generalists. This company finds that creating teams of individuals with different expertise enhances learning and further engages the employees. Each team has an area they are fully accountable for and they make all of the decisions, including hiring and compensation, for their area. In making hiring decisions, the teams consciously avoid hiring people for a specific functional expertise and instead focus on looking for people who would be a good cultural fit. The evaluation process is done by the teams where fifty percent of the employees compensation is based on financial performance, safety and environmental impacts and the other fifty percent is based on the ability to model the company's four core values.

The top executives or shapers, focus their time on fulfilling four roles: advisor, guardian of the four values, chief of accountability officer, and encourager. AES emphasizes celebrating accomplishments. Copying the company's design will not

necessarily result in empowerment unless the leadership fully believes and models its values (Wetlaufer, 1999).

<u>Implementation</u>

Due to the macro forces in the market place companies need to restructure their businesses in a manner that will make the implementation of company decisions and processes as easy as possible. Most organizations fail at this because they are out of alignment in some area. For example, a company will reorganize the top levels of their organization, but not change the bottom. The first step in accomplishing proper alignment is to make sure the company's structure follows its strategy. Orit Gadiesh, chairman of the board of Bain and Co., and Scott Olivet, vice-president of the board of Bain and Co., (1997) suggest that companies start the restructuring process by reorganizing the entire vertical hierarchy. This will help identify inherent tensions in the work process. It is also crucial when organizing the bottom tier to keep in mind the existing working relationships as employees are often very loyal to the their existing boss.

Next, it is crucial to design the coordinating mechanisms like cross-organizational collaboration. It is important to be very specific and explicit in the mechanism design. If only general direction is given then likely the mechanism will not create the necessary alignment that is needed for fast implementation. Similarly it is necessary to map out the decision making process in an explicit and specific pattern. The lack of a formal decision making process often causes conflict. It is advisable to first map a company's current process and figure out the key decisions, and the corresponding critical issues, data, and analyses that the company needs to make in order to successfully implement the strategy.

This information will allow you to map out the ideal decision making path, which

highlights crisp definitions of the roles of individuals and groups as well as the process

and timing of people and information coming together. A typical mistake made by

companies who are moving towards a team based approach is that they do not give

specific charters which outline the team's specific role (Gadiesh and Olivet, 1997).

Mergers & Acquisitions

When two companies attempt to combine, it is necessary to carefully think

through the process of creating a new organizational design and culture. Before the

merger takes place, it is important for the individual companies to identify their own

culture by culture mapping. The companies need to explore what culture they want the

combined companies to have and how realistic it would be to obtain that culture given the

current position of each company. An appropriate time line needs to be considered as

well. Once the organizations agree that the merger should take place, OD practitioners

should be brought in to facilitate a whole system change intervention that will identify the

new organizational design that matches the combined company's strategy and culture.

This transformation process needs to be complimented by a strong and solid

communication program. The company needs to continually identify short-term wins to

keep moral high during this long and arduous process (Kotter, 1996).

Trend #4: Using OD to facilitate partnerships and alliances

As noted in the macro section people feel partnerships and alliances are currently

and will continue to be important to organizations. Considering that the success of

partnerships and alliances is mostly dependent on relationships, culture, communication,

and design, it is natural that OD interventions will play a crucial role in making them

work. Interview data suggests that there is a large gap between organizations that need help making their partnerships and alliances successful and the amount of OD practitioners who are sufficiently skilled to deal with this challenge. Thus, using OD to facilitate partnerships and alliances is an up and coming trend.

Nicholson McBride is one of the few examples of an OD firm that does offer advice to companies who want to partner with their suppliers. They facilitate the necessary dialogue between an organization and its supplier(s) allowing the parties to transform the traditional organization/supplier relationship into a new strategic partnership (interview, December 8, 1999).

In their book Alliance Advantage , Yves L. Doz and Gary Hamel (1998) describe the necessary steps that help make partnerships and alliances effective. OD competencies are visibly needed to make many of these steps successful. Before any company enters a partnership or an alliance, several items must already be in place. The company must have an awareness of its identity, which includes its core competencies, its culture, its weaknesses, and its vision. The OD practitioner can help a company identify these elements by using tools like appreciative inquiry, cultural assessment, organizational assessment, and facilitation of vision development. Management also needs to be prepared to be flexible in order to deal with the ambiguity involved in managing partnerships and alliances, as they are very unstable. Cultures of successful companies are innovative, focused on competencies and non-linear goals, functionally oriented, fast learners, strategically looking for what the customer might want next, and define failure as a learning experience. OD practitioners can help companies develop and/or identify these traits in themselves and in their perspective partners.

The key to making partnerships and alliances work is actively managing the relationship over time. Therefore, it is advisable for the companies involved in a partnership to bring in an outside facilitator to help manage the process. This is particularly important in the beginning of the alliance, as the initial design serves as the foundation for future success and thus can make the process go smoothly or create problems. Trust and openness are essential if the relationship is going to survive for the long term. The facilitator needs to help the companies define the parameters of the relationship, which helps prevent avoidable conflict while fostering cooperation. Part of the initial design process is reaching a mutual agreement that outlines the specific type of partnership and alliance the companies will engage in. Doz and Hamel (1998) suggest all partnerships and alliances typically fall into one of the following three categories:

1. Co-Option – companies work together to try and set market standard(s) or to obtain leverage against competition.

2. Co-specialization – 2 firms with different competencies work together to enter a new markets or make new products.

3. Learning or internalization – companies learn from each other

The scope of the project should be defined as a combination of strategic, economic, and operational objectives. Each company should define the specific contribution it will make, the critical success factors and the appropriate measurement methods. It is also helpful for the partners to discuss what they do not want the relationship to become. (i.e. what trade secrets they do not want to reveal). It is also helpful to define the expected duration of the project, check in points, and exit strategies.

On the operational front, the companies need to define effective communication patterns by forming alliance governance and an alliance interface. This includes both communications between the different companies and communication within each company. Each company needs to consider who will be effected by the partnership and how these people will most effectively collaborate. Most importantly, the communication pattern needs to yield quick decision-making including effective conflict resolution. Companies should also discuss possible tension points (i.e. existing competition between companies and boundary issues) and how they might be managed.

Each company must also prepare those executives who will actively manage the process. This task will be unlike their prior management experience as it requires them to balance purpose with flexibility, be analytical, entrepreneurial, and use organizational and political skills. Many things can cause the alliance to become unstable such as emerging markets and technologies, government regulations, the partners themselves, and competition. Therefore, executives need to be able to track many moving targets, constantly ask themselves how they can maximize this relationship, continually evaluate if the partnership is worth future involvement, as well as evaluate whether the interfaces provide the mutual trust and understanding expected from the relationship. Executives can not be afraid to periodically go back and renegotiate if the balance of power is not even. It would be helpful to have an OD practitioner coach executives who are new to this process.

In most partnerships and alliances, there is a need for multiple communication bridges between the two companies. These bridges often occur at three levels: the operational level, the strategic level, and the middle manager level. In order to help each

company understand the other company's perspective, it is necessary for all people who serve as these bridges to understand the other company's implicit norms and values. OD can play a active role in facilitating this process by implementing interventions like new team development, teambuilding, and maximizing diversity. The individuals involved with the partnership will likely need a new set of incentives for their new positions. OD practitioners can intervene by making sure these new incentives are in alignment with the rest of company and with the goals of the alliance.

As the process evolves, the OD practitioners will often be needed to help facilitate situations, which are conflicted or difficult to resolve. Typically, this occurs because of one or more of the following "gaps":

1. Communication gaps – something is framed incorrectly, gap in expectations, and/or gap in task definition.

2. Culture gap – conflict between different cultures

3. Confidence Gap – one or more companies find the relationship threatening

4. Skill understanding gap – one or more of the company's skills do not match what they originally said or what the other companies expected

5. Information gap – one or more of the companies does not share information

6. Timing Gap – companies' scheduling or timing are not aligned

A major aspect of the partnership and alliance relationship is reciprocal learning. The OD practitioner can help the companies maximize this learning by helping them design the appropriate learning systems. The type of relationship will dictate the actual system. For example, a collaboration relationship's learning system would look much different than one in which the partners are trying to learn skills from each other, rather

than with each other. In any case, it is important for all companies to learn how to

dialogue. Proper dialoguing will not only help with the communication process, but will

also enhance learning. Individual and group reflection activities will further enhance

learning. No matter which relationship scenario is being used, a system must be

developed to capture new knowledge and to communicate this new knowledge with

others in their respective companies. Mentoring or coaching relationships would work

well in relationships where one company is trying to teach another a specific skill. It is

also crucial to measure how much each side has learned in order to keep the relationship

balanced and ensure expectations are being met.

     As can be seen, there are numerous opportunities for OD practitioners to utilize

their competencies to facilitate successful partnerships and alliances.

Trend #5: Enhancing Constant Learning

     Al Gore said at a conference on education, "the ability to learn is the most

important skill to take into the workforce" (Gore, TV Broadcast June 1999). One of the

implications of the macro forces is that in order for companies to keep a competitive

advantage, they will need their employees at all levels to learn more at a faster rate.

Continual learning allows companies to have a better understanding of how to change in

alignment with the evolving customer needs and market dynamics. The rate of change is

constant, hence it is difficult for companies to take time out of their schedules to educate

their employees. Therefore, there is a great need to combine the processes of

accomplishing work and learning so that employees can do both simultaneously.

Furthermore, companies need to speculate about the future so that they are not caught off

guard when change occurs. Jack Welch said best that we are moving from JIT (just in time) delivery to JIT development to just in case learning (Byrne, 1998).

The top four OD interventions that interviewees predicted to grow over the next three years all had to with learning. Knowledge Management was predicted to have the biggest growth at 48%. Learning organizations and system thinking were rated the second biggest at 44% growth. Fourth was improving an employee's ability to learn at 37%. Other OD interventions relating to learning also scored higher than the average growth rate of OD interventions of 19.8%: mentoring (20%), executive coaching (23%), and executive development (21%) (See Appendixes D and E).

Notable differences in my research data occurred between people with an internal perspective and people with an external perspective. In several learning areas, those inside the company perceived certain learning interventions as being used more than those outside the company. These areas include: learning organization rated (58% vs. 24%), executive coaching (30% vs. 19%), and executive development (32% vs. 13%) (See Appendixes D and E). People with an external perspective's lower growth rate can at least partially be explained because they perceive a higher current use of OD. This perception is obviously biased because the majority of the companies they are exposed to are their own clients.

The experts seem to agree that learning is extremely important to the success of an organization. Senge (Drucker et al., 1997) says employees need to continually learn. In addition to the challenge of learning quickly, companies need to learn to be able to work through the vast amount of data available. Drucker (1998) claims that the ability to gather and analyze outside data will be a major skill and challenge for executives and

information experts. Another challenge will be learning with/from the customers, suppliers, and partners. Senge (Drucker et al., 1997) emphasizes that in order to make the real systematic changes that are needed, the knowledge most come from the bottom of organization as often they are the ones who have the key relationships with the customers, partners, and suppliers, not the top.

OD practitioners have many interventions that can help organizations and their employees learn faster traditional training, distance learning, and computer learning. These interventions include knowledge management, learning organizations and system thinking, leadership development, creating and leveraging a community of practice, improving employees' ability to learn, using diversity to enhance learning, group reflection, and scenario planning. The challenge will be knowing which tools to use with which companies at what times and how to use the learning tools together.

Knowledge Management

A recent survey by the Cranfield School of Management in Bedford, UK, revealed 260 organizational leaders believe that knowledge management will be a critical factor in helping organizations gain a competitive advantage, increase profits, and succeed in the future. Lotus defined knowledge management best as "the systematic leveraging of information and expertise to improve organizational innovation, responsiveness, productivity and competency" (Wharton, 1998). An example of a knowledge management system is creating an on-line forum where customers can interact allowing the company to learn by observing the interaction. Another knowledge management system might link people from different companies or from parts of the value chain by using technology (Venkatraman & Henderson, 1998).

Successful execution and implementation of any knowledge management system requires an OD perspective. Motivating people to use the system is driven by aligning the knowledge management system with the culture, reward system, performance management system, technology, and skill set of the organization. Implementation of a new knowledge management system is a major change for the company. Use of OD interventions will enhance the transition (Puccinelli, 1998).

Learning Organizations

OD practitioners are also involved with transforming organizational design and culture into learning organizations. Learning organizations is a term coined by Peter Senge (1990) in his book The Fifth Discipline. He defines the term as an organization "that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future" (p. 14). The core disciplines of his learning organization are system thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning (See Appendix H). In order to enhance learning it is helpful to create an environment of innovation and diffusion of knowledge as well as having people's highest capabilities aligned with their deepest personal and professional aspirations (Drucker et al., 1997).

Since Senge came up with his model several other people have come up with their own variations of learning organizations. Glenn Jones (1997), the board and education council of the National Alliance of Business, has his own model called "Creating a Leadership Organization with a Learning Mission." He claims that all companies need to be leadership organizations that will be part technology-based, part customer service oriented, and part learning oriented. The success in this model involves a leader who has a passion for the company's mission, who has the ability to be a risk taker, who attracts

risk takers to the mission, and who becomes a student as well as a mentor. Jones believes that leaders need to be constant learners who learn from their followers, their mistakes, and their adversaries. Employee learning is then enhanced through technology. Jones has created a distance learning program called Mind Extension University, which offers all degrees ranging from associates to masters including certification programs. Employees attend these programs while doing their job (Jones, 1997).

Executive/Leadership Development

Many organizations have formal programs to develop their current and future executives/leaders. There are many different approaches to accomplishing this. Some simply have employees use a 360-feedback tool to receive feedback on their performance for their development. Typically, this is followed with a development plan and often with coaching. Other tools used to develop executives are having multiple mentors and by rotational job assignments.

Some of the more sophisticated organizations have their own universities to develop executives. Albert A. Vicere (1998), Professor of Business Administration at Penn State University, developed an innovative program that blended real life business issues in real-time, training, and education. This program also focused on continuous learning and developing networks in the company. One of the key learning assignments of this program is having the executives work in a group as internal consultants. Their client is an unrelated department within the same company. The culmination of the assignment is a presentation of the group's recommendations to their employees. The plan is usually implemented. This gives the employees a real time business opportunity to apply their skills. It also helps them learn more about their own company. In addition,

it helps the company solve important problems while saving them money because they do not have to hire an outside consultant. Further, it helps develop many relationships within the company. To enhance these relationships the education center has reunions to help people keep in touch with their colleagues (Vicere, 1998).

<u>Community of Practices</u>

A community of practice is a network of employees across an organization that shares knowledge in order to better serve the customer. This is a successful way to create an environment of learning while working because employees are transferring their knowledge to others on the job. Since the term has been coined, OD practitioners have been trying to leverage the concept to enhance learning. This can be done in a number of ways. One is strategically creating networking opportunities so people can learn who knows what and start to build relationships with each other.

Community of practices is often used when creating knowledge management systems. It is best to match the purpose of the knowledge management system with the right type of community of practices. There are four types of community of practices:

	Highly focused and structured	Loosely focused structured
Centralized	Type I	Type II
Decentralized	Type III	Type IV

(Baird, 1998).

Today one of the more popular types of communities of practices is the knowledge community. A knowledge community is a group of people who share a

similar interest, but are not directly competing. For example Mitchell and Company, a management-consulting firm, has founded knowledge community called Share Price Growth 100. The group's purpose is to swap knowledge on how to improve stock price. Companies in the group are all from different industries. They meet a couple of times during the year to swap their best practices and discuss ideas and problems with each other. Boston University runs similar groups: the Executive Development Roundtable and the Human Resource Policy Institute.

Another application of community of practices involves mapping the relationships in a community of practice in order to locate key people, the pattern of information flow, the bottlenecks, and discover how are people are perceived. A computer software program called social networking analysis can do this mapping (interview, May 16, 1999).

Improving an Employee's Ability to Learn

There are several ways to improve employee's ability to learn. One is by helping people see how their defensive routines prevent them from learning. Chris Argyris (1991), a Harvard professor, has done a lot of work in this area. He feels the most important type of learning a person can do is to ask himself what he did to contribute to the situation. His research indicated that most people are trained by society to avoid this type of self-examination during difficult situations because they feel embarrassed and find it threatening. Instead they become defensive and blame others (Argyris, 1991).

Argyris (1991) believes that when exploring the reasons for failure, the universal human tendency is to use four basic values. These are to retain unilateral control, to maximize winning and minimize losing, to suppress negative feelings, and to be as

rational as possible. The use of these values leads to the defensive reasoning that encourages individuals to keep private the premises, inferences, and conclusions that shape their behavior and to avoid testing them in a truly independent, objective fashion.

Helping people be less defensive involves showing them the patterns of their behavior that are preventing them from learning and challenging them to make their reasoning explicit and to look at their reasoning objectively. It is important to make sure people understand that challenging one's reasoning is not a sign of mistrust, but a valuable learning opportunity. As Argyris (1991) says, "Learning to reason productively can be emotional – even painful, but the payoff is great" (p.107).

Another way one can enhance his/her learning is to improve what Dan Goleman (1995) coined "Emotional Intelligence." Emotional Intelligence is set of competencies that help one master themselves (Personal Competence) and their interactions with people (Social Competence) (Goleman book, 1998). It would be helpful for companies to learn these emotional intelligences on an organizational and individual level as they can lead to enhanced productivity. I believe enhancing emotional intelligence on an individual level enhances one's ability to learn. For example, a person with improved self-confidence would likely take more risks, which would help him/her learn. It would also help him/her present him/herself with more "presence", which will make others more confident in them and give them more opportunities to try new things. These new experiences will help the person learn. Improved self confidence will also allow the person voice unpopular points of view, which challenge others. These challenges will often lead to deeper conversations that both parties can learn from.

Another example of an emotional intelligence is improved conflict management skills. Good conflict management helps one maintain relationships during tense moments. The more relationships one has the more people he/she has to learn from. People with this skill also encourage debate and open discussion. This form of interpersonal interaction is often one of the best ways to learn (Goleman book, 1998).

Diversity

Diversity can be an effective tool to enhance learning. The more diverse a group is the more different perspectives it has at its disposal to learn from, to create/innovate, and to use for critical thinking. Many companies' only recruit people like them and suffer from "groupthink" (they all think alike). A diverse workforce often attracts diverse customers. Anything that can expand the customer base is advantageous to the company.

Making diversity happen in an organization is a challenge. The culture has to be one where differences are tolerated and preferably appreciated. One of the challenges is that organizations need to figure out how to attract people who are different than their usual employee. This is difficult for both the company and perspective employees because people innately prefer people who are like themselves. Once a diverse workforce is in place, the people in the organization must have excellent conflict resolution and dialoguing skills in order to turn differences into shared knowledge.

Group Reflection

Building time for reflection into the work process is essential for the action learning needed in today's society. Organizations should be encouraging their employees to reflect both individually and in-groups. This should not only be done at the end of projects, but also during them. The United States Center for Lessons Learned (CALL)

uses group reflection to enhance their learning process. The process starts with the need to identify and focus on specific learning opportunities. The next step in the process is designed to capture the learning through group reflection and by using outside observers. The third step is to synthesize, analyze and code the data to identify and define lessons learned. These lessons are then applied by turning them into appropriate documents for training or recommendations for leaders. The final step is sharing what has been learned by teaching others. This sharing enhances the learning process as it helps the teacher better understand what they learned, hence making it more usable for themselves and others (Baird, Henderson and Watts, 1997).

Scenario Planning

Scenario planning is another learning tool that helps employees explore possible future experiences giving them the opportunity to learn and prepare. OD practitioners would be wise to know how to facilitate such an activity.

Some examples of the types of issues that scenario planning allows companies to explore are: flaws in strategies and operations, potential new competitors, possible new substitute products, new technologies that might enhance or harm them, and macro events that could help or harm them. The idea is not to figure out what will happen, but to understand what could happen so that the organization can be at least mentally be prepared if it does occur. Scenario planning can also be used to discover new opportunities.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

I began this project with the assumption that the field of OD is driven by organizational challenges, thus, I identified and analyzed the macro forces. I feel my assumption was validated by the research as both the experts and the people surveyed made this connection as well. My belief was that the macro force constant change would be the primary driver of future organizational challenges. After completing my research, it appears that changes in technology is the macro force that is the catalyst for constant change and many of the other macro forces that drive organizational challenges.

I further hypothesized that constant change would result in a need for constant learning and adaptive organizations and therefore I believed that the emerging trends in OD would be implementing knowledge management systems, creating a culture for constant learning, designing flexible organizational structures, and facilitating change in organizations. The research confirmed that these would be emerging trends. It also indicated that there would be other important emerging trends including enhanced use of OD interventions, combining traditional "hard" business competencies and OD, creating whole system change, and using OD to facilitate partnerships and alliances.

My findings are useful to OD practitioners like myself because they create awareness of many of the current and future challenges facing organizations. Beyond awareness, this research offers an outline of potential OD solutions to organizational challenges and explicitly exposes the necessity of using OD to ensure organizational success.

Appendix A: Number of Completed Surveys

Qualitative Survey Information

Category	# Complete
External	18
Internal	7
Line	7
Other	10
Total	42

Quantitative Survey Information

Category	# Complete
External	18
Internal	11
Line	22
Other	10
Total	61

Given to Those with an Outside the Company Perspective (External OD Consultants and Other Business Minds)

Name: _____
Company: _____
Phone: _____
Type: _____
Title: _____

Please rate the following OD interventions on a scale of 1-5 on how much does your client or companies you follow currently uses them	1= not at all 2= rarely 3= sometimes 4= often 5= all the time

OD Interventions

Intervention					
360 Feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Career Development	1	2	3	4	5
Change Management	1	2	3	4	5
Competency Modeling	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict Resolution	1	2	3	4	5
Culture Change	1	2	3	4	5
Diversity in the Work Place	1	2	3	4	5
Developing Effective Communication Skills	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Coaching	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Development	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitation	1	2	3	4	5
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge Management	1	2	3	4	5
Leadership	1	2	3	4	5
Learning Organizations	1	2	3	4	5
Mentoring	1	2	3	4	5
Mission/Vision Statements	1	2	3	4	5
New Team Development	1	2	3	4	5
Organizational Design	1	2	3	4	5
Process Consultation	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Work Life	1	2	3	4	5
Re-engineering	1	2	3	4	5
Reward & Recognition	1	2	3	4	5
Self Management	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic Planning	1	2	3	4	5
System Dynamics	1	2	3	4	5
Team Building	1	2	3	4	5
Other:_____	1	2	3	4	5

Please rate the following Macro forces on 1-5 on how much they currently effect your clients and/or your own business with 1 meaning no effect and 5 meaning huge effect	1= no effect 2=little effect 3= some effect 4= a lot of effect 5= huge effect

Force					
Changes in Technology	1	2	3	4	5
Shift in Age Demographics	1	2	3	4	5
Increased Diversity in Workforce	1	2	3	4	5
Constant Change	1	2	3	4	5
Changes in Structure of Work	1	2	3	4	5
Partnerships and Alliances	1	2	3	4	5

Please rate the following OD interventions on a scale   **1= not important**
of 1-5 on how important they will be to your clients or   **2= slightly Important**
companies you follow in 3 years   **3= somewhat important**
                                               4= very important
                                               5= essential

OD Interventions

Intervention					
360 Feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Career Development	1	2	3	4	5
Change Management	1	2	3	4	5
Competency Modeling	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict Resolution	1	2	3	4	5
Culture Change	1	2	3	4	5
Diversity in the Work Place	1	2	3	4	5
Developing Effective Communication Skill	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Coaching	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Development	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitation	1	2	3	4	5
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge Management	1	2	3	4	5
Leadership	1	2	3	4	5
Learning Organizations	1	2	3	4	5
Mentoring	1	2	3	4	5
Mission/Vision Statements	1	2	3	4	5
New Team Development	1	2	3	4	5
Organizational Design	1	2	3	4	5
Process Consultation	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Work Life	1	2	3	4	5
Re-engineering	1	2	3	4	5
Reward & Recognition	1	2	3	4	5
Self Management	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic Planning	1	2	3	4	5
System Dynamics	1	2	3	4	5
Team Building	1	2	3	4	5
Other:_____	1	2	3	4	5

Please rate the following Macro forces on 1-5 on how much you think they will   **1= no effect**
effect your and/or your clients business 3 years from now with 1 meaning   **2=little effect**
no effect and 5 meaning huge effect   **3= some effect**
                                               4= a lot of effect

Macro force					
Changes in Technology	1	2	3	4	5
Shift in Age Demographics	1	2	3	4	5
Increased Diversity in Workforce	1	2	3	4	5
Constant Change	1	2	3	4	5
Changes in Structure of Work	1	2	3	4	5
Partnerships and Alliances	1	2	3	4	5

5= huge effect

Given to Those with an Inside the Company Perspective (Line Managers and Internal OD Consultants)

Name: _____
Company: _____
Phone: _____
Type: _____
Title: _____

Please rate the following OD interventions on a scale
of 1-5 on how much your company currently uses them

1= not at all
2= rarely
3= sometimes
4= often
5= all the time

OD Interventions

360 Feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Career Development	1	2	3	4	5
Change Management	1	2	3	4	5
Competency Modeling	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict Resolution	1	2	3	4	5
Culture Change	1	2	3	4	5
Diversity in the Work Place	1	2	3	4	5
Developing Effective Communication Skills	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Coaching	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Development	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitation	1	2	3	4	5
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge Management	1	2	3	4	5
Leadership	1	2	3	4	5
Learning Organizations	1	2	3	4	5
Mentoring	1	2	3	4	5
Mission/Vision Statements	1	2	3	4	5
New Team Development	1	2	3	4	5
Organizational Design	1	2	3	4	5
Process Consultation	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Work Life	1	2	3	4	5
Re-engineering	1	2	3	4	5
Reward & Recognition	1	2	3	4	5
Self Management	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic Planning	1	2	3	4	5
System Dynamics	1	2	3	4	5
Team Building	1	2	3	4	5
Other:_____	1	2	3	4	5

Please rate the following Macro forces on 1-5 on how much they currently
effect your business with 1 meaning no effect and 5 meaning huge effect

1= no effect
2=little effect
3= some effect
4= a lot of effect
5= huge effect

Changes in Technology	1	2	3	4	5
Shift in Age Demographics	1	2	3	4	5
Increased Diversity in Workforce	1	2	3	4	5
Constant Change	1	2	3	4	5
Changes in Structure of Work	1	2	3	4	5
Partnerships and Alliances	1	2	3	4	5

Please rate the following OD interventions on a scale   **1= not important**
of 1-5 on how important they will be to your company in 3 years   **2= slightly Important**
         3= somewhat important
         4= very important
         5= essential

OD Interventions

360 Feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Career Development	1	2	3	4	5
Change Management	1	2	3	4	5
Competency Modeling	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict Resolution	1	2	3	4	5
Culture Change	1	2	3	4	5
Diversity in the Work Place	1	2	3	4	5
Developing Effective Communication Ski	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Coaching	1	2	3	4	5
Executive Development	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitation	1	2	3	4	5
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge Management	1	2	3	4	5
Leadership	1	2	3	4	5
Learning Organizations	1	2	3	4	5
Mentoring	1	2	3	4	5
Mission/Vision Statements	1	2	3	4	5
New Team Development	1	2	3	4	5
Organizational Design	1	2	3	4	5
Process Consultation	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Work Life	1	2	3	4	5
Re-engineering	1	2	3	4	5
Reward & Recognition	1	2	3	4	5
Self Management	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic Planning	1	2	3	4	5
System Dynamics	1	2	3	4	5
Team Building	1	2	3	4	5

Other:_____

Please rate the following Macro forces on 1-5 on how much you think they will   **1= no effect**
effect your business 3 years from now with 1 meaning no effect and   **2=little effect**
5 meaning huge effect.   **3= some effect**
       4= a lot of effect

Changes in Technology	1	2	3	4	5
Shift in Age Demographics	1	2	3	4	5
Increased Diversity in Workforce	1	2	3	4	5
Constant Change	1	2	3	4	5
Changes in Structure of Work	1	2	3	4	5
Partnerships and Alliances	1	2	3	4	5

5= huge effect

Appendix C: Qualitative Surveys

Questionnaire for External OD Consultants and Other Consultants
Name: _____
Company: _____
Phone: _____
Type: _____
Title: _____

Questions:

1. What does your company do?
2. What types of clients do they work with?
3. What are your company's biggest challenges?
4. What, if any, types of OD interventions do your firm use currently?
5. What do you currently do on a day to day activity?
6. What are your biggest challenges today?
(Give quantitative questions)
7. In what ways are the following effecting your current work if it all:
Changes in Technology:
Shift in Demographics:
Increased Diversity in the Workforce
Constant Change
Changes in Structure of Work
Partnerships and Alliances
8. What are your client's biggest issues?
9. What types of OD interventions do they typically use?
10. What do they need?
11. Why the gap?
12. What types of OD interventions do you think you would like to add to your arsenal and why?
13. Why aren't they being developed now, if they are how are they?
14. What are some Marco and micro factors you expect to change that will effect how you do your work over the next 3 years?
15. What is driving it?
16. What will be your company's biggest business challenges in 3 years?
17. How do you expect your company to deal with them?
18. How will this effect your work?
19. What will be your biggest business challenges in 3 years?
20. What will be your client's biggest challenges in 3 years?
21. How do you expect they will deal with them?
22. How will this effect your work?
23. What types of OD interventions do you think will be needed to solve your client's problems in 3 years?
24. In what ways do you think the following will effect you work in 3 years if it all:
Changes in Technology:

Shift in Demographics:
Increased Diversity in the Workforce
Constant Change
Changes in Structure of Work
Partnerships and Alliances

25. Anything else you would like to add?
26. Who else should I speak with?
27. What books, articles, and/or research should I look to help me understand trends in business and hence OD over the next 3 years?

*Questionnaire **for Internal OD Consultants and Line Managers***

Name: _____

Company: _____

Phone: _____

Type: _____

Title: _____

Questions:

1. What does your company do?
2. What do you currently do on a day to day activity?
3. What are your company's biggest challenges?
4. What are your biggest challenges today? How is the company dealing with these challenges? How does this effect the work you do?

(Give quantitative questions)

5. In what ways are the following effecting your current work if it all:

Changes in Technology:

Shift in Demographics:

Increased Diversity in the Workforce

Constant Change

Changes in Structure of Work

Partnerships and Alliances

6. What types of OD interventions do you and your company use currently?
7. What types of OD interventions do you think are currently needed and why?

Why aren't they being used?

8. What will be your company's biggest business challenges in 3 years? What is driving it? How do you expect the company to deal with these challenges?
9. How do you expect this will effect the work you do?
10. What will be your biggest business challenges in 3 years?
11. What other things do you expect to change on how you do your work over the next 3 years that you have not already mentioned? What is driving those?
12. What types of OD interventions do you think will be needed to solve the types of issues facing you and your company in 3 years?
13. In what ways do you think the following will effect you work in 3 years if it all:

Changes in Technology:

Shift in Demographics:

Increased Diversity in the Workforce

Constant Change

Changes in Structure of Work

Partnerships and Alliances

14. Anything else you would like to add?
15. Who else should I speak with?
16. What books, articles, and/or research should I look to help me understand trends in business and hence OD over the next 3 years?

All Combined

OD Interventions	P(T<=t) one-tail	Significant for .05
360 Feedback	8.9594E-05	yes
Career Development	1.03996E-07	yes
Change Management	6.32647E-07	yes
Competency Modeling	8.03014E-06	yes
Conflict Resolution	8.74981E-07	yes
Culture Change	4.39306E-07	yes
Diversity in the Work Place	0.000344377	yes
Developing Effective Communication Skills	6.74748E-07	yes
Executive Coaching	1.19E-06	yes
Executive Development	1.31959E-06	yes
Facilitation	0.011357221	no
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	6.93119E-09	yes
Knowledge Management	4.71594E-12	yes
Leadership	1.27575E-07	yes
Learning Organizations	4.52258E-07	yes
Mentoring	1.23825E-06	yes
Mission/Vision Statements	0.175104397	no
New Team Development	4.72247E-05	yes
Organizational Design	0.000316837	yes
Process Consultation	0.002641745	yes
Quality of Work Life	6.7135E-07	yes
Re-engineering	0.304327084	no
Reward & Recognition	0.000309552	yes
Self Management	6.02833E-06	yes
Strategic Planning	2.84599E-05	yes
System Dynamics	2.02806E-11	yes
Team Building	0.000618426	yes

Macro Forces Effecting Business

Changes in Technology	0.032756854	yes
Shift in Age Demographics	8.3306E-05	yes
Increased Diversity in Workforce	7.99133E-06	yes
Constant Change	0.08267971	no
Changes in Structure of Work	0.015074387	yes
Partnerships and Alliances	0.003082774	yes

External OD Consultants

OD Interventions	**P(T<=t) one-tail**	**Significant for .05**
360 Feedback	0.346645219	no
Career Development	0.000679853	yes
Change Management	0.026632475	yes
Competency Modeling	0.062375211	no
Conflict Resolution	0.051101114	no
Culture Change	0.00022295	yes
Diversity in the Work Place	0.008003566	yes
Developing Effective Communication Skills	0.024370387	yes
Executive Coaching	0.032077691	yes
Executive Development	0.097143491	no
Facilitation	0.5	no
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	0.01061202	yes
Knowledge Management	0.001686051	yes
Leadership	0.01118185	yes
Learning Organizations	0.067951185	no
Mentoring	0.014837971	yes
Mission/Vision Statements	0.196813628	no
New Team Development	0.099154122	no
Organizational Design	0.033371069	yes
Process Consultation	0.191402658	no
Quality of Work Life	0.00316146	yes
Re-engineering	0.5	no
Reward & Recognition	0.068999169	no
Self Management	0.031847913	yes
Strategic Planning	0.079326252	no
System Dynamics	0.002859512	yes
Team Building	0.13798841	no

Macro Forces Effecting Business		
Changes in Technology	0.143742154	no
Shift in Age Demographics	0.002224165	yes
Increased Diversity in Workforce	0.00125089	yes
Constant Change	0.101562301	no
Changes in Structure of Work	0.058850091	no
Partnerships and Alliances	0.089592339	no

Internal OD Consultants

OD Interventions	P(T<=t) one-tail	Significant for .05
360 Feedback	0.003372388	yes
Career Development	0.000286872	yes
Change Management	0.018393749	yes
Competency Modeling	0.044295197	yes
Conflict Resolution	0.012423172	yes
Culture Change	0.011183595	yes
Diversity in the Work Place	0.001087439	yes
Developing Effective Communication Skills	0.051944065	no
Executive Coaching	0.003372388	yes
Executive Development	0.004312791	yes
Facilitation	0.040563094	yes
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	0.002496552	yes
Knowledge Management	1.79211E-05	yes
Leadership	0.001885779	yes
Learning Organizations	0.002496552	yes
Mentoring	0.047866954	yes
Mission/Vision Statements	0.083925328	no
New Team Development	0.018393749	yes
Organizational Design	0.010355694	yes
Process Consultation	0.1394365	no
Quality of Work Life	0.012423172	yes
Re-engineering	0.39881226	no
Reward & Recognition	0.069092377	no
Self Management	0.001143378	yes
Strategic Planning	0.011183595	yes
System Dynamics	0.001373193	yes
Team Building	0.019935969	yes

Macro Forces Effecting Business		
Changes in Technology	0.051944065	no
Shift in Age Demographics	0.295525616	no
Increased Diversity in Workforce	0.171718198	no
Constant Change	0.363157105	no
Changes in Structure of Work	0.279932012	no
Partnerships and Alliances	0.321207569	no

Internal OD Consultants

OD Interventions	P(T<=t) one-tail	Significant for .05
360 Feedback		
Career Development	0.000784405	yes
Change Management	0.00184003	yes
Competency Modeling	0.001157409	yes
Conflict Resolution	0.004958483	yes
Culture Change	0.005918362	yes
Diversity in the Work Place	0.426682999	no
Developing Effective Communication Skills	5.81382E-06	yes
Executive Coaching	0.001157409	yes
Executive Development	0.000693387	yes
Facilitation	0.000397244	yes
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	0.00042609	yes
Knowledge Management	0.000125328	yes
Leadership	0.000693387	yes
Learning Organizations	0.000486741	yes
Mentoring	0.00098312	yes
Mission/Vision Statements	0.270815563	no
New Team Development	0.002802247	yes
Organizational Design	0.192734394	no
Process Consultation	0.036423253	yes
Quality of Work Life	0.001854514	yes
Re-engineering	0.204216887	no
Reward & Recognition	0.000181025	yes
Self Management	0.05514869	no
Strategic Planning	8.3797E-05	yes
System Dynamics	5.08516E-06	yes
Team Building	0.019522702	yes
Macro Forces Effecting Business		
Changes in Technology	0.5	no
Shift in Age Demographics	0.165282466	no
Increased Diversity in Workforce	0.007751056	no
Constant Change	0.22676451	no
Changes in Structure of Work	0.5	no
Partnerships and Alliances	0.003258303	yes

Outside the Company Perspective (External OD Consultants & Other Business Minds Combined)

OD Interventions	P(T<=t) one-tail	Significant for .05
360 Feedback	0.164091631	no
Career Development	0.008363779	yes
Change Management	0.009876547	yes
Competency Modeling	0.014301619	yes
Conflict Resolution	0.001968765	yes
Culture Change	2.61091E-06	yes
Diversity in the Work Place	0.000723955	yes
Developing Effective Communication Skills	0.007449456	yes
Executive Coaching	0.006170188	yes
Executive Development	0.010911135	yes
Facilitation	0.238484608	no
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	0.000259252	yes
Knowledge Management	2.88974E-06	yes
Leadership	0.001234538	yes
Learning Organizations	0.003193625	yes
Mentoring	0.002505028	yes
Mission/Vision Statements	0.078080848	no
New Team Development	0.026240445	yes
Organizational Design	0.011853553	yes
Process Consultation	0.135640827	no
Quality of Work Life	0.000305546	yes
Re-engineering	0.198016977	no
Reward & Recognition	0.077855843	no
Self Management	0.001177827	yes
Strategic Planning	0.212939715	no
System Dynamics	8.69933E-06	yes
Team Building	0.09263595	no

Macro Forces Effecting Business

Changes in Technology	0.15314953	no
Shift in Age Demographics	0.000192967	yes
Increased Diversity in Workforce	0.00043519	yes
Constant Change	0.163643441	no
Changes in Structure of Work	0.012880422	yes
Partnerships and Alliances	0.047561411	yes

Inside the Company Perspective (Line Managers & Internal OD Consultants Combined)

OD Interventions	**P(T<=t) one-tail**	**Significant for .05**
360 Feedback	4.91178E-06	yes
Career Development	3.48092E-06	yes
Change Management	0.000100572	yes
Competency Modeling	0.000732626	yes
Conflict Resolution	0.000263674	yes
Culture Change	0.000712914	yes
Diversity in the Work Place	0.134848662	no
Developing Effective Communication Skills	5.51997E-06	yes
Executive Coaching	8.99625E-05	yes
Executive Development	7.46897E-05	yes
Facilitation	0.000641487	yes
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	1.03371E-05	yes
Knowledge Management	6.60182E-08	yes
Leadership	5.54522E-06	yes
Learning Organizations	5.54522E-06	yes
Mentoring	0.000822724	yes
Mission/Vision Statements	0.129087062	no
New Team Development	0.001450776	yes
Organizational Design	0.021656534	yes
Process Consultation	0.019954759	yes
Quality of Work Life	0.000800203	yes
Re-engineering	0.203608695	no
Reward & Recognition	0.000641487	yes
Self Management	0.002916155	yes
Strategic Planning	4.02811E-06	yes
System Dynamics	6.09713E-07	yes
Team Building	0.00678064	yes

Macro Forces Effecting Business		
Changes in Technology	0.162790994	no
Shift in Age Demographics	0.084681051	no
Increased Diversity in Workforce	0.005827397	yes
Constant Change	0.422690173	no
Changes in Structure of Work	0.43261283	no
Partnerships and Alliances	0.048023506	yes

All Combined

OD Interventions	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Knowledge Management	2.61	3.87	1.26	48%
Learning Organizations	2.48	3.57	1.09	44%
System Dynamics	2.36	3.39	1.03	44%
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	2.82	3.87	1.05	37%
Self Management	2.6	3.42	0.82	32%
Quality of Work Life	2.65	3.45	0.80	30%
Culture Change	3	3.76	0.76	25%
Developing Effective Communication Skills	3.21	3.98	0.77	24%
Career Development	3.12	3.86	0.74	24%
Executive Coaching	3	3.69	0.69	23%
Competency Modeling	2.71	3.32	0.61	23%
Leadership	3.52	4.26	0.74	21%
Executive Development	3.21	3.88	0.67	21%
Conflict Resolution	2.74	3.3	0.56	20%
Mentoring	2.82	3.38	0.56	20%
New Team Development	3.03	3.61	0.58	19%
360 Feedback	2.95	3.47	0.52	18%
Change Management	3.54	4.12	0.58	16%
Team Building	3.38	3.88	0.50	15%
Organizational Design	3.02	3.43	0.41	14%
Strategic Planning	3.79	4.25	0.46	12%
Process Consultation	2.74	3.07	0.33	12%
Diversity in the Work Place	3.23	3.57	0.34	11%
Reward & Recognition	3.66	4	0.34	9%
Facilitation	3.36	3.44	0.08	2%
Mission/Vision Statements	3.92	4.01	0.09	2%
Re-engineering	2.96	2.89	-0.07	-2%
avg. amount chg.	0.60			
avg. % chg.	19.79%			
avg.-current	3.05			
avg.-in 3 years	3.66			

Macro Forces Effecting Business

	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Increased Diversity in Workforce	3.09	3.54	0.45	15%
Shift in Age Demographics	3.08	3.45	0.37	12%
Partnerships and Alliances	3.98	4.32	0.34	9%
Changes in Structure of Work	3.58	3.77	0.19	5%
Changes in Technology	4.4	4.52	0.12	3%
Constant Change	4.12	4.21	0.09	2%

External OD Consultants

OD Interventions	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
System Dynamics	2.29	3.61	1.32	58%
Self Management	2.14	3.24	1.10	51%
Knowledge Management	2.94	4.11	1.17	40%
Quality of Work Life	2.5	3.44	0.94	38%
Career Development	2.88	3.89	1.01	35%
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	2.88	3.89	1.01	35%
Mentoring	2.65	3.44	0.79	30%
Culture Change	3.24	4.18	0.94	29%
Conflict Resolution	2.65	3.39	0.74	28%
Diversity in the Work Place	3.06	3.82	0.76	25%
Executive Coaching	3.06	3.72	0.66	22%
Learning Organizations	2.88	3.5	0.62	22%
Organizational Design	3.06	3.64	0.58	19%
Developing Effective Communication Skills	3.47	4.11	0.64	18%
Competency Modeling	3.06	3.59	0.53	17%
New Team Development	3.18	3.67	0.49	15%
Change Management	4.06	4.61	0.55	14%
Executive Development	3.53	4	0.47	13%
Leadership	4	4.5	0.50	13%
Process Consultation	2.88	3.22	0.34	12%
360 Feedback	3.12	3.39	0.27	9%
Team Building	3.53	3.78	0.25	7%
Facilitation	3.65	3.89	0.24	7%
Reward & Recognition	3.88	4.12	0.24	6%
Strategic Planning	4.18	4.18	0.00	0%
Mission/Vision Statements	4.18	4.11	-0.07	-2%
Re-engineering	3.12	2.78	-0.34	-11%
avg. amount chg.	0.58			
avg. % chg.	18.30%			
avg.-current	3.19			
avg.-in 3 years	3.77			

Macro Forces Effecting Business

	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Shift in Age Demographics	2.97	3.88	0.91	31%
Increased Diversity in Workforce	3.25	3.82	0.57	18%
Changes in Structure of Work	3.71	4.11	0.40	11%
Partnerships and Alliances	4	4.31	0.31	8%
Constant Change	4.53	4.67	0.14	3%
Changes in Technology	4.71	4.78	0.07	1%

Internal OD Consultants

OD Interventions	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Knowledge Management	2.5	3.82	1.32	53%
Self Management	2.1	3.2	1.10	52%
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	2.4	3.64	1.24	52%
Learning Organizations	2.4	3.6	1.20	50%
System Dynamics	1.8	2.7	0.90	50%
Career Development	2.8	4	1.20	43%
360 Feedback	2.64	3.73	1.09	41%
Executive Development	2.82	3.91	1.09	39%
Executive Coaching	2.64	3.64	1.00	38%
Leadership	3.36	4.36	1.00	30%
Team Building	3.18	4.09	0.91	29%
Conflict Resolution	2.45	3.09	0.64	26%
Organizational Design	2.6	3.27	0.67	26%
Developing Effective Communication Skills	2.91	3.64	0.73	25%
New Team Development	2.91	3.55	0.64	22%
Strategic Planning	3.36	4.09	0.73	22%
Culture Change	3	3.64	0.64	21%
Diversity in the Work Place	2.9	3.45	0.55	19%
Competency Modeling	2.91	3.45	0.54	19%
Quality of Work Life	2.73	3.18	0.45	16%
Mentoring	2.82	3.27	0.45	16%
Change Management	3.55	3.91	0.36	10%
Reward & Recognition	4	4.36	0.36	9%
Facilitation	3.55	3.82	0.27	8%
Process Consultation	2.55	2.73	0.18	7%
Re-engineering	2.82	2.91	0.09	3%
Mission/Vision Statements	3.55	3.09	-0.46	-13%
avg. amount chg.	0.70			
avg. % chg.	24.45%			
avg.-current	2.86			
avg.-in 3 years	3.56			

Macro Forces Effecting Business

	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Changes in Technology	3.82	4.18	0.36	9%
Increased Diversity in Workforce	3	3.27	0.27	9%
Changes in Structure of Work	3.55	3.81	0.26	7%
Shift in Age Demographics	3	3.09	0.09	3%
Constant Change	3.91	3.81	-0.10	-3%
Partnerships and Alliances	4.27	4.09	-0.18	-4%

Line Managers

OD Interventions	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Knowledge Management	2.55	4.24	1.69	66%
Learning Organizations	2.32	3.75	1.43	62%
Developing Effective Communication Skills	2.82	4.25	1.43	51%
System Dynamics	2.64	3.7	1.06	40%
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	2.96	4.13	1.17	40%
Competency Modeling	2.46	3.4	0.94	38%
Change Management	3.04	4.15	1.11	37%
Leadership	3.14	4.25	1.11	35%
Quality of Work Life	2.87	3.85	0.98	34%
360 Feedback	2.7	3.55	0.85	31%
Strategic Planning	3.36	4.4	1.04	31%
Executive Development	3	3.85	0.85	28%
Culture Change	2.73	3.5	0.77	28%
Executive Coaching	2.91	3.7	0.79	27%
Mentoring	2.82	3.55	0.73	26%
Process Consultation	2.55	3.2	0.65	25%
Career Development	3.27	4.1	0.83	25%
New Team Development	2.96	3.7	0.74	25%
Team Building	3.14	3.89	0.75	24%
Conflict Resolution	2.77	3.4	0.63	23%
Reward & Recognition	3.27	4	0.73	22%
Facilitation	2.87	3.5	0.63	22%
Self Management	3.23	3.85	0.62	19%
Organizational Design	3.05	3.35	0.30	10%
Re-engineering	3	3.2	0.20	7%
Mission/Vision Statements	3.77	3.9	0.13	3%
Diversity in the Work Place	3.59	3.55	-0.04	-1%
avg. amount chg.	0.82			
avg. % chg.	27.72%			
avg.-current	2.96			
avg.-in 3 years	3.77			

Macro Forces Effecting Business

	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Partnerships and Alliances	3.73	4.4	0.67	18%
Increased Diversity in Workforce	2.91	3.4	0.49	17%
Shift in Age Demographics	3.32	3.5	0.18	5%
Constant Change	3.77	3.95	0.18	5%
Changes in Technology	4.46	4.55	0.09	2%
Changes in Structure of Work	3.55	3.5	-0.05	-1%

Other Business Minds

OD Interventions	<u>current</u>	<u>in 3 years</u>	<u>amount chg.</u>	<u>% changed</u>
Knowledge Management	2.57	4.17	1.60	62%
Quality of Work Life	2.14	3.43	1.29	60%
Self Management	2.33	3.67	1.34	58%
System Dynamics	2.43	3.5	1.07	44%
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	2.88	4.14	1.26	44%
Learning Organizations	2.86	3.83	0.97	34%
Leadership	3.75	4.86	1.11	30%
Diversity in the Work Place	3	3.88	0.88	29%
Culture Change	3.22	4.14	0.92	29%
New Team Development	3.13	3.86	0.73	23%
Competency Modeling	2.33	2.75	0.42	18%
Executive Coaching	3.71	4.33	0.62	17%
Conflict Resolution	3.25	3.75	0.50	15%
Organizational Design	3.38	3.88	0.50	15%
Executive Development	3.63	4.14	0.51	14%
Developing Effective Communication Skills	3.67	4.14	0.47	13%
Mission/Vision Statements	4.22	4.61	0.39	9%
Team Building	4	4.33	0.33	8%
Process Consultation	3.25	3.43	0.18	6%
Change Management	3.78	3.88	0.10	3%
Mentoring	3.29	3.33	0.04	1%
Re-engineering	2.71	2.71	0.00	0%
Reward & Recognition	3.75	3.71	-0.04	-1%
360 Feedback	3.71	3.67	-0.04	-1%
Strategic Planning	4.75	4.63	-0.12	-3%
Career Development	3.63	3.43	-0.20	-6%
Facilitation	3.88	3.29	-0.59	-15%
avg. amount chg.	0.53			
avg. % chg.	15.96%			
avg.-current	3.31			
avg.-in 3 years	3.83			

Macro Forces Effecting Business				
Increased Diversity in Workforce	3.38	4.11	0.73	22%
Shift in Age Demographics	2.78	3.4	0.62	22%
Changes in Structure of Work	3.44	3.67	0.23	7%
Partnerships and Alliances	4.2	4.4	0.20	5%
Changes in Technology	4.4	4.4	0.00	0%
Constant Change	4.44	4.44	0.00	0%

Outside the Company Perspective (External OD Consultants and Other Business Minds Combined)

OD Interventions	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
System Dynamics	2.33	3.58	1.25	54%
Self Management	2.2	3.35	1.15	52%
Knowledge Management	2.83	4.13	1.30	46%
Quality of Work Life	2.4	3.44	1.04	43%
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	2.88	3.96	1.08	38%
Culture Change	3.23	4.17	0.94	29%
Diversity in the Work Place	3.04	3.84	0.80	26%
Mentoring	2.72	3.42	0.70	26%
Learning Organizations	2.88	3.58	0.70	24%
Conflict Resolution	2.84	3.5	0.66	23%
New Team Development	3.04	3.72	0.68	22%
Career Development	3.12	3.76	0.64	21%
Executive Coaching	3.26	3.88	0.62	19%
Organizational Design	3.16	3.71	0.55	17%
Leadership	3.92	4.6	0.68	17%
Developing Effective Communication Skills	3.54	4.12	0.58	16%
Executive Development	3.56	4.04	0.48	13%
Competency Modeling	2.87	3.23	0.36	13%
Change Management	3.96	4.38	0.42	11%
Process Consultation	3	3.28	0.28	9%
Team Building	3.68	3.96	0.28	8%
360 Feedback	3.29	3.46	0.17	5%
Reward & Recognition	3.84	4	0.16	4%
Mission/Vision Statements	4.19	4.28	0.09	2%
Strategic Planning	4.36	4.32	-0.04	-1%
Re-engineering	3	2.76	-0.24	-8%
Facilitation	3.72	3.36	-0.36	-10%
avg. amount chg.	0.55			
avg. % chg.	17.23%			
avg.-current	3.22			
avg.-in 3 years	3.77			

Macro Forces Effecting Business

	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Shift in Age Demographics	2.9	3.7	0.80	28%
Increased Diversity in Workforce	3.29	3.92	0.63	19%
Changes in Structure of Work	3.62	3.96	0.34	9%
Partnerships and Alliances	4.07	4.34	0.27	7%
Constant Change	4.5	4.59	0.09	2%
Changes in Technology	4.59	4.64	0.05	1%

Inside the Company Perspective (Line Managers and Internal OD Consultants Combined)

OD Interventions	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Knowledge Management	2.53	4.08	1.55	61%
Learning Organizations	2.34	3.7	1.36	58%
Improve Employees Ability to Learn	2.78	3.95	1.17	42%
System Dynamics	2.38	3.37	0.99	42%
Developing Effective Communication Skills	2.85	4.03	1.18	41%
360 Feedback	2.7	3.61	0.91	34%
Leadership	3.21	4.29	1.08	34%
Executive Development	2.94	3.87	0.93	32%
Competency Modeling	2.61	3.42	0.81	31%
Executive Coaching	2.82	3.68	0.86	30%
Career Development	3.13	4.06	0.93	30%
Strategic Planning	3.36	4.29	0.93	28%
Quality of Work Life	2.83	3.61	0.78	28%
Change Management	3.21	4.06	0.85	26%
Self Management	2.88	3.63	0.75	26%
Team Building	3.15	3.97	0.82	26%
Culture Change	2.82	3.55	0.73	26%
New Team Development	2.94	3.65	0.71	24%
Conflict Resolution	2.67	3.29	0.62	23%
Mentoring	2.82	3.45	0.63	22%
Process Consultation	2.55	3.03	0.48	19%
Reward & Recognition	3.52	4.13	0.61	17%
Facilitation	3.09	3.61	0.52	17%
Organizational Design	2.91	3.32	0.41	14%
Re-engineering	2.94	3.1	0.16	5%
Diversity in the Work Place	3.38	3.52	0.14	4%
Mission/Vision Statements	3.7	3.61	-0.09	-2%
avg. amount chg.	0.77			
avg. % chg.	26.33%			
avg.-current	2.93			
avg.-in 3 years	3.70			

Macro Forces Effecting Business

	current	in 3 years	amount chg.	% changed
Increased Diversity in Workforce	2.94	3.35	0.41	14%
Partnerships and Alliances	3.91	4.29	0.38	10%
Changes in Technology	4.24	4.42	0.18	4%
Shift in Age Demographics	3.21	3.35	0.14	4%
Constant Change	3.82	3.9	0.08	2%
Changes in Structure of Work	3.55	3.61	0.06	2%

Appendix F: Harvard Business Review

Month	Year	OD related Article
Sept.-Oct.	**1998**	1) How to Kill Creativity 2) The Right Mind-Set for Managing Information Technology 3) Desperately Seeking Synergy 4) After the Layoffs, What Next? 5) The hidden Traps in Decision-making 6) Right Away and all at Once how we saved Continental

6 out 11 OD related

Month	Year	OD related Article
Nov.-Dec.	**1998**	1) What makes a leader? 2) Covert Leadership: Notes on Managing Professionals 3) Clusters and the New Economies of Competition 4) Work and Life: The End of the zero-sum game 5) The New Math of Ownership

5 of 11 articles are OD related

Month	Year	OD related Article
Jan.-Feb.	1999	1) Organizing for Empowerment 2) A Report Card on Diversity 3) Can this Merger be Saved 4) The Human Moment at Work

4 out of 11 articles are OD related

Month	Year	OD related Article
Mar.-Apr.	1999	1) Driving Change 2) New Thinking on How to Link Executive Pay with performance 3) What's your strategy for Managing Knowledge? 4) What Effective General Managers Really Do 5) Managing Oneself 6) Are Managers Obsolete? 7) Unbundling the Corporation

7 out of 11 OD Related

May-June   1999   1) Changing Leaders
                            2) Firing Up the Front Line
                            3) Turning Negotiation into a Corporate Capability
                            4) Patching: Restitching Business Portfolios in Dynamic
                               Markets
                            5) How Risky is Your Company?
                            6) The Smart-Talk Trap
                            7) Being Virtual: Character and the New Economy

7 out of 11 are OD related

Appendix G: The Six Pillars of Self-Esteem

1. The practice of living consciously – being aware of outer world, seeking
    feedback, seek to understand our inner world

2. The practice of self-acceptance -- accept ourselves for who we are- take
    responsibility for own actions

3. The practice of self-responsibility – excepting responsibility of our own
    choices

4. The practice of self assertiveness – being authentic, stand up for selves,
    protect values

5. The practice of living purposefully – identify short and long term goals,
    actions to get there, execute, monitor, adapt when necessary

6. The practice of personal integrity – living with what we know, what we
    do, what we profess – telling the truth, honoring commitments, treating
    people appropriately.

(Branden, 1997).

Appendix H: Definitions of the 5 Disciplines of a Learning Organization

1. **System Thinking** - "a conceptual framework, a body of knowledge and tools that has been developed to make full patterns clearer, and to help us see how to change them effectively" (pg. 7).

2. **Personal Mastery** – "the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and of seeing reality objectively." (pg.7)

3. **Mental Models** – "deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action." (pg. 8)

4. **The Practice of Shared Vision** – "the skills of unearthing shared "pictures of the future" that foster genuine commitment and enrollment rather than compliance." (pg. 9)

5. **Team Learning** – "starts with dialogue, the capacity of members of a team to suspend assumptions and enter into genuine thinking together." (pg. 10); **(Senge, 1990).**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argris, Chris (1991). Teaching Smart People How to Learn. <u>Harvard Business Review</u>. May-June, 99-109.

Baird, Lloyd. (1998). "Competing in the Knowledge Economy: Leading for the Knowledge Economy." (Lecture.) November 28th, 1998.

Baird, Lloyd, Henderson, John C., and Watts, Stephanie (1997). Learning from Action: An Analysis of the Center for Army Lessons Learned (CALL). <u>Human Resource Management</u>. <u>36</u>(4) 385-395.

Bennis, Warren (1969). <u>Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins and Prospects.</u> Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Berry, Jay (1997). Consulting's New Breed. <u>Journal of Management Consulting</u>. <u>9</u>(4), 42.

Bond, Meg & Pyle, Jean L (1998). Diversity Dilemmas at Work. <u>Journal of Management Inquiry</u>. <u>7</u>(3), 252-262.

Branden, Nathaniel (1997). Self-Esteem in the Information Age. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), <u>The Organization of the Future</u> (pp. 221-229). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burke, Warner (1982). <u>Organization Development: Principles and Practices</u>. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Bushe, Gervase R. (1998). Power and the Empowered Organization: The Design of Power in Highly Adaptive Organizations. <u>OD Practitioner</u>. <u>30</u>(4), 31-43.

Byrne, John. (1998). JACK: A Close-up Look at How America's #1 Manager Runs GE. <u>Business Week</u>. June 8 1998, pp. 91-110.

Cairncross, Frances. (1997). <u>Death of Distance</u>. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Champy, James. (1997). Preparing for Organizational Change. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), <u>The Organization of the Future</u> (pp. 9-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, Jay (1997). How Generational Shifts Will Transform Organizational Life. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), <u>The Organization of the Future</u> (pp.17-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cummings, T.G. & Worley ,C.G. (1993). Organization Development and Change,
(5th ed.). Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co.

DeAngelis, Joseph A (1998). Mergers & Acquisitions: Why the Beat Goes ON.
Unpublished manuscript.

Dertouzos, Michael (1998). Working with New Technology. Harvard Management
Update. January, 3-6.

Doz, Yves L. & Hamel, Gary (1998). Alliance Advantage. Boston: Harvard Business
School Press.

Drucker, Peter (1998). The Future That Has Already Happened. Boston: Harvard
Business School Press.

Drucker, Peter (1997). Introduction Toward the New Organization. In F. Hesselbein, M.
Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 1-5).
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Drucker, Peter F., Dyson, Esther, Handy, Charles, Saffo, Paul, & Senge, Peter M.
(1997). Looking Ahead: Implications of the Present. Harvard Business Review,
September-October, 2-10.

Drucker, Peter F. (1998, September). On Developing the Future Organization.
Symposium conducted in partnership with The Greater Boston Chamber of
Commerce Management Forum on September 8th, 1998, Boston.

Easton, Robert (1999). The Art of Smart. Fast Company. 26, 94.

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. & Brown, Shona L. (1999). Patching: Restitching Business
Portfolios in Dynamic Markets. Harvard Business Review. 77(3), 72-82.

Esty, Katharine, Griggin, Richard, & Hirsch, Marci Schorr (1995). Workplace Diversity.
Holbrook, MA: Adams Media Corporation.

Fast Forward. (1998, November 16). The Wall Street Journal. November. 16, 1998)
p. 1.

Gadiesh, Orit & Olivet, Scott (1997). Designing for Implementability. In F. Hesselbein,
M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp.53-64).
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Galbraith, Jay (1997). The Reconfigurable Organization. In F. Hesselbein, M.
Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 87 – 97).
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goleman, Daniel (1995). Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, Daniel (1998). What Makes a Leader?. Harvard Business Review. 76(6), 92-102.

Goleman, Daniel (1998). Working with Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam.

Hamel, Gary & Prahalad, C.K. (1994). Competing for the Future. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Hanaka, Martin E. & Hawkins, Bill (1997). Organizing for Endless Winning. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 169-176). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Handy, Charles (1989). The Age of Unreason. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Harmon, Frederick (1997). Future Present. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 239-247). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harmon, Frederick G. (1997). Future Present. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 239-247). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

HR Becomes More Strategic, Survey Finds (1997, November). Employee Benefit Plan Review. 52(5), pp. 27-28.

Horne, Jf. (1999, January 18th). The Education Assumption. Handout received.

Jones, Glenn R. (1997). Creating a Leadership Organization with a Learning Mission. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp.127-135). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, John. (1996). Leading Change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Malone, Thomas W. & Laubacher, Robert J. (1998). The Dawn of the E-Lance Economy. Harvard Business Review, September-October, 144-152.

McClelland, Sandra. (1998, November). Whole System Change in Education. Arizona Organization Development Network Newsletter.

Miller, Doug (1997). The Future Organization – A Chameleon in All its Glory. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 119-125). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, Brian S.& Schiemann, William A. (1999). Measuring People and Performance: Closing the Gaps. Quality Progress. 32(1), pp. 47-53.

New IDC Report Forecasts Change Management Fastest-Growing Consulting Activity. (1998). PR Newswire (Research Report of September 8th). Framingham, MA. pp. 1-2.

Pierce, F David (1996). How to Fight Organizational 'Fires'. Occupational Health & Safety. 65(12), 18-22.

Porter, Michael E. (1998). Clusters and the New Economies of Competition. Harvard Business Review. 76(6), 77-90.

Prahalad, C.K. (1997). The Work of New Age Managers in the Emerging Competitive Landscape. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp.159- 168). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Puccinelli, Bob (1998). Overcoming Resistance to Change. Inform. 12(8), 40-41.

Schiro, James J. (1998). Inside the Mind of the CEO. www.pwcglobal.com/extweb/ncsurves.nsf/ DocID/ 532E29E8A4E680EC852566330002658E.

Senge, Peter (1990). The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of The Learning Organization. New York: Doubleday.

Shearman, Jack. (1998, September). On Developing the Future Organization. Symposium conducted in partnership with The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce Management Forum on September 8th, 1998, Boston.

Smith, Anthony F. & Kelly, Tim (1997). Human Capital in the Digital Economy. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 199- 211). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Somerville, Iain & Mroz, John Edwin (1997). New Competencies for a New World. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), The Organization of the Future (pp. 65-78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stalk, George, Evans, Phillip, & Schulman, Lawrence (1992). Competing on Capabilities: The New Rules of Corporate Strategy. Harvard Business Review. March-April.

Staff. Rover Elementary School Pamphlet. Handout received at the symposium conducted for the Arizona Organizational Development Network on November 19th, 1998.

Stevenson, Howard H. & Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. (1998). <u>Do Lunch or Be Lunch</u>. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Taylor, William, (1991). The Logic of Global Business: An Interview with ABB's Percy Barnevik. <u>Harvard Business Review</u>, March-April, 90-104.

Thomas Jr., Roosevelt (1997). Diversity and Organizations of the Future. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Bechkard (Ed.), <u>The Organization of the Future</u> (pp. 329-339). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Unfinished Management Revolution, The. (1999, Winter). <u>Leader to Leader</u>, pp. 48-50.

VanDeusen, John M. (1999, January). <u>Using OD in Project Delivery</u>. Symposium conducted for the Greater Boston Organizational Development Network on January 14th, 1999, Boston.

Varney, Glenn H. & Darrow, Arthur L. (1998). Name Recognition of Master Level Graduate Programs in Organizational Development and Change. <u>OD Practitioner</u>. <u>30</u>(1), 36-40.

Venkatraman, N. & Henderson John C. (1998). Real Strategies For Virtual Organizing. Boston University School of Management Systems Research Center, discussion paper.

Vicere, Albert A. (1998, May). <u>The New Fabric of Leadership Development</u>. Symposium conducted for the Human Resource Management Group May 28th, 1998, Boston.

Walton, Cathy & McBride, John (1998). Broken Engagements. <u>Financial Times</u>. February 26th, pg. 14.

Wetlaufer, Suzy, (1999). Organizing for Empowerment: An Interview with AES's Roger Sant and Dennis Bakke. <u>Harvard Business Review</u>. <u>77</u>(1), 110-123.

Wharton, Andrea (1998). Common Knowledge. <u>Document World</u>. <u>3</u>(5), 7.

Willis, Clint (1997). Intel Corporation. <u>Worth</u>. November, 83-97,104-107.

60 HR Predictions for 2008. (1999, January). <u>Personnel Journal, Inc</u>. <u>77</u>(1), pp. 50-51.