ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT & CHANGE

by

Claude FAUCHEUX (FBA-Delft-NL)
Gilles AMADO (CESA-Jouy-en-Josas-F)
André LAURENT (INSEAD-Fontainebleau-F)

N° 81/11

15 April 1981

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT & CHANGE

Claude FAUCHEUX
(Foundation for Business Administration - Delft - The Netherlands)

Gilles AMADO
(Centre d'Enseignement Superieures des Affaires - Jouy en Josas - France)

André LAURENT
(European Institute of Business Administration - Fontainebleau - France)

Fontainebleau, April 15, 1981

This paper has been written in conformity with the format requested by the editors of the Annual Review of Psychology.

It had to be a selective - not comprehensive - survey of the literature on Organizational Development and Change and a critical analysis of the present state of the field, restricted in length to approximately 12.500 words, including bibliography.

We were wisely advised to save space by shunning statements of an introductory nature stressing the obvious, namely that we read many more articles in preparation for the chapter than can be cited, that the articles were of unequal value, that the review is selective and that, of course, we could have used more pages.

Actually we read more than 600 articles and 50 books having in mind to cover more or less the same aspects as the previous reviewers did, with perhaps a more international coverage.

We found a deep change in the field which led us to stress the cultural aspects and the change of paradigm at the cost of a more detailed discussion of methodological aspects of research and a presentation of the interventions in various settings.

ABSTRACT

- Theory is not lagging behind practice and might even be actually ahead of practice in the field of planned social change.
- A theoretical basis for the integration of the various activities in the field of planned organizational change is more likely to be found with the socio-technical approach than within OD which is more than ever a label for an aggregate of techniques with no doubt a dignified ancestry but only loose theoretical foundations.
- Socio-technical theory has emerged in a cultural setting very different from that where OD has developed.
- Socio-technical theory by stressing the necessity of dealing jointly with both technology and people has indeed rendered obsolete OD as an approach mainly centered on people and process, but has been able to merge with a development in the US parallel and complementary to its own in UK and Northern Europe to form a social movement known today by the name of "Quality of Working Life".
- Latin countries provide us with an example of cultures where the organization is not the prime locus of social change, where change is less "planned" and where consequently approaches different from OD have emerged.
- Organizational Development & Change has to be assessed in the broader context of the world socio-economic development, if it is to take its full significance.

The purpose of this paper is to review Organizational Development and Change. The scope and coverage have been extended in two important directions over what has been done by the two previous review papers (Friedlander & Brown, 1974; Alderfer, 1977).

Firstly, the coverage has been extended beyond North American publications. Indeed, it is no longer possible to ignore developments outside the US and Canada when they influence thinking and research in these two countries. For instance, developments in Northern Europe (Industrial Democracy) and Japan (Quality Circles) cannot be ignored. In addition, the special situation in Latin countries can provide significant insights about the field.

Secondly, the scope of this review - as reflected by its title - goes beyond OD to include Organizational Change. This is an indication of the fact that the OD label may no longer be adequate to describe the various developments that have taken place in the field during the past few years. The impact of the Quality of Working Life (QWL) movement has become critical. Some authors even wonder whether OD is not becoming an obsolete label (Jones & Pfeiffer, 1977) to be replaced by QWL (Burke, 1976).

Part I of this review will discuss and compare OD and QWL. The second part will extend this discussion to the cultural foundations of OD and QWL. The third part will look at a variety of developments specific to the Latin countries. Finally, there will be a concluding section attempting to broaden the perspective.

I - ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE?

Friedlander & Brown (1974) had assimilated the socio-technical approaches with the "techno-structural approaches" which, in their own classification, dealt with structures and technology (in opposition to the "human processual approaches" dealing with processes and peoples). However, this classification is puzzling if we do recognize that one of the main characteristics of the socio-technical approaches is precisely to deal jointly with both people and technology.

This is an indication indeed that "socio-technical approaches" have been somewhat foreign to OD practice though they were nonetheless perceived as concurring toward similar goals.

Kahn (1974) concluded his so often quoted paper by welcoming "the work on job design which approaches organizational structure - the division of labor..; not only will this strengthen the practice of OD, it will also bring the language of OD into the larger realm of organizational theory and research. It is a long awaited convergence."

This underlines again the lack of theoretical unification within OD, but also points in a direction where hopefully such a theoretical base might be found.

Burke (1976), a very perceptive observer of the field, opens his description of the main transitions in OD with the statement that what was known as OD might come to be called QWI (Quality of Work Intervention) or QWL (Quality of Working Life). He then describes the penultimate transition as one where "the role of the practitioner has changed from working almost exclusively with the management, to working with both managers and persons at all organizational levels "...This transition in OD means that practitioners must pay considerably more attention to the whole area of socio-technical systems and to human engineering, job design, and ultimately to the quality of working life."

The following year, Burke (1977) used the previous paper as an introductory chapter to "Current Issues". However, the opening remark about QWL is suppressed and the end of the last sentence quoted above becomes: "...practitioners must pay considerably more attention to industrial engineering, job design or redesign and the whole area of socio-technical systems."

In 1978 in the introductory chapter of "The Cutting Edge", Burke, (1978) states "Although OD might have another name in the future, I do not think now it is going to be one of these," (QWI or QWL). He continues asserting: "Be that as it may, the new kid on the block, at the moment, is QWL: It has replaced job enrichment" and asks "But is QWL the same as OD?" He notes that Walton, though he does not make any comparative statement, defines QWL as broadly, if not more so, than OD; finally, after referring to Nadler's chapter which describes some typical QWL projects, he concludes "QWL will not encompass nor replace OD, but perhaps will be integrated within it as job enrichment has been in many instances... This integration will be all to the good, since OD could be improved with more use of QWL principles and practices, that is OD would no longer be seen solely as a management tool, but would become more of a total organizational process." This leads him to recognize that Kahn's (1974) criticism still holds today: "OD is only a convenient label for a bunch of activities."

Two years later Burke (1980a) still sees QWL as "OD under a new name" and wonders about "what's an OD consultant to do?" Only three alternatives occur to him: Either fine tune and tinker with the

system, or quit the system altogether or attempt to fundamentally change the system itself. In concluding he recommends: "OD consultants should continue fine-tuning, keeping in mind the risk of furthering the organizational imperative, but they should also attempt to change bureaucracies in some fundamental ways. OD is one way that is still worth pursuing."

In a recent interview Burke, (1980b) does provide some clues to the reasons for such a weak, disillusioned conclusion. Referring to the series of conferences on OD (several of which were chaired by Burke) sponsored by NTL and University Associates, Burke notes that OD researchers and practioners might not be as hung-up about being theory based today as they were in the early seventies; but he observes also that concepts coming out of socio-technical systems approach are beginning to impact the field now and predicts an even stronger influence in the future.

Recent Books in the Field - Some authors did care recently to title their publications as "Organization Change and Development" (Beer, 1980) or "Organization Development & Change" as did Huse as early as 1975, who states in the Preface to his second edition. (Huse, 1980): "Much that appeared new and innovative in 1975 seemed like history and 'old hat' in 1979 and 1980." Huse is indeed among the few who very early on acknowledged the importance of socio-technical approaches to work redesign as did the first reviewers for this chapter (Friedlander & Brown, 1974).

A rapid glance at some books published in the last five years will indicate the transformations in the field. Among handbooks, manuals or textbooks in 1976, little recognition was as yet given to the emergence of socio-technical approaches. Some do not even mention it: (Dunnette, 1976; Bowers, 1976a). This silence extends even later with Bryant and Niemans (1978), Weick (1979), Golembiewski (1979a), even Beer (1980) who nonetheless advocates a system view. Some give a passing recognition like Dubin (1976), Burke (1977), French et al (1978) who devote a few chapters to socio-technical systems.

The turning point seems to be the second edition of Katz and Kahn (1978) which provides the most adequate and up to date coverage of North-European literature with a detailed account of the socio-technical systems approach. Similarly, the second edition of Huse (1980), and Miles (1980) also give an extensive presentation of this approach. Only a few collected papers are entirely devoted to the socio-technical approach: Davis & Cherns 1975a, 1975b, Clark (1976), Pasmore & Sherwood (1978), and also the last volume of ICQWL (1979) (a new series published in Holland), Cooper & Mumford (1979).

Perhaps this significant change in the OD field is best reflected in the new quarterly "Group and Organizational Studies" with editorial notes, interviews, book reviews, abstracts from significant papers in addition to articles derived from a wide variety of sources, and a meritorious effort to cover what is going on outside the US. This last feature is particularly welcomed at a time when the industrial and economic interdependencies in the world should make us aware of the many different cultural contexts in which social change is taking place and when the influence of Japan and Northern Europe can be felt in the US in the field of organizational change.

In order to better understand the nature of these influences it is useful to characterize, even briefly, the different intellectual climates in which organization research has developed.

II. - PLANNED CHANGE IN THE ANGLO-SAXON COUNTRIES

Different US and European Orientations - Some useful considerations concerning the history of OD in the US can be found in French et al (1978) and Tichy (1978). In addition, it is important to note that the rapprochement between the Lewin group and the Tavistock Institute had resulted in little more than the journal Human Relations after Lewin's death. Lewin's conceptualization of ecological psychology was an early recognition of the open system nature of persons and groups within the social field. This formulation was attractive to the researchers of the Tavistock Institute who had gone a long way in this direction whereas this orientation in the US was retained by only a few (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Another dimension of the Tavistock Institute's work further differentiates their approach. Strongly influenced by unorthodox and creative psycho-analysts such as Melanie Klein, Fairbairn, Winnicott, Bion, they developed an approach to groups with a dual focus: They differentiate between the level of the activities carrying out a purpose involving a task in an environment and the level of the activities implying unconscious or unlearned assumptions. Such an orientation led to the recognition of complex systemic interdependencies whereas the T-group posterity in the US was rather restricted to intra-group and interpersonal phenomena, and only slowly became interested in intergroup aspects. Whereas the task was always central in the Tavistock focus, it was secondary at best for the US.

The Tavistock approach was not only deeper with its psycho analytic framework, but was also broader in the sense that they preserved a sociological and anthropological interest which made them sensitive to the cultural contexts in which groups and organizations found themselves. This aspect, which was certainly present with Lewin, is not apparent in OD which tends to be satisfied with the analysis of attitudes.

In the US, an implicit belief in technical determinism might have discouraged any inclination to tinker with the technology of the tasks. On the contrary, with its holistic approach, and its appreciation of cultural realities, the Tavistock could more easily evolve the socio-technical views according to which there is no such thing as technological determinism, but rather a mutual influence of both technological and social requirements which can lead to a joint optimization of the work systems.

The nature of societal demands was also different. The Tavistock Institute team emerged from the demands of a society confronted with exceptional war problems. The level of intervention was that of the "community" (Bridger, 1946, 1978a; Gray, 1970). On the other hand, the US demand came primarily from post-war needs of industry to increase productivity in an expanding economy, where the group approach was seen as a convenient road toward the solution of individual problems. The concern with the organization as a whole and the realization that its environment was part of the organization's world emerged comparatively later in the US.

Though the theoretical formulation of socio-technical systems was born in England, it is in Scandinavia that the Tavistock researchers found a major field for intervention. In the early sixties in Norway a joint concern at the national level of both management and unions for the working conditions in industry was at the origin of the

"Industrial Democracy" project. (Emery and Thorsrud, 1976). This movement spread at the end of that decade in Sweden (Herbst, 1974-1976).

Only very few OD men in the US during the 60's have intervened at the shop floor level or concerned themselves with structural problems of the organization. The Scandinavian experiments received relatively little attention from the US at the time.

In the US, work design was left almost entirely to specialists who favored an individual job approach to the problem and were not favorable to work participation and collaboration with unions as developped in Scandinavia (Weinberg, 1974). Lou Davis, who developped a more wholistic approach to work design felt much more akin to the Tavistock style than to the views which were dominant in the US at the time. His collaboration with Eric Trist at UCLA in the mid-sixties strengthened the socio-technical approach from the technological side and resulted in the major theoretical thrust of the QWL movement ten years later (Davis, 1977a, b, c, 1978, 1979a, b, c, 1980).

Ted Mills (1975) described very clearly the conditions which led to the emergence of a new concern with human resources, which was to gain such momentum that it would indeed be possible to see it as a genuine social movement. Comparing Europe's industrial democracy project with that of the QWL in the US, Mills (1978) very perceptively stresses the deep differences in style: The European approach being more legalistic, formal and government induced, whereas the American pragmatism let union-management cooperation develop voluntarily, with a concern for the individual worker involvement in day-to-day decision making.

Nonetheless, it is important to bear in mind that the US government was very influential in the development of a concern for the QWL. For instance, Ted Mills was at the Price Commission in 1971-73 and at the National Commission on Productivity and Work Quality in 1973. He then became the first director of the "National Quality of Work Center" in Washington, later known as the "American Center for the Quality of Work Life". In this capacity he has played a very central role in stimulating this development which was not concerned with legislation (though this aspect is not completely absent (Lawler et al 1980, p.91) but rather with the development of institutions where unions, management and government could collaborate. The support of a private institution like the Ford Foundation was also essential in launching the initial conferences (1971-1972) (Davis & Cherns, 1975a,b) and in funding research programs like the Michigan one (1973) (Seashore, 1981).

However, without any real concern among industrialists and unionists, the QWL movement could not have gained such a momentum. This social movement is not even in full swing in the US as yet, while on the other hand the industrial democracy movement in Scandinavia seems to have lost some of its initial thrust of the 60s. Gunzburg & Hammarström (I.C.Q.W.L. 1979) describe how two approaches were tried in Sweden - socio-technical after the Tavistock Institute and representative systems for joint management-union consultation - and observe that work democracy through changes in work design has been slower to develop than worker representation. The interest in a comparative approach to representative systems and workers' participation has developed only recently (Kühne 1980, Jain 1980, Wilpert et al 1978a,b; Garson 1977, Wall & Lischeron, 1977).

<u>Research on OD</u> - An important review of research evidence about OD has been done by Porras in a series of papers. Though the period reviewed ranges from 1959 to mid-1975 no posterior publications seem to invalidate the conclusions. A systematic search yielded 160 evaluation studies of planned organizational change (spread over 36 journals, 22 books and 8 unpublished manuscripts) out of which only 35 were retained which satisfied the following criteria:

- <u>human processual approach</u> (to the exclusion of socio-technical, participative or structural change studies).
- <u>real life organizations</u> (excluding laboratory or simulation studies).
- collecting and presenting <u>quantitative data</u> (excluding case studies).
- relevant to the <u>change activity</u> of the organization (excluding mere participants evaluation of the intervention).
- related to changes in human processes (excluding studies with only economic or output measures).

Among many interesting findings let us note the following ones from Porras & Berg, 1978a:

. A significant increase in the use of Survey Feedback and Process consultation and a large decrease in the use of the Managerial Grid approach.

  . an increased use of the more common OD approach, <u>Laboratory training</u>, but with a task focus becoming more popular (and a process orientation focus becoming less popular).

From Porras & Berg, 1978b:

. counter evidence is provided to the widely accepted model that changed process causes changed outcome.

. task oriented variables were among the low changers which questions the effects of OD on task related behavior <u>in general</u>.

. relatively little systematic evidence about the efficacy of OD.
  - OD does not seem to make people happier and more satisfied.
  - Group process variables change less than half the time they are measured.
  - OD does not have an important impact on the overall organizational process (only on individuals).
  - T-groups, Encounter Groups and Sensitivity Training Groups resulted in the lowest percentage of reported change.

This systematic survey led to further useful considerations about research methodology, stressing the distinction between implementation research (focusing primarily on finding solutions to a specific organizational problem), evaluation research (focusing primarily on the global outcomes of an intervention), assessment research (designed to discover not only outcomes, but also the processes which generated them) and theory building research (oriented toward discovering fundamental relationships existing in any planned change process) (Porras & Roberts, 1980). Some of the reasons why so little assessment research is done were also reviewed, a model of OD assessment proposed with several recommendations for overcoming some of the obstacles to this necessary type of research (Porras & Patterson, 1979). Finally, a concrete illustration of these recommendations is provided by an empirical study of OD in a large system (Porras & Wilkins, 1980), yielding unexpected findings contradictory to generally accepted OD theory and practice.

The complaints about the paucity of good research and particularly fundamental research are not new, but it is only recently that reasonably good evidence has been provided on the poor efficacy of OD intervention as well as the unsubstantiated character of many OD conceptions (cf also Pate et al 1977). Perhaps the only emerging efficacy seems to be related to the degree to which the OD intervention uses participative methods (Dunn & Swierszek, 1977).

Research on QWL - While research on OD appears to be primarily critical, research on QWL projects seems to be gathering momentum. (Taylor, 1977). With the support of both the Ford Foundation and the US Department of Commerce, a research program for organizational assessment has developed at the Institute for Social Research, known as the "Michigan Quality of Work Program" (cf Lawler et al 1980; Drexler & Lawler 1977; Seashore et al 1981; Seashore, 1981). This effort has been up to now primarily methodological and has resulted in the design of field procedures which could also be useful for the evaluation of organizations and organizational change in different contexts. Eight QWL projects were included in the original plan, some of them having been already reported (Trist et al, 1977; Goodman, 1979; Nadler 1978a,b; Nadler et al, 1980), but most of them are not yet advanced enough for the findings to be published. Such a research effort is unprecedented in scope, magnitude and sophistication. While awaiting these findings we have not as yet much research evidence at hand.

Cummings et al, 1977 satisfying themselves with some 58 field studies on "work experiments", in spite of a degree of validity which left much to be desired, seemed nonetheless to assess as plausible the overwhelming number of positive results reported and their generalizability. Pasmore & Sherwood (1978 p.259) selected out of these 58 studies 16 which were more socio-technical in their approach and describe a typical socio-technical study as follows:

"it includes male, blue collar, unionized workers who perform industrial tasks. These employees number about 40 and they particpate directly in the change program. The experimental changes involve forming an autonomous work group; specific modifications include increases in autonomy, interpersonal/group processes, feedback of results, and task variety, with parallel changes in the technical/-physical setting to form whole task groups and in the pay/reward system to reinforce group perfomance. If the necessary conditions for autonomous group functionning are implemented the likely results are increases in productivity and worker satisfaction" (p.268).

Some case studies: The "National Processing Case" (Drexler & Lawler, 1977), Bolivar (Duckles et al, 1977), Tarrytown (Guest, 1979) concur in stressing the importance of union-management collaboration and employee participation which require patience in building an appropriate climate through appropriate new organizational structures and decision making processes.

Sometimes these new structures are labelled "parallel organizations" (Carlson, 1978), "collateral" or "reflective" organizations, even "shadow" structures (Schein & Greiner, 1977), "flat, flexible, but formal problem solving and governance organizations that serve to supplement bureaucracy and exist side by side with it, not replace it" as described by Stein & Kanter (1980, p.371) who see this as a developing trend of the 1980s.

Some sobering observations have been made by Walton (1977) at Topeka, but on the other hand he develops a positive and pragmatic overall view of the work improvements over the last 10 years (Walton, 1979).

<u>Cultural Contexts</u> - As we have seen, in order to understand the transformation of the field in the US today, it is necessary to realize that the socio-technical approach has emerged in an intellectual climate different from that of the US. In a way, it could be compared (mutatis mutandis) to the coming of Kurt Lewin in the 30's with the only difference that Lewin had not found in the US a trend of research complementary to his own as, for instance, Tavistock researchers found with Lou Davis.

However, it is only in Northern Europe that the Tavistock found an opportunity to develop its approach. Southern Europe provides us with a situation where OD (as it was known in the US or Northern Europe) has never developed to the same extent and a different attitude toward social change, particularly in the organization, has yielded different styles of intervention. The part of Europe which has been visible from the US has mostly been Northern Europe, whereas the comparatively smaller number of publications in English coming from Latin Europe (as well as from Latin America) has not facilitated the awareness of important cultural differences (Faucheux & Rojot, 1979).

The fact that different approaches to organizational change seem to have emerged in different cultural contexts should not come as so much of a surprise. It is all the more surprising that these strategies for organizational change have been proposed for so long as almost independent from their societal and cultural context (Maurice, et al 1980).

The very same cultural blindness, ethnocentrism and claim for universality that has plagued the field of management and organization theory (Hofstede, 1980) may have plagued also the field of planned organizational change.

In a recent study comparing managerial ideologies across ten western countries, Laurent (1979) has shown for instance, that the widest gap in management and organizational conceptions could be found between the US and the Latin countries of Europe and that these important national differences were not reduced within large multinational companies. On the basis of his research data, he argues with Inzerilli (1979) that while the American managers predominantly hold an "instrumental" view of the organization as a set of tasks to be achieved, French managers favor a "social" view of the organization as a collectivity of people. No wonder then that OD emerged in the US with an instrumental focus on organizational process as tools to be improved, whereas the Latin countries have developed institutional approaches that try to deal with the social intricacies of human collectivities.

Having realized the importance of a proper appreciation of the cultural dimension within social change, we are in a better position to examine why, within the Western world, the technological transfer of OD to Latin countries has been difficult and why alternative approaches to social change have emerged there.

Having done this, we will be better equipped to wonder how, outside of the Western world but still within the industrialized nations, the Japanese deal with organizational change, leaving for the main conclusions some considerations about the significance of all this for "developping countries".

III – ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE IN LATIN COUNTRIES

When we analyze the theoretical developments as well as present practices in the field of OD and change within Latin countries we find power to be the key factor around which all major research work revolves. That is not to say that power is a neglected dimension elsewhere. In the U.S. (Chesler et al., 1979) and even more so in Northern Europe (Mulder, 1977; Pettigrew, 1979; Borum, 1980) power training has been seriously considered as an alternative to OD. Van Dongen (1978) has, however, vigorously criticized this conception which considers power only intra-organizationally without giving proper recognition to the societal context where its real significance originates: According to van Dongen if we are seeking real organizational change we should rather attempt to change the rules of the game more than anything else.

In addition, the power dimension assumes a further significance in Latin cultures where the influence of Roman Law and the lack of consensual basis strengthen state centralization of authority and power (Faucheux & Rojot, 1979; Maurice & Sellier, 1979). This central notion incidentally renders very problematical any practice of planned change in these countries. The very fundamental assumptions of OD are thus questioned: Its cultural origin, its presuppositions about development, organization, adaptation, and change, its epistemological basis consequently, but also its methods and aims. To be sure, OD ideas and practices have been introduced in many Latin countries: In France (Morin, 1976), in Italy (Salvemini, 1980) and most recently in Brazil (Cavalcanti, 1979). However, we must take note that reports on intervention in these countries are scarce and that the most interesting works are precisely those which have attempted to explain the deficiency or the ineffectiveness of those interventions by the cultural specificity of each country.

Latin Bureaucracies – Taking a look at Brazil for a moment, whose basic culture is closer to the Latin countries than it is to the Anglo-Saxons, we notice that the first reservations concerning the transfer possibilities of OD had been formulated shortly after its introduction (Da Costa Moura, 1978; Carvalho da Cunha, 1979; Boetger, 1978) and elaborated later by Pinto (1979). For this author, a meaningful crosscultural application of OD requires at least the rudiments of a comparative theory of a caliber higher than presently available. This is why he attempts to compare the basic OD assumptions as they appear in the current OD literature with their equivalent cultural counterparts drawn from empirical and theoretical writings on comparative administration, development and politics in Latin America. He goes as far as to suggest the risks of "cultural substitution". Starting from the confrontation of four dimensions (norms and values underlying OD, the individual at work, group processes, organizational climate) he shows how the assumptions of OD are in every respect contradictory to the social reality of Latin America. For instance, "traditional" societies, in Latin America, stand in opposition to the "modern" Anglo-Saxon societies in their lesser capacity for openness, trust and rational expression of feelings. Contrary to the contractual basis of North American society, Latin America seems marked by the predominance of deeply rooted tradition, class structure and government centralization. As Pinto says, Theory Y, suited to the Protestant ethic, does not fit the Catholic work ethic; competence is most often overruled by formal status in Latin America, where, according to this author, tolerance for uncertainty, ambiguity and undefined structure would be very low. Group cohesion results generally from intergroup rivalry and conflict resolution follows a win-lose model.

These analyses are striking in their similarity to those developed in Latin Europe. The failure of MBO in France in the seventies provides a good illustration. Considered as an additional control procedure by managers who alternate authoritarianism and seduction (Trepo, 1973), MBO was integrated mostly in a context where centralization of decision making existed together with bureaucratic protection (Horovitz, 1978).

Moreover, the tremendous centralization of business, the marked intervention of the State, ideological splits, the preeminence of the external processes of change (social movements) over internal processes, the importance of law (Sudreau Report and the law on continuous education in France), the representative structure needed for every change, and the distributive model of power constitute many elements likely to jeopardize what is often called the "truth-love-trust" model of OD. Management's lack of inclination toward OD values and their suspicion of the social sciences, their frequently belonging to academic elite castes and the manipulative perspective with which they consider change are not foreign to the disappointment of the most enlightened French practitioners, to their withdrawal from industrial organizations (Rouchy et al, 1980) or to their intention of fighting against their present mode of operation (Tichy, 1974). These reactions, however, are not merely emotional. They rest upon, or result in a reflective and theoretical analysis of organizations, development and change as well as in specific methods of action and intervention.

For instance, Crozier observing a fear of face to face relations within French firms, a certain mythical view of the boss, a tendency to regulate rather than negotiate, has developed a theory of bureaucratic organization (Crozier, 1964) which he later put in proper perspective in his analysis of French society as a "stalled" society (Crozier, 1973). This analysis of the bureaucratic phenomena concur with that made in Brazil (Daland, 1973) and in Italy (Ferraresi, 1980). For Crozier, the organization, whether administrative or industrial, is typically a power structure. In fact, it is formed of a combination of more or less hidden games (Crozier, Friedberg, 1980; Crozier, 1976) which the outside observer as well as the actor can not easily discern. These games are organized around uncertainty areas which individuals would try to control for their own goals. Information being the key to power, giving it would necessarily mean losing power. Therefore, any intervention based on a purely voluntary process of information sharing might be a failure. To act upon the 'real' organization requires first understanding it by gathering data about the actors' experiences, and then mainly to rebuild their rationale, their strategies (conscious or unconscious) which make their behavior a rational one. The outsider here is more a researcher than a consultant, thus sharing no relation with the members of the organization before or after the research. The independence of the researcher and his distrust in obvious data seem to be two basic elements of an understanding of organization prior to action.

Crozier and his co-workers have therefore developed a very detailed analysis of power structures and organizational games mostly within public administration, and have contributed to the analysis of cultural processes within firms (Sainsaulieu, 1977) as well as within the social castes which compose French society (Thoenig, 1973). This theory of organization, called "strategic analysis", consequently views the Human Relations movement as being rather naive and presents some similarity with the systems approach even though it is, no doubt, an original contribution. It

is understandable that such a theory does not make much provision for intervention of the OD style even though it is not opposed to it.

Influencing the attitudes of organization members is certainly a necessity if one hopes for a real development of the organization. In France, the uncertainties and tensions which go with a more open style of management are not readily acceptable. However, intervening in organizational games might appear to be wishful thinking or an insuperable task, (Morin, in Levy-Leboyer, 1980) in any case inseparable from parallel action at the level of social and organizational structures. Finally, by insisting on the "necessary priority to be given to knowledge" Crozier and Friedberg (1980:351-355) situate their work prior to the change action.

The Psychosociological Approach - The movement of psychosociological intervention, which has preceded that of strategic analysis and remains parallel to it, is more radical through its clinical orientation. Its initial phase originally corresponds with OD and relies largely on OD principles, as noted by Dubost & Levy (in Mendel & Beillerot, 1980). Missions of experts to Bethel in the mid-50's had familiarized the French social psychologists with the Lewinian approach, action-research and T-groups. Still under the influence of the cohesive climate produced by the post war period of reconstruction, the French specialists were seduced by the democratic view, Floyd Mann's survey feedback and Rogers' non-directive approach. Breaking away from the traditional role of the expert who holds and distributes knowledge was central then, and social psychological intervention was seen as a way to change authority relationships, decision making and communication styles. Yet an interest in unconscious and collective emotional phenomena was dawning, thanks to a privileged relationship with the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London (Amado & Guittet, 1975; Anzieu, 1975). The aim was nevertheless (as Dubost noted) a "war of cultures" in the attempt to impose a democratic way of being and acting within organizations.

With the 60's, the analogy drawn with the psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic model had already pointed to a contradiction between a process of adaptation and a process of elucidation. Two phenomena then accelerated the rupture with the classical OD approach. Firstly, Carl Roger's visit to France, in 1966, an event which triggered off great disappointment amongst most French social psychologists, shocked by his naiveté, his angelicism, his theoretical weaknesses. Secondly and simultaneously, the impact of the clinical, theoretical and epistemological work of the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan led to the suspension of the desire to cure the individual or the organization, such a desire implying a normativity incompatible with a real analytical process. A counterpart to this psychoanalytic approach could be found at the sociological level with a largely Marxist view colored with anarcho-syndicalism.

In opposition to American functionalism, to its trust in the self-regulating exchanges of a liberal economy and to its humanistic psychology, the gap had been widening and several basic assumptions of OD were exposed and seriously questioned, if not entirely rejected (Dubost & Levy, in Mendel & Beillerot, 1980). For instance:

- Knowledge in the Lewinian approach is considered an unquestionable positive value.

- Reality is considered reachable (attainable) provided that the various different views are added together, referring to a Kantian assumption.

- Data collection is supposed to favor an analytical process whereas, it could be argued that it contributes rather to repression, first in transferring into points of view all the splits and contradictions resulting from the intra-organizational divisions (particularly the division of labor) then in letting us believe in the imaginary merging of these divergent representations, reduced to closed statements, disconnected from conduct and strategy (Dubost, ibid).

- The action research perspective has not led to an epistemological revolution. It is still marked by traditional conceptions of knowledge and action considered as complementary and not contradictory. It is possible on the contrary to argue that action requires some degree of ignorance or blindness.

- The importance of the here and now is illusory if one admits that the participants in a process of organizational development or change are thwarted by their membership in various institutions. Understanding their discourse implies replacing it in its proper sociological context and interpreting it in relation to these determinisms (which explains the failure of ordinary T groups especially within the firm).

It is therefore appropriate to consider the organization as being the proper scene for class struggle and also as a construction of the imaginary, a place where the secret is buried and covered up by rationalizations, in the psychoanalytic sense; historicity is most often put aside, leaving the consultant with a partial and temporal image of organizational processes as underlined by Enriquez (1972b) and Rouchy (1980). Furthermore, the role and involvement of the consultant in the social field largely determine the product of his work and the knowledge he brings into light. The position of the consultant is therefore neither socially nor ideologically (Touraine, 1981; Mendel, 1974) nor unconsciously neutral (Dubost, 1972; Enriquez, 1972a,b.).

Finally, even a theoretician sympathetic to managerial concerns like Crozier insists (Crozier & Friedberg, 1980) on the inevitability of perverse effects, vicious circles inherent in the organization, rejecting thereby the implicit assumption of smoothly linear development found in OD.

Consequently, we may note the interest of the fundamental questions which are raised and of the theoretical contribution to an analysis of organization attempting to relate psychoanalytic approach and social analysis. However, contributions to intervention methods are more limited, less clear, still in gestation. They resemble the sociology of Elliot Jaques, or rely upon techniques closer to OD (meetings, interviews, confrontations) with a psychoanalytic perspective, or rest upon psychotherapeutic sensitization outside the organization (psychodrama, group analysis, Balint groups). The proponents of this psychosociological orientation, academic researchers, consultants and psychotherapists belong for the most part to an association (ARIP) and publish Connexions, the only review of this kind exploring organizational and social change from a clinical vantage point.

The Institutional Analysis Approach - The movement showing most originality and theoretico-practical depth is probably institutional analysis (Lourau, 1970). In opposition with the supposedly normal, rational or natural order in OD concepts (thus aiming at the defense of a certain social order), institutional analysis, backed by the more recent movement of sociopsychoanalysis, gives a real status to disorder. In the end, both refuse the treatment of dysfunctionings in favor of, as Ardoino

says (in Mendel & Beillerot, 1980) a question on the meaning, the unveiling and the uncovering of that till then was left hidden in the institutional phenomena through interests and the resulting "opacity".

Institutional analysis originated in 1940 from the work of a psychiatrist (Tosquelles, 1966) convinced that "it is a question of first taking care of the institution of care" if one wants to have a true psychotherapeutic view, the relationship between institution and psycho-therapeutic behavior within the institution being dialectically linked. He debureaucratizes the psychiatric hospital, stimulates the cooperation of the patients, establishes micro-institutions (clubs, etc...). We can see some relations here with the first experiments led by the Tavistock Institute in hospitals (Bridger, 1946; Gray, 1970).

To some extent, the institution is put "in negation" according to the expression of Basaglia (1967), a psychiatrist who has a similar orientation in Italy, who includes in his work the discoveries of anti-psychiatry and takes into account Marcuse's theories. The institutional approach then invades the universe of pedagogy and is espoused by psycho-sociologists critical of the school of Human Relations.

It is indeed in the course of the experience of a training-group in the early sixties that Lapassade (1967) demonstrated that a hidden instituted and authoritarian order (visible through session schedules, fees, etc.) was overdetermining this non-directive and quasi self-managed experiment, and unfortunately was not considered as a proper object for analysis. On that day, a practice of intervention was born which has gained a particular notoriety among Latin countries and which is characterized by several operations:

- The analysis of "demand" including the official request from the client-staff (in charge of the organization), their hidden implicit demand and the client-group demand (members of the organization). The intervention bears on this "collective".

- The self management of the intervention by the client-collective: It is the one who makes the decision about the process of action and the pedagogical and financial contract which binds it to the consultants.

- The rule of "say everything" meant to feed-back all the institutional unspoken in the sessions.

- The clarification of multiple memberships, of positive and negative references to groups, categories, ideologies which deny the common belonging to the organization and the analysis of the resistances to such an elucidation.

- The analysis of the involvement, of the institutional transference and countertransference of the consultant in the organizational field studied.

- The construction or elucidation of "analyzers". These are the elements which can reveal the hidden determinants of a given situation. So a rumor, an unforeseen incident can be seen as revealing an underlying reality that needs to be further explored as well as important hidden power relations. These are natural analyzers which have never before been thought of and whose strength is all the greater as they have appeared in life itself. The built up analyzers, on the contrary, are elaborate situations, carefully designed to provoke disclosures of meanings.

Therefore, we can see that this prospect is inspired both from psychoanalysis (whilst denouncing the collusion of psychoanalysis with the dominant oppressive power structure) and a radical orientation to unmask the unconscious reality of organization (Lapassade, 1972) and allow its members to regain power on their own social life.

If the school of institutional analysis is relatively clear about its methodological approach and its aims, its main problem, however, is one of having only very limited markets for its fieldwork. They very rarely include companies of the private sector not that naive to allow themselves to be caught up in interventions that might disclose the undesirable and shatter their present structure, without clearly offering any real developmental therapeutic process. In most cases those organizations which call socioanalysts are liberal, marginal-type institutions and are likely to regret it later.

Finally, the internal struggles which invade this school of thought (Guigou et al, 1978) result in an inflation of publications out of proportion with the actual significance of the reported interventions. Two categories of criticism seem worth mentioning here: On the one hand, the modality of intervention which is seen as uncontrolled, provocative, inductive and even narcissistic. On the other hand, institutional analysis is criticized by Touraine (1981) for attempting to substitute for social order "an anti-society completely undetermined, a decomposite form of metaphysical aspiration towards transcendence". In addition, he qualifies the notion of "analyzer" as being a mere play on words since "an event is not an analyzer, it is that which has to be analyzed".

The Sociopsychoanalytic Approach - The goal of sociopsychoanalysis is not far from that of institutional analysis but borrows a somewhat different methodology and theory which may explain its greater success. Sociopsychoanalysis was born in the early seventies in keeping with the anti-authoritarian revolt of May 1968 in France. It begins with the diagnosis that society tends more and more to deprive the citizen of his social power, confiscated in favor of a small elite. This confiscation is to be found in schools as well as in hospitals, administrations or enterprises. Here, sophisticated techniques of management such as M.B.O. are attacked as the tools of an insidious seduction and social control. That seduction which operates through anesthesia (Loue, 1974) rests on unconscious psychic mechanisms that need be disclosed if one wants to help every one to recover lucidity, power over his own action and, in the end, to enter the permanent democratic conflictual negotiation, the only way of making organizations dynamic.

As an intermediate area of the singular and the collective, the institution-organization, is considered as a privileged cross-roads of observation and action. Here, the intervention (Mendel, 1974) is unfolded at the request of an "institutional class", that is of a category of actors bound together by common interests within the organization. During a fortnight of sessions, successive consultants - gathered in a sociopsychoanalytic "collective" - try to understand the nature of psychological mechanisms which prevent the actors from reaching the political dimension, a dimension which represents the upper stage of personality development (the political ego only develops itself through outranging the "psycho-family" ego) (Mendel, 1972). One of the originalities of the method lies in the postulate: - That which concerns a group can only be understood by another group - (as we are reminded by Mendel in Mendel & Beillerot, 1980 and the Desgenettes group in Rouchy et al, 1980). The verbal material recorded during the sessions is then decoded within another sociopsychoanalytical-group in order that the counterprojective positions of the intervention group be analysed. The consultants are paid only after collective negotiations. Involved in other organizations, they essentially intervene during their free time which confers on the teachings of this action-research a greater truth.

Initiated by Mendel, a psychoanalyst, the sociopsychoanalytic method originated many developments in France, but also since 1977 in Belgium, Switzerland, Brazil, Spain, Algéria, Israël, Columbia, Italy, even in Canada and U.S.A. The success of most of those interventions has been recently underlined by Mendel (Sociopsychanalyse, 1980) even if his evaluation methodology is essentially of a clinical nature.

There is no doubt that these practices are different from those of OD. Their aim is rather to increase the power of the individual over himself and over society rather than to facilitate the development of the organization conceived as necessarily alienating. In many ways the work of Max Pagès and his co-workers (1979, 1980 in Johnstadt) comes close to sociopsychoanalysis: According to these authors, we are at a time when "hypermodern" firms develop tools of a soft violence through sophisticated methods of personnel management. Starting from the study of a multina-tional company, the authors have attempted to understand the relationships among economic, political, ideological and psychological variables. Observing that there are correspondencies between social organization and unconscious structures forming a "socio-mental" system, they conclude that it is impossible to change the organization unless the nature of unconscious ties, through which the individual is attached to it, is understood as well as the policies which reinforce them.

In this perspective Pagès develops a method of "dialectical analysis" (Rouchy et al 1980) using elements of psychoanalysis and social analysis, as well as body expression work, and aims at providing those working within organizations with the means for creating their own area of freedom.

It is important to observe, however, that through their contestation of power, and their marginality, the most radical approaches find very few opportunities for intervention among firms and few such interventions have thus far been reported in detail (Lourau, 1974; C.E.R.F.I., 1971; Pages et al, 1979). These specialists are less and less keen to intervene in large firms and prefer intervention sites where real change is more likely to be produced: cooperatives, schools, hospitals, unions, minority groups, couples and individuals.

Psychoanalysis & Organization – As we can see, psychoanalysis has considerably influenced research about organizations within Latin countries, France and Italy above all. This is a different case from what has happened in the US where OD rests essentially on psychological and "humanistic" approaches. This does not mean that the OD philosophy has not reached some firms in Latin countries. On the contrary, managers and trainers often collude in diffusing what the academic researchers consider as products of US culture. The fear of manipulation expressed by trade unions is then reinforced by what they consider as a managerial ideology. However, even in the U.S., there exists a psychoanalytic approach to organization which is even taught in some business schools. Actually, this approach remains relatively marginal in view of the quantity of publications on organization that ignore it. However, the work of Zaleznik (1966) on leadership, of Levinson (1970) on stress, of Maccoby (1976) on the managers' profiles, of Zaleznik and Kets de Vries (1975) on power have offered a more sophisticated framework of interpretation for organizational realities establishing thereby the clinical approach to management (Kets de Vries, 1980) as a legitimate one. Amado (1980) has nonetheless shown that psychoanalytic research applied to organizations carried implicit assumptions largely determined by the cultural context

where they originated. In comparing three countries having yielded the most original contributions in this field, France, Great Britain and the US, a number of essential differences must be noted.

In the US, the psychoanalytic approach is predominantly normative: Hartman's egopsychology looks at personality development as a progressive adaptation to an external reality considered as given. Impregnated with the values of liberal economy, they focus mostly on the ways managers exert power and on the potentially dangerous consequences for their careers. In this perspective, they draw upon the contributions of psychiatry and theories of organization.

On the other hand, in England, the influence of psychoanalysts free from psychiatric nosography, has helped researchers of the Tavistock Institute to look at the organization differently. Instead of considering it merely as a setting for self-actualization, they deal with it as a defense structure against archaic anxieties. They do stress the importance of task and technology and they pay due attention to administrative structures (such as personel management policies) and to the environmental context of the organization. The emphasis, there, is put on the client system rather than on the change agent as in the US, explicitly giving an equal weight to the different actors in the organization in a way that is consistent with their own approach to the psychotherapeutic process (Bridger, 1977, 1978a,b, 1980).

As we have already seen, the basic assumptions are more explicitly formulated among the Latin and the French in particular who devote to them an attention at least as important as to the practice itself. The influence of more or less radical social philosophies (marxism, anarchism, self-management) has led researchers to question the use of psychoanalysis which is not weaved with concepts taking into account the socioeconomic environment. More or less explicitly, they consider organization as the "bad object" using such Kleinian concepts to give credit to the widely shared notion that organization is an inescapable source of alienation for its members, unless they gain awareness of several sets of determinisms. A dialectical approach stands in opposition to the North American positivism and leads the researcher consultant to keep a greater independence vis à vis the object of study (the organization) which he goes sometimes as far as to consider as a construction of fantasy.

Organizational Change, Drop-by-drop - In Latin cultures, the organization is not the primary place for social change, as it is for instance in the US, and also to some extent in Northern Europe. The polarization which is found not only in the social field, but also in the organization may help us to understand why the request for interventions of change agents is rather low. Latin social scientists favor the institutional dimension because it is there that society pervades organizations. Consequently, change is more likely to be looked for at the societal level. For instance, Touraine and his co-workers have developed a method of sociological intervention (Touraine, 1980, 1981). They attempt to identify among various movements - students, anti-nuclear, regional, women, union - those which have the potential of becoming the one real social movement likely to produce a real social change. To that extent they are willing to help this social movement develop the analytic reflection needed for social action.

This is parallel to the aim of most social scientists who see the main legitimate role of interventions in organizations as helping individuals to mature into responsible citizens.

On the other hand, there is a growing market in continuous education for trainers who often collude with management in avoiding the questioning of organizational structures. Training packages using Human Potential Movement techniques are thus more appealing than methodologies trying to integrate the educational process within actual work situations and within firms structures (Meignant, 1972; Meignant in Rouchy, et al 1980).

In addition, some economists (Savall, 1979), managers, and engineers helped by social psychologists, have gathered in order to devote themselves to the improvement of working conditions, stimulated by the creation of a government agency (instead of the QWL centers led jointly by management and unions as they exist in North America). The peculiarity of the French approach seems to be the close link maintained at this level between a psychosociological approach and ergonomic studies: The improvement of the quality of working life taking into consideration not only the actors' discourses but also the systematic studies of various physiological (posture, mental load...), psychological and environmental noxiants. Some sophisticated analytical tools have thus been developed (Guelaud et al, 1975) for the study of jobs, tools which gradually allow in depth actions supported or tolerated by the various actors within the firm. However, there is no research program similar to the Michigan one, monitoring major change experiments. Case studies which have been published until now provide definite results in France (Trepo, 1980; European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 1980), as in Italy (Novara & Ratti, 1980; Musati et al 1980). In spite of a technicist singularity, the improvement of working conditions does disturb the traditional power games between known players with codified relationships (Gautrat, 1980), to the extent that it requires certain tasks to be collectively managed. Thus, a practice of "drop-by-drop self-management" (Mothé, 1980) is beginning to appear and perhaps modify working relations more deeply than had actually been anticipated.

CONCLUSIONS

In contrast with the parcimonious and reluctant change of Latin countries, Japan stands as the non-Western industrialized nation able to compete successfully in the liberal economy game - a western invention - from completely different cultural premises.

The innovativeness of Japanese organizations has to be understood at least as much in the context of Japanese society as in the context of industrial technology. As an example, recently the high level of quality control in some Japanese industries has put some pressure on Western industries. This has led some American firms to pay more attention to quality control and to the "Quality Circles" (QC) which were responsible in Japan for this performance (Yager, 1979). Very rapidly the most progressive industries (very often the same that pioneered QWL projects) were able to follow suit. It is interesting to note then, that QC have been presented in the West very often as a re-importation toward the US of "technological transfers" made in the early 60's from US to Japan. Such an interpretation is puzzling. There is no doubt that American experts have adequately transmitted statistical techniques of quality control to Japan, as well as to many other countries, but of course they cannot be credited with the creative use of those inputs into the design of an innovative work structure, more consistent with Japanese culture than with usual Western work organizations. It would also have to be explained why others who had benefited from the same inputs were not able to make a comparable innovation. Nonetheless, what is mostly perceived among Western industries, is the technological instrumental aspect, not the social dimension. Actually this short-sightedness of some Western industries trying to imitate the Japanese has led them to the bitter discovery of the hidden part of the cultural icebergs.

The case of QC in Japan, only touched upon here, provides however a particularly useful reminder of the fact that strategies for organizational change cannot be analyzed without proper consideration of their socio-cultural and socio-economic context.

It is therefore essential at this point to recollect that OD has emerged within a booming post-war economy where rapid growth required to be eased with the development of more participative attitudes among the middle management of organizations. Concerned primarily with process, OD consultants happily left to scientific management specialists all problems of structure and task. This non belligerent state of mutual ignorance across mutually agreed dividing lines between OD men and scientific management could not be maintained very long given the mounting necessity to redesign working conditions in many industries.

The field of planned change, which has been commensurate with OD in the US for nearly twenty years, is now undergoing a very significant transformation. It may not be exaggerated to see in the socio-technical system approach a new paradigm, and in QWL a significant social movement.

The crucial paradigmatic change lies in the central importance of the notion of boundary. It can be said that OD conceptions are the reflection of a split universe: Split between the technical and the human, split between Scientific Management and Human Relations, split between atomistic parts whose organic ties are not seen, split between managers and managed, split between the organizations and their environment.

On the contrary, the gist of the socio-technical approach is to insist always that both sides of the picture be looked at and dealt with jointly if one is to gain mastery of our social reality. It refuses the

above schizophrenia and seeks negotiation and trade-offs between conflict-
ing demands. Whenever a piece of reality is singled out, the context from
which it is carved is never lost from view.

More research of a new kind (for instance an action research closer
to field experiments) is needed before a more substantial knowledge about
social change becomes available. Nonetheless, the collaborative and open
nature of these new efforts is crucial in order to face the problems
confronting all nations today. Beyond the necessary mastery of
organizational life, it is urgent to cope with the interorganizational
domains (Trist, 1979) and with the intercultural dimension of
collaboration between nations (Emery & Emery, 1976; Trist in Clark, 1976).

An aggiornamento of development conceptions and models is not only
needed for organizations. Economic development, community development even
urban development are also fields questionning now their assumptions of
the early 60's.

Social debate about the ways of redesigning our social order,
wherever it can take place, is what counts most. It is fortunate that
Western countries, in their own ways, begin to question and reflect upon
the tacit assumptions made in the early sixties, during the "first decade
of development". For those who might find the conclusions of the present
review pessimistic, we advise to assess them in the context of the almost
universal admission of failure of the present development strategies. At a
time when a collaborative spirit is needed (if impending economic and
social disasters are to be minimized) not only at the shop floor, but also
internationally, the QWL movement and its underlying philosophy provide
some ground for optimism.

The recent realization, within the third world, that socioeconomic
development has to be self-managed is to be related with the recent
interest in self-designing organizations (Hedberg et al, 1976; Weick,
1977) and self-help groups (Katz & Bender, 1976; Liberman & Borman, 1980).
However it might be important to realize that when structural changes of
such magnitude are considered, a critical boundary condition lies in the
maturity of the individual actors. Then the approach of Argyris (Argyris &
Schon, 1978) takes a particular significance because of his focus on
increasing the reflective and learning capacities of critical actors. This
approach is commensurate with the need to learn about our own culture as a
critical path toward learning about and from other cultures (Shah, 1979).
Both intervention approaches - structural and personal - must be seen as
complementary and should operate collaboratively, if one is to deal
adequately with social change. The crucial importance of individuals and
minorities as cultural innovators and sources of change must also be
realized (Moscovici, 1976).

As the limits to growth have been stressed by many, it is about time
that the limits to "first-order", "single-loop" type organizational change
and development be more fully recognized as well. In most instances organ-
izational change takes place as a result of changes in the context that
organizations create for themselves through their interaction. P l a n n e d
organizational change can only be a gimmick when it does not fully
integrate the contextual dimension that provides life, meaning and raison
d'être to organizations.

In order to take into account the increased internationalization of
today's organizational environment, this review has stressed the
consideration of the cultural and cross-cultural context of organizational
change as a challenge to be met by both theoreticians and practitioners.

The field of organizational development needs some significant
change. The field of organizational change can only develop if it ventures
more into its context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderfer C.P. 1977a. Organizational Development. Ann. Rev. Psych. 28:197-223.

Amado, G. 1980. Psychoanalysis and Organization. Sigmund Freud House Bulletin. 4(2):17-20. Vienna.

Amado, G., Guittet, A. 1975. La dynamique des communications dans les groupes. Armand Colin, coll. "U", Paris.

Anzieu, D. 1975. Le groupe et l'inconscient. Dunod.

Argyris, C., Schon, D.A. 1978a. Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective. Reading Mass. Addison Wesley.

Basaglia, F. 1967. L'instituzione negata. Einaudi, Milano.

Beer, M. 1980. Organization Change and Development: A System View. Goodyear.

Boetger, R. 1978. Desenvolvimento organizacional : alguns aspectos voltados a realidade brasileira, Revista de Administraçao Publica. Jan/Mars 1978, vol 12, ediçao especial, pp. 75-91.

Borum, F. 1980. A Power-Strategy Alternative to Organizational Development. Org. St. 1(2):123-146.

Bowers, D.G. 1976a. Systems of Organization: Management of the Human Resource. Un. Michigan Press.

Bridger, H. 1946. The Northfield Experiment. Bull. Meninger Clinic. 10.

Bridger, H. 1977. Reducing Occupational Stress. Conference May 10-12. NY Hospital-Cornell Medical Center. Alan McLean (editor).

Bridger, H. 1978a. The relevant Training and Development of People for Organizational Development of People for Organizational Development roles in Open Systems. Proceedings First European Forum on Organization Development. Aachen, Germany. 30 Oct.-1 Nov.

Bridger, H. 1978b. The Increasing Relevance of Group Processes and Changing Values for Understanding and Coping with Stress at Work. In Cooper, C.L., Payne, R. (eds). Stress at Work. Wiley.

Bridger, H. 1980. The Implications of Ecological Change on Groups, Institutions and Communities. Reviewing a Therapeutic Community Experience with Open-System Thinking. Paper presented at the Intern. Congress of Group Psycho-Therapy. Copenhagen. 2-8 May.

Bryant, D.T., Niemans, R.J. (eds) 1978. Manpower Planning and Organization Design. N.Y. - Plenum Publ. Corp.

Burke, W.W. 1976. Organization Development in Transition. JABS 12(1):22-43.

Burke, W.W. (ed.) 1977. Current Issues and Strategies in Organization Development. NY:Human Sciences, 448p.

Burke, W.W. (ed.) 1978. Cutting edge: Current theory and Practice in Organization Development. La Jolla, Calif. University Associates.

Burke, W.W. 1980a. Organization Development and Bureaucracy in the 1980's. JABS 16(3):423-438.

Burke, W.W. 1980b. Interview by John Jones. Gr. & Org. St. 5(3):272-294.

Carlson, H.C. 1978. GM's Quality of Working Life Efforts... An Interview by E.C. Miller. Personnel. 54(4):11-23.

Carvalho da Cunha, E. 1979. Desenvolvimento organizacional no contexto brasileiro, Revista de Administraçao Publica. Fundaçao Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, Abr/Jun. de 1979 13(2):85-99.

Cavalcanti, B.S. 1979. D O : consideraçoes sobre seus objectivos, valores e processos, Revista de Administraçao Publica. Fundaçao Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, 13(2):49-84.

C.E.R.F.I., 1971. Analyse institutionnelle à la FNAC, in Education Permanente. no.9.

Chesler, M.A., et al 1979. Power Training: An Alternative to Conflict Management. Calif. Mngt. Rev. XXI(2):84-90.

Clark, A.W. (ed) 1976. Experimenting With Organizational Life: The Action Research Approach. NY-Plemun Press.

Cooper, C., Mumford, E. (eds) 1979. Quality of Working Life in Western and Eastern Europe. Westport-GT. Greenwood Press.

Crozier, M. 1964. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. University of Chicago Press.

Crozier, M. 1973. The Stalled Society. Viking Press.

Crozier, M., Friedberg, E. 1980. Actors and Systems. University of Chicago Press.

Cummings, T.G., et al. 1977. A Methodological Critique of 58 Selected Work Experiments. Hum. Rel. 30(8):675-708.

Da Costa Moura, P.C. 1978. DO nas organizaç oes brasileiras : aceitaçao real ou ficticia ? Revista de Administraçao Publica. Fundaçao Getulio Vargas. Jan/Mars 1978. vol 12, ediçao especial pp. 9-23.

Daland, R. 1973. Bureaucracy in Brazil : Attitude of Civilian Top Executives Toward Change. Revista de Administraçao Publica. Fundaçao Getulio Vargas. 7(4):5-34. Out/Dez.

Davis, L.E., Cherns, A.B. (eds.) 1975a. The Quality of Working Life, I: Problems, Prospects and State of the Art. Free Press.

Davis, L.E., Cherns, A.B. (eds.) 1975b. The Quality of Working Life, II: Cases and Commentary. Free Press NY-MacMillan.

Davis, L.E. 1977a. Evolving Alternative Organization Designs: Their Socio-Technical Bases. Hum. Rel. 30(3):261-273.

Davis, L.E. 1977b. Job Design: Overview and Future Directions. J. Contemp. Bus. Spring:85-102.

Davis, L.E. 1977c. Evolving Alternative Organization Designs: Their Socio-Technical Basis. Hum. Rel. 30(3):261-273.

Davis, L.E. 1978. Socio-Technical Systems: The Design of Work and Quality of Working Life in Pasmore and Sherwood (eds.).

Davis, L.E. 1979a. Optimizing Organization-Plant Design: A Complementary Structure for Technical and Social Systems. Org. Dyn. Autumn:3-15.

Davis, L.E. 1979b. Design of Jobs. US-Goodyear.

Davis, L.E. 1979c. A Labor Management Contract and QWL. J. Occup. Beh. 1(1).

Davis, L.E. 1980. Individuals and the Organization. Calif. Mngt. Rev. XX11(2):5-14.

Drexler, J.A., Lawler, E.E. 1977. A Union-Management Cooperative Project to Improve Quality of Working Life. JABS 13:373-387.

Dubin, R. (ed.) 1976. Handbook of Work, Organization and Society. Chicago-Rand McNally.

Dubost, J. 1972. Introduction sur la méthode socioanalytique d'E.Jaques in Jaques, E. Intervention et changement dans l'entreprise. Dunod, pp.IX-XL.

Duckles, M.M., Duckles, R. et al 1977. The Process of Change at Bolivar. JABS. 13:387-399.

Dunn, W.N., Swierczek, F.W. 1977. Planned Organizational Change: Toward Grounded Theory. JABS 13(2):135-157.

Dunnette, M.D. (ed.) 1976. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago-Rand McNally.

Emery, F., Emery M. 1976. A Choice of Futures. International Series on the QWL Nº4. Martinus Nijhoff-Leiden.

Emery, F., Thorsrud, E. 1976. Democracy at Work. International Series on QWL Vol 2. Martinus Nyhoff-Leiden.

Enriquez, E. 1972a. Problématique du changement. Connexions nº4, pp.5-45.

Enriquez, E. 1972b. Imaginaire social, refoulement et répression dans les organisations, in Connexions nº3 pp.65-93.

22.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. 1980. The Analysis of Change in Work Organizations. Dublin.

Faucheux, C., Rojot, J. 1979. Social Psychology and Industrial Relations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective in Stephenson and Brotherton (eds.). Industrial Relations: A Social Psychological Approach. NY-Wiley.

Ferraresi, F. 1980. Burocrazia e politica in Italia. Bologna, Il Mulino.

French, W.L. et al (eds.) 1978. Organization Development: Theory, Practice and Research. Dallas Texas: Business Publications.

Friedlander, F., Brown D.L. 1974. Organization Development. Ann. Rev. Psych. 25:313-341.

Garson, D.G. 1977. Worker Self-Management in Industry: West European Experience. Holt-Saunders (Praeger).

Gautrat, J; 1980. L'effet perturbateur de la participation dans l'amélioration des conditions de travail. CNRS.

Golembiewski, R.T. 1979a. Approaches to Planned Change. NY-Marcel Dekker.

Goodman, P. 1979. Assessing Organizational Change: The Rushton Quality of Work Experiment. NY-Wiley.

Gray, S.G. 1970. The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in Dicks H.V. (ed.) 50 Years of Tavistock Clinic London-Rontledge & Kegan.

Guelaud, F. et al 1975. Pour une analyse des conditions de travail ouvrier dans l'entreprise. Armand Colin.

Guest, R.H. 1979. Quality of Work Life-Learning from Tarry-Town. Harv. Bus. Rev. July/Aug:76-87.

Guigou, J. et al 1978. L'analyse institutionnelle en crise? in revue Pour. n°62-63.

Hedberg, B. et al 1976. Camping on Seesaws: Prescription for a Self-Designing Organization. ASQ 21:41-65.

Herbst, P.G. 1974. Socio-Technical Design. London Tavistock.

Herbst, P.G. 1976. Alternatives to Hierarchies. International Series on the QWL no.1 Martinus Nyhoff.

Hofstede, G. 1980. Motivation, Leadership & Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad? Org. Dyn. Summer:42-63.

Hofstede and Kassem (eds.) 1976. European Contributions to Organizational Theory. Van Gorcum.

Horovitz, J.H. 1978. Management Control in France. Columbia J. World Bus. Summer:16-32. GB & Germany.

Huse, E. 1980. Organizational Development and Change. St. Paul Minn. West Publ. Co.

I.C.Q.W.L. 1979. Working on the QWL. M. Nyhoff-The Hague.

Inzerilli, G., Laurent, A. 1979. The Conception of Organizational Structure: A Comparative View. Presented at the 4th EGOS Colloquium, Noordwijk.

Jain, H.C. 1980. Worker Participation: Success and Problems. Holt-Saunders (Praeger) Summer.

Johnstadt, T. (ed) 1980. Group Dynamics & Society. Oegelschlager Cambridge (Mass.)

Jones, J.E. Pfeiffer, J.W. 1977. On the Obsolescence of the terms Organizational Development. Gr. & Org. St. 2(3):263-264.

Kahn, R.L. 1974. Organizational Development: Some Problems and Proposals. JABS 10(4):485-502.

Katz, D., Kahn, R.L. 1978. The Social Psychology of Organizations. John Wiley and Sons.

Kets de Vries, M. 1980. Organizational Paradoxes. Clinical Approaches to Management. Tavistock Publication.

Kuhne, R.J. 1980. Co-Determination in Business: Workers Representative in the Board Room. Holt-Saunders (Praeger).

Lapassade, G. 1967. Groupes, Organizations et Institutions. Gauthiers Villars.

Lapassade, G. 1972. L'analyse institutionnelle et l'intervention. Connexions. nº4, pp.65-106.

Laurent, A. 1979. Cultural Dimensions of Managerial Ideologies: National Versus Multinational Cultures. Presented at the 5th Annual Meeting of the European Business Association, London.

Lawler, E.E., et al 1980. Organizational Assessment: Perspectives on the Measurement of Organizational Behavior and the Quality of Working Life. NY-Wiley.

Levinson, H. 1970. Executive Stress. New York, Harper & Row.

Levy, A., 1973. Le changement comme travail. Connexions. nº7. pp.97-114.

Levy-Leboyer, C. (eds) 1980. Le psychologue et l'entreprise, Masson.

Lieberman, M., Borman, L.D. 1980. Self Help Groups for Coping with Crisis. Jossey-Bass (Sage).

Loue, L. 1974. L'anesthésie sociale dans l'entreprise. Payot.

Lourau, R. 1970. L'analyse institutionnelle. Ed. de Minuit.

Lourau, R. 1974. L'analyseur Lip. U.G.E., coll. 10/18.

Lund, R. 1980. Indirect Participation, Influence and Power: Some Danish Experiences. Org. St. 1(2):147-160.

Maccoby, M. 1976. The Gamesman. New York, Simon & Schuster.

Maurice, M., Sellier, F. 1979. Societal Analysis of Industrial Relations: A Comparison Between France and West Germany. Brit. J. Ind. Rel. XVII(3):322-336.

Maurice, M. et al 1980. Societal Differences in Organizing Manufacturing Units: A Comparison of France, West Germany and Great Britain. Org. St. 1(1):59-86.

Meignant, A. 1972. L'intervention sociopédagogique dans les organisations industrielles. Mouton, La Haye.

Mendel, G. 1972. De la régression du politique au psychique. In Sociopsych-analyse 1. pp.11-63.

Mendel, G. 1974. Qui est l'intervenant? in Sociopsychananlyse 4. pp.11-66.

Mendel, G., Beillerot, J. (eds.) 1980. L'Intervention Institutionnelle. Pajot. Paris.

Miles, R.H. 1980. Macro-Organizational Behaviour. Goodyear.

Mills, T. 1975. Human Resources - Why the New Concern? Harv. Bus. Rev. March/April:120-134.

Mills, T. 1978. Europe's Industrial Democracy: An American Response. Harv. Bus. Rev. Nov/Dec:143-152.

Moscovici, S. 1976. Social Influence and Social Change. London-Academic Press.

Mothe, D. 1980. L'autogestion goutte à goutte. (ed) Le Centurion.

Mulder, M. 1977. The Daily Power Game. International Series on the QWL No.6. Martinus Nyhoff-Leyden.

Musatti, C. et al 1980. Psicologi in Fabrica. Einaudi, Turino.

Nadler, D.A. 1978a. Consulting with Labor and Management: Some Learnings from the Quality of Worklife Projects in W. Burke (ed.) 1978b. pp. 262-277.

Nadler, D.A. 1978b. Hospital, Organized Labor and Quality of Work: An Intervention Case Study. JABS 13(3):366-381.

Nadler, D.A. et al 1980. Developing a Feedback System for Work Units: A Field Experiment in Structural Change. JABS 16(1):41-62.

Novara, F., Ratti, F. 1980. L'utile e l'umano: l'industria italiana e la qualita del lavoro. Cedis, Roma.

Pages, M. et al 1979. L'emprise de l'organisation. P.U.F.

24.

Pasmore, W.A., Sherwood, J.J. (eds.) 1978. Socio-Technical Systems: A Source Book. La Jolla: Universtiy Ass. XIV+365.

Pate, L.E., et al 1977. Advances in Research on Organizational Development: Toward a Beginning: Gr. & Org. St. 2(4):449-460.

Pettigrew, A.W. 1979. On Studying Organizational Cultures. ASQ. 24:571-581.

Pinto, R.F. 1979. Desenvolvimento organizacional intercultural : aplicaçao na América Latina, Revista de Administraçao Publica. Fundaçao Getulio Vargas, 3, Jul/Set. 13:47-68.

Porras, J.I., Berg, P.O. 1978a. Evaluation Methodology in Organization Development: An Analysis and Critique. JABS. 14(1)(2):151-173.

Porras, J.I., Berg, P.O. 1978b. The Impact of Organizational Development. Acad. Mngt. Rev. April:249-266.

Porras, J.I., Patterson, K. 1979. Assessing Planned Change. Gr. & Org. St. 4(1):39-58.

Porras, J.I., Wilkins, A. 1980. Organization Development in Large Systems: An Empirical Assessment. JABS. 16(4):506-534.

Porras, J.I., Roberts, N. 1980. Toward a Typology of Organization Development Research. J. Occup. Beh. 1(3):163-180.

Rouchy, J.C. et al 1980. Psychosociologies. Connexions. n°29.

Sainsaulieu, R. 1977. L'identité au travail. Presses de la Fondation National des Sciences Politiques.

Salvemini, S. 1980. Cambiamento e sviluppo organizzativo. Suppl. al bimestrale Sviluppo e Organizzazione. n°58. Milano, E.S.T.E.

Savall, H. 1979. Reconstruire l'entreprise. Une analyse socioeconomique des conditions de travail. Dunod, Paris.

Schein, V.E., Greiner, L.E. 1977. Can Organizational Development be Functioned to Bureaucracies. Org. Dyn. Winter:48-61.

Seashore, S.E. 1981. The Michigan Quality of Work Program: Issues in Measurement, Assessment and Outcome Evaluation in A van de Ven (ed.) Wiley.

Seashore, S.E. et al (eds.) 1981. Observing and Measuring Organizational Change. NY-Wiley.

Shah, I. 1978. Learning How to Learn. Octagon Press - London.

Sociopsychanalyse 1980. Pratiques d'un pouvoir plus collectif aujourd'hui. Payot.

Stein, B.A., Kanter, R.M. 1980. Building the Parallel Organization: Creating Mechanisms for Permanent Quality of Working Life. JABS. 16(3):321-388.

Taylor, J.C. 1977. Experiments in Work System Design: Economic and Human Results. Personel Rev. 6(3):21-34 - Part I (4):21-42 - Part II.

Taylor, J.C. 1978. An Empirical Examination of the Dimensions of QWL. OMEGA. 6(2):153-160.

Thoenig, J.C. 1973. L'ère des technocrates. Ed. d'organisation.

Tichy, N. 1974. An interview with Max Pages. J. Appl. Behav. Sci. 10(1):8-26.

Tichy, N.M. 1978. Demise, Absorption or Renewal for the Future of Organizational Development in Burke. pp.70-87.

Tosquelles, F. 1966. Pédagogie et psychothérapie institutionnelle. In Revue de Psychothérapie institutionnelle.

Touraine, A. 1980. The Voice and the Eye: On the Relationship Between Actors and Analysts. Polit. Psych. 2(1):3-14.

Touraine, A. 1981. The Voice and the Eye. Cambridge University Press.

Trepo, G. 1973. Management Style à la française. European Business. Autumn.

Trepo, G. 1980. Conditions de travail et expression du personnel. Dalloz.

Trist, E. 1976. Toward a Post Industrial Culture in Dubin (ed.) pp. 1011-1034.

Trist, E. 1979. Referent Organizations and the Development of Inter-Organizational Domains. Distinguished Lecture to Acad. of Mngt. 39th Annual Con.

Trist, E. et al 1977. An Experiment in Autonomous Working in an American
    Underground Coal Mine. Hum. Rel. 30:201-236.
van Dongen, H.J. 1978. The Contributions of Organizational Development at the
    Level of Subsystems in the Organization. Paper presented at AACHEN.
Wall, T.D., Lischeron, J.A. 1977. Worker Participation: A Critique of the
    Literature and Some Fresh Evidence. Maidenhead-Berkshire, England.
    McGraw-Hill, UK.
Walton, R.E. 1977. Work Innovation at Topeka: After 6 Years. JABS.
    13(3):422-433.
Walton, R.E. 1979. Work Innovation in the United States. Harv. Bus. Rev.
    July/Aug:88-98.
Weick, K.E. 1977. Organization Design: Organizations as Self-Designing
    Systems. Org. Dyn. 6(2):30-46.
Weick, K.E. 1979. The Social Psychology of Organizing. 2nd ed. Reading Man.
    Addison Wesley.
Weinberg, A.S. 1974. Work Experiments and Improving the QWL in the U.S. Eur.
    Ind. Rel. Rev. (10):2-5.
Wilpert, B. et al 1978a. Workers' Participation in an Internationalized
    Economy. Kent State Un. Press.
Wilpert, B., Dachler, M.P. 1978b. Conceptual Dimensions and Boundaries of
    Participation in Organizations: A Critical Evaluation. ASQ. 23(1):1-39.
Yager, E. 1979. Examining the Quality Control Circle. Pers. Journal.
    Oct:682-684,708.
Zaleznik, A. 1966. Human Dilemmas of Leadership. New York, Harper & Row.
Zaleznik, A., Kets de Vries, M. 1975. Power and the Corporate Mind. Boston,
    Houghton Mifflin.

80/01 "Identifying cognitive style determinants of retail patronage, by Christian PINSON, Arun K. JAIN and Naresh K. MALHOTRA, January 1980.

80/02 "Dimensions culturelles des conceptions de management - une analyse comparative internationale", par André LAURENT Février 1980.

80/03 "Cognitive style and effective communication", by Arun K. JAIN, Naresh K. MALHOTRA and Christian PINSON, Dec. 1979.

80/04 "Accomodative cognitive style differences in consumer reduction of alternatives", by Naresh K. MALHOTRA, Christian PINSON and Arun K. JAIN, October 1979.

80/05 "Stability and reliability of Part-Worth utility in conjoint analysis : a longitudinal investigation", by Arun K. JAIN, Naresh K. MALHOTRA and Christian PINSON, September 1979.

80/06 "The expected future spot exchange rate, the forward rate, and the trade balance", by Charles A. WYPLOSZ, March 1980.

80/07 "Decline and adjustment: Public intervention strategies in the European clothing industries", by José de la TORRE, July 1980.

80/08 "The uncommon market: European policies towards a crisis industry - clothing in the 1970's", by José de la TORRE and Michel BACCHETTA, May 1980.

80/09 "Stratport: a decision support system for strategic planning", by Jean-Claude LARRECHE and V. SRINIVASAN, April 1980, Revised October 1980.

80/10 "A new approach to market segmentation strategy: a banking application", by Arun K. JAIN, Christian PINSON and Naresh K. MALHOTRA, March 1980.

80/11 "The exchange and interest rate term structure under risk aversion and rational expectations", by Charles A. WYPLOSZ, Revised Version, September 1980.

80/12 "Individual cognitive differences in MDS analysis of perceptions", by Arun K. JAIN, Naresh K. MALHOTRA and Christian PINSON, July 6-12, 1980.

80/13 "STRATPORT: A Model for the evaluation and formulation of Business Portfolio Strategies", by Jean-Claude LARRECHE and V. SRINIVASAN, April 1980, Revised November 1980.

80/14 "Les styles cognitifs : une nouvelle approche de la segmentation des marchés, by Christian PINSON, Naresh K. MALHOTRA and Arun K. JAIN, Septembre 1980.

80/15 "Cognitive styles: A new approach to market segmentation", by Christian PINSON, Naresh K. MALHOTRA and Arun K. JAIN, March 1980.

81/01 "Eurobanking, open market operations and the monetary base" by Herwig LANGOHR, August 1980.

81/02 "Alternative approaches to the theory of the banking firm: a note" by Herwig LANGOHR, September 1980.

81/03 "Why does beta shift when the length of securities returns varies?" by Gabriel HAWAWINI, December 1980.

81/04 "Forward market and the cooperative firm" by Gabriel HAWAWINI, January 1981.

81/05 "On some propositions regarding the behavior of the labor-managed firm under uncertainty" by Gabriel HAWAWINI, Jan. 1981

81/06 "Impact of the investment horizon on the association between securities' risk and return: theory and tests" by Gabriel HAWAWINI and Ashok VORA, February 1981.

81/07 "New evidence on beta stationarity and forecast for Belgian common stocks" by Gabriel A. HAWAWINI and Pierre A. MICHEL, February 1981.

81/08   "Industrial policy in the European economic community :
             Crisis and change", by Kenneth S. COURTIS, June 1980.

81/09   "Dogmatism as a moderator of banking behavior and
             attitudes", by Arun K. JAIN, Christian PINSON and
             Naresh K. MALHOTRA, March 1981.

81/10   "Investment horizon, diversification, and the efficiency
             of alternative beta forecasts", by Gabriel A. HAWAWINI
             and Ashok VORA, March 1981.