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Abstract

The only constant in this world is change. Therefore, the study of the basis of organization development (OD) is the study of how organizations change. Today, the very foundation of this field, Kurt Lewin’s three-step change model—unfreeze, change, refreeze (Cummings & Worley, 2009), is under scrutiny by theories like Bill Pasmore’s complex continuous change model (Pasmore, 2015). As the relatively young field of OD closes in on its “diamond anniversary,” one must ask the question: Are those foundational principles really relevant today?

The purpose of this study was to evaluate that very premise by examining the life and work of one of the original pioneers of the field of OD. The study sought to determine the continued importance, impact, and influence the original work presents in a field that has continued to evolve due to information technology, globalization, and maturity. This research addresses that very inquiry through the investigative interpretation of the life of one of the field’s most prolific and accomplished co-creators: Richard (Dick) Beckhard.

The compelling findings of the study were as follows:

1. The founders’ relevance did not dissipate; it evolved
2. This evolution may be interpreted around key events
3. The evolution has identifiable, logical methods of perpetuation

In establishing these three findings, the author recognized the under-developed practice of utilizing historical analysis to systematic means of interpreting
the present and future. Therefore, Evert Gummesson’s (2000) concept of a “hermeneutic bridge” was adopted as a terminal learning objective of this study.

This “hermeneutic bridge” provided the requisite lens to view the interpretations of the life of Beckhard in a light that not only demonstrates the continued influence of all the field’s early pioneers, but also addresses a glaring gap in the body of knowledge for the field of OD: recognizing a creator of the field.
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Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Passing on something of value has long been a concern of mine. Fifteen years ago, as part of a learning workshop, I was asked to respond to the question: If you could have achieved totally what you want to be and do professionally, what would you have done? I found, somewhat to my surprise, that I had no difficulty answering the question. I want to influence organizations to function in a more humane as well as high-performance mode. I want to have been significant in empowering the next generation of people with the same goal. (Beckhard, 1997, p. xi)

Overview

To know where the field of organization development (OD) is and where it is going, one must first understand where it came from. Thanks to technology and globalization, the world is changing so rapidly that not only is a computer obsolete by the time it hits the market, but the skillsets of anyone may become null and void overnight. In a world where the only thing that is certain is change, one must wonder: Are the accomplishments of the founding fathers of OD in the 1940s and 50s still relevant today? For example, organization leaders of today may ask the questions:

1. Does the significance of Lewin’s three-step change model provide any value in an organization under continuous change?

2. Does the efficiency of the Likert scale still have value in an information age of big data?

3. Is the relevance of McGregor’s famed Theory X and Theory Y concepts diminished in a society of self-managed teams?

This body of work addresses such questions through a historical analysis of the contributions of an early pioneer of the field. It also provides an interpretation of
the process of linking these personal contributions of the past to the advancement of the field of OD (as well as those of multiple complementary fields) today. Additionally, it will provide an indication of how these contributions will impact future developments.

Statement of the Problem and Significance

Proverbs 4:7—“Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore, get wisdom: and with all thy getting get understanding.” (King James Version, The Holy Bible)

This dissertation examines the development of the field of OD by assessing the life and contributions to history as a direct result or building block of the works of one of the field’s premier founders: Richard (Dick) Beckhard. If one were to study the writings and the legacy of Dick Beckhard, few would disagree that his life of “doing and learning” personifies the scripture of Proverbs 4:7. He appeared to glean every bit of knowledge he could out of every experience he encountered. His philosophy and belief in shared wisdom emanate in the following quote from his published memoirs: “It is my firm belief that no one can truly copyright an idea. Nor, if we are to continue to change and improve, should this be possible” (Beckhard, 1997, p. xvii). It was this philosophy that made Beckhard decide he would not take a job if he could not learn something from doing it.

Beckhard was a renaissance man of sorts. He excelled in business, management, and philosophy, as well as research, consulting, and teaching, and even music, theater, and writing. His talents were vast and far-reaching. An evaluation of Beckhard’s life makes excellent content for a historiography of the foundation of OD.
It offers clarity of the past, comprehension of the present, and insight into the future.

Once a review of the content of this document is complete, the reader should be able to answer the research question posed by the author: “Do the contributions made by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact today?”

The significance of this dissertation is threefold: it acknowledges Beckhard’s place in and contribution to OD history, the practitioner-scholar’s role in the continued development of the field of OD, and the impact and influence OD has on complementary fields of research and application. An elaboration of this significance follows:

1. The first point of significance highlights the contributions Beckhard’s life and endeavors had on the development of the field of OD. This was a glaring gap in the scholarly research literature. Numerous dissertations and theses were examined and works were found devoted to the contributions of Lewin, McGregor, Likert, Trist, Alban, Burke, Schein, and the Seashores, to name a few, but, somehow, there was this huge gap in the literature where the life and achievements of Beckhard should have been acknowledged. This body of work fills that gap.

2. The second point of significance emphasizes the value of the practitioner-scholar by identifying specific linkages of development. This body of work developed mechanistic “modes of expansion” to the routine evolution process commonly described in OD text, such as Cummings and Worley (2009).
3. The third point of significance this dissertation contributes to the field of OD is it builds on these aforementioned “modes of expansion,” showing how this concept extends across subject matter boundaries as well as the time continuum.

**Summary of Dissertation Design**

This section concludes the introductory chapter; however, before moving to the next section, a review of the format utilized for this document was deemed prudent. The first concept that needs to be discussed is that of a “hermeneutic bridge.” The hermeneutic versus positivistic perspective is clearly summarized by Gummesson:

Hermeneutics represents a reaction against the awkward rigidities of positivism in relation to certain types of problems in the social field. Instead of trying to explain causal relationships by objective “facts” and statistical analysis, hermeneutics uses more a personal interpretive process to “understand reality.” (2000, p. 177)

He later added: “in positivistic science, there is no merit in having studied a problem area first hand” but stated

it is not possible to follow an interpretive approach at a distance. It requires a personal commitment on behalf of the researcher such that he invested his personality and experience into the field of research; a personal commitment is an actual requirement for understanding… Indeed hermeneutics views it as a requirement rather than just a merit.” (p. 179)

With this fact understood, the content of each chapter will be explained.

This first chapter gives a frame of reference of the research concept. It presents the research question; tells why this work is important to the field of OD; and, finally, details its importance to the author.
The introduction is followed by a chapter that lays the foundation for the research to take place. It begins with an interpretive biography of the life of Beckhard, which will be the initial blueprint of the analysis. Then it conducts a corresponding historical assessment of the field of OD along a parallel timeline. It then explains a “mode of expansion” theory. Lastly, it provides a wrap-up to show how it will all come together in the method of inquiry.

The next chapter provides a review of all pertinent literature that went into developing the research question and finding the evidence to answer that question. It should be noted here that since this dissertation is qualitative by design, it is therefore exploratory in nature. The relevance of this fact is that the literature review was a living document right up to its completion. Because of the inductive perspective taken with the design of this project, research was conducted before, during, and even after the analysis phase’s completion. This was done to support the exploratory process; therefore, updates and revisions continued practically through the conclusion of the finished product. While an arduous task, this procedure contributed significantly to the clarity of the research objective and answers the question of how, which is the topic of the following methodology chapter.

Once the dissertation has addressed the who, what, where, and when inquiries of research, the next logical question becomes how. This is where the next chapter on methodology provides some momentary satiation. The research method combines the techniques of interpretive biography, historiography, and content analysis to develop a complete picture of Beckhard’s impact on OD during his lifetime, as well as how
the concept of “modes of expansion” addresses the relevance of his influence through posterity.

The methodology chapter is followed by a unique hybrid chapter called Results and Discussion. This anomaly was devised after thorough review of the procedural aspect of data analysis deemed the listing of results, without the benefit of some corresponding discussion, inadequate and impractical. Therefore, an abridged overview of the research-specific data analysis is presented in one section of the chapter. Another section provides the results (“modes of expansion”) with the appropriate follow-up discussion (“nodes of connectivity”) to provide a complete picture of the concepts and theories that forge the research model.

Finally, the conclusion chapter provides an overview of the significant findings of the study and their implications to current theory. Additionally, this is where opportunities for future research implications and applications are recommended.
Chapter 2: BACKGROUND

Beckhard…sets out to tell us a story—his own—and along the way passes on his great wisdom. He truly is a master teacher; using the unfolding of his life and career, he teaches us how to be flexible, develop theory from practice, garner strength through experience, create change, and much more. (Cover comments by Fredda Herz Brown, Beckhard, 1997)

The Life of Dick Beckhard—Biography

In The Beginning

The story of Dick Beckhard’s life parallels a series of histories in the field: the history of human relations training, of organization development, of managing change, of the consulting process, of consulting to large complex systems, of using educational interventions as a strategy for large systems change, of the field of family business consulting, and of professional development programs for organization and organization development consultants. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 1)

However, to fully understand and appreciate his contributions and the overall impact to these fields, as well as to the applied behavioral sciences application of these various settings, one needs to go back to the birth of his connection between the entrepreneurial and the behavioral realms of his cognitive ability. This study takes that journey and provides a glidepath of activity that will forge a galactic impact, with repercussions that are not only felt today (almost 70 years later), but will continue to influence future developments in these fields throughout posterity.

Richard Beckhard was born in April 1918 to an affluent family (biographical information in this section is from Beckhard, 1997). His grandfather was a millionaire investment banker and his father a successful Harvard alum business owner; however, all this would change three days after the Beckhard family moved to the St.
Petersburg, Florida, area in 1929. Seventy-two hours after this relocation, the stock market crashed and a day later Dick’s father’s business burned down. As a result, the Beckhard family went broke and Dick found himself viewing the economic landscape from a whole new perspective: an impoverished one. This fact becomes important later; as Beckhard began to consult on businesses and what would enhance an organization from a behavioral science point of view, he was able to appreciate every individual perspective, from the full-spectrum view of the chief executive officer (CEO) to where the rubber meets the road view of the line worker because he had lived the experience and was able to relate it to his own life. It is from this holistic perspective that this analysis will be conducted to provide an understanding and appreciation of employee as well as employer empowerment in support of an organization’s good health.

During the Great Depression of the United States, the Beckhard family lost most of their wealth, but not their entrepreneurial spirit. Young Dick Beckhard pursued his first entrepreneurial endeavor as a magazine salesman, selling The Saturday Evening Post. The Post’s sales strategy, at that time, was to utilize children as local distributors. Unfortunately, a week before Beckhard’s first day on the job, he broke his collarbone in a diving accident. When the 11-year-old Beckhard was dropped off for his first day of selling magazines, his arm was in a sling and he could barely carry his bag load of magazines. Since Beckhard was naturally small in stature, the sight of his “Tiny Tim” frame struggling to support himself under the weight of a bag full of Saturday Evening Post magazines provided a visual that tugged at the
heartstrings of the local elderly female tourists along the beaches of St. Petersburg, Florida. As they rushed to help the little one-armed paperboy, Beckhard received a human behavior revelation: by tapping into human emotion, one could influence human actions. Dick realized he had a great business opportunity; so, every Thursday during tourist season, he would mount his arm sling and bag of magazines and head to the beach. Young Beckhard used this revelation of human nature to quickly become the top marketing representative in his district, a fact that would go on to be reflected in his consulting, counseling, coaching, and writing throughout his illustrious career.

The next great lesson learned in the life of Beckhard occurred at the early age of 12 years old, when his uncle, a theatrical producer, needed a menacing young piano student for one of his plays. Having witnessed his nephew’s piano lessons, the uncle recruited Dick for the role. This was the start of Beckhard’s fascination with the theater. Beckhard would go on to master acting, singing, producing, stage managing, and directing stage productions. This will be relevant to Beckhard’s contributions to OD for multiple reasons: It provided a means for Beckhard to attend Pomona College, introduced him to the writing and teaching professions, grounded him in executive-level management, and taught him the importance of managing his surrounding settings. All these, along with many other attributes, benefits, and capabilities, are the result of Beckhard being bitten by the theater bug and will be reviewed later in the discussion section of this document.
**The Whole World is a Stage**

Beckhard’s stage management expertise would lead him to multiple diverse career opportunities that utilized his staging ability as a projection platform for achieving a plethora of accomplishments en route to becoming a noted scholar, academic, researcher, and practitioner. His life of “doing and learning” is a testament to the concept of action research, where every new endeavor he attempted provided insight and inspiration for the justification of the next iteration of endeavors attempted. An example of this pattern would be Beckhard’s accepting a teaching position with the Red Cross, having no knowledge of curricula or course development. Nevertheless, he began to teach theater, leading the class in show tunes like Oklahoma (doing or action), then watching their participation and response to base his next series of instructions for the course (learning or research, respectively).

His combined understanding of human nature and the world as a stage made him an excellent candidate to support the Red Cross’ entertainment needs. The Red Cross would develop his executive management skills as he ascended from recreation worker to the top management position in the area, area director, with more than 1,600 staff members and a $6 million (1940s) budget in slightly more than a six-month period. Beckhard had to literally refine his management skills on the fly (as he flew from base to base on an Air Force mail plane), a clear example of his doing and learning concept. He eventually became the Red Cross representative on a task force planning the invasion of Japan. Yet, even with being thrust into the highest levels of
responsibility, he accomplished all assigned tasks, irrespective of initial familiarity, while continuing to learn from each attempt at the effort.

The next evolution of the Beckhard persona resulted from his staging expertise being applied to business operations: first by applying his staging expertise to planning meetings; then, writings on staging meetings; and, finally, being picked up to support the planning of a major conference—the Ford Motor Company’s industrial show. Suddenly Beckhard was a subject matter expert on staging meetings and industrial shows. So, what does a subject matter expert do to market his skillset? He becomes a consultant. Enter the next iteration of the action research analysis of the life of Dick Beckhard, an iteration that would evolve drastically and dramatically over the years, but continue the rest of his life.

Beckhard successfully completed major staging consultations with entities such as Ford Motor Company, the Girl Scouts of America, the American Theater Wing (where he developed the curriculum for conducting industrial shows), The White House, and The World’s Fair before fate would intercede and Beckhard would be brought to the attention of Ron Lippitt and Lee Bradford, two of the three founders of the National Training Laboratory (NTL). Lippitt and Bradford decided to bring Beckhard into the fourth year of the summer program made famous by its inception and introduction by the founder of group dynamics, Kurt Lewin. Beckhard was recruited to spice up some relatively dull general session theoretical presentations using his staging expertise. This staging assignment would change Beckhard’s life and future in ways no one could have possibly foreseen.
NTL: A Life Changing Experience

In exchange for his staging consultation, Lippitt and Bradford offered Beckhard a scholarship to attend the general sessions and join a T-group at NTL (a new behavioral science technique for training). That summer of 1950 introduced Beckhard to group dynamics and the laboratory method of learning. This experience, in Beckhard’s own words, changed his life, as he began to see the learning method as a metaphor for his own life.

The laboratory method was to produce behavior, analyze the behavior, generalize from the analysis, look at applications of the generalizations, and produce some more behavior. The activity was a form of action research; group participants were both the subjects and the researchers. As my career progressed and my self-awareness and group skills increased, the metaphor became a major force in my understanding of what I was doing and learning in the laboratory of my life. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 12)

During the NTL summer program of 1950, Beckhard was introduced to the president of Antioch College, Douglas McGregor, and they forged a positive acquaintance. The next year they were both invited back to the NTL summer program as faculty, and it was in 1951 that the true friendship was developed and McGregor’s influence on Beckhard had its biggest impact (extending to the early 1960s): perennially co-teaching executives at NTL, co-consulting on sociotechnical systems with General Mills and Procter & Gamble, and eventually co-presenters at a Society for the Advancement of Management meeting in the spring of 1963. It was after this meeting that McGregor (who by this time was at MIT) invited Beckhard to join his Department of Organization Studies and teach at the prestigious Massachusetts
Institute of Technology (MIT). This invitation would open yet another chapter of Beckhard’s development as a premier behavioral scientist.

The compilation of Beckhard’s experience with the scholars of NTL and MIT helped him to become an accomplished academic himself. The result of his personal development would proliferate the field of OD with new educational programs. Examples of such programs would be the Program for Specialists in Organization Development (PSOD) at NTL and one of the first Master of Science in Organization Development (MSOD) programs at Pepperdine University or professional development organizations like the Organization Development Network (OD Network) or the Family Firm Institute. These achievements are testaments to the contributions of Beckhard to OD and ancillary fields.

**Go Global, Add Value**

It was simultaneously during the 1950s and early 1960s that Beckhard established himself as an acclaimed international consultant, with consulting assignments in Austria, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Columbia, and England. Beckhard’s extensive international consulting practice began through his affiliation with NTL and Gordon Lippitt (deputy director of NTL), who was working with the European Productivity Center in Paris. Lippitt selected Beckhard to lead a training team of Lee Bradford (NTL director), Elbert Burr (vice president of personnel at Monsanto Chemical Company), and Robert Hood (president of Ansul Chemical). This team would conduct leadership training in Austria. The results were so successful that eventually Marjan Schroeder (head of the Social Work Department,
Netherland Institute of Preventive Medicine) brought Beckhard to the Netherlands to train their leaders. From the Holland opportunity, Freddie Jeppeson (president of the Danish Employers Association) invited him to come to Denmark. While in Denmark Hanne Ernst and Gunnar Hjelholt met with Beckhard and brought him to Sweden to conduct training for social-sector leaders in community building and diversity. As a result of this training, Lauri Penti of the Finnish Management Institute brought him to Finland. Remarkably, everywhere he went seemed to expand his international practice into additional opportunities, either in new organizations in that specific country or in an entirely new country. Soon Beckhard’s name and reputation would expand far beyond NTL and the United States.

He would add venues such as Canada, Mexico, Israel, Bermuda, and Venezuela to the list, as time went by and the scope of his consulting expanded. Over the years Beckhard gained an appreciation for the power and importance of understanding culture as an effective tool for consulting, both in general and specifically in foreign countries (Beckhard, 1997, p. 91). The fact that language and culture barriers did not diminish Beckhard’s effectiveness as a consultant is yet another testament to his ability of doing and learning.

**Life at MIT**

The next segment of Beckhard’s life added academician, researcher, and prolific author to his resume. The fall of 1963, Beckhard joined the MIT Organization Studies staff with McGregor, Warren Bennis, and Ed Schein. The irony here was that Beckhard, who had only completed undergraduate studies at Pomona College, found
himself teaching some of the most elite minds of the country in master and doctoral programs and was a highly successful as well as sought-after professor.

The intellectual environment of MIT was conducive to both Beckhard’s research and writing. The following is a summary of the influence of both McGregor and NTL and McGregor and MIT on the prolific nature of Beckhard’s writings (excludes writings for the magazine Sales Meeting):

**Table 1. Table of Beckhard’s Published Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Videos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckhard Pre-1950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckhard 1950-1962</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckhard 1963-1984</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckhard Post-1984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Prior to joining MIT’s staff, Beckhard’s writings were minimal; however, while aligned with the likes of McGregor, Bennis, and Schein, his writings, and supporting research, flourished. In addition, to his extensive research and writing, MIT developed the academician in Beckhard. His practicum course (Consulting and Large System Change) was in such high demand that, due to a reciprocal arrangement with Harvard, he would have to cut off the Harvard enrollment at 30% of his class.
capacity to allow priority for MIT students, given the physical restrictions of the classroom.

Finally, after 21 years of developing powerful practitioners, Beckhard prepared to retire. Schein and the Sloan School of Management sponsored an MIT Richard Beckhard Day to celebrate his contribution to the university, School of Management, and the Department of Organization Studies. The event saw corporate CEOs; renowned scholars; and a multitude of students, friends, and family participating in honoring him. Chris Argyris called him “the best teacher at Harvard.” The final speaker of the day was Abraham Siegel, dean of the Sloan School. Siegel announced the university had established the Richard Beckhard Prize for the best OD article published in Sloan Management Review annually. The first recipient of this award was the great scholar Peter Senge.

Over Beckhard’s tenure, his curriculum, mentorship, counsel, and coaching were legendary with his students. He produced a list of scholars and practitioners that reads like a Who’s Who among elite OD scholars: Ron Fry (Case Western Reserve University), Ernesto Poza (Arizona State University), Irvin Rubin (Temenos Inc.), and W. Gibb Dyer (Brigham Young University) are just a few examples of the proliferation of Beckhard’s efforts as an academician.

*Academics Extends Beyond MIT*

While the philosophies of Beckhard were spreading around the world via consulting and the production of MIT disciples, he found additional opportunities to spread his gospel of organization transition and change management by traveling the
highways and byways, planting his seeds of knowledge in the fertile soil of various venues as a visiting lecturer at various premier universities. As a result, Beckhard disciples quickly were fruitful and multiplied, both nationally and internationally.

In addition to MIT, he had a legion of followers from Columbia University; Pepperdine University; Yale University; Case Western Reserve University; Kings College (London, England); London Graduate School of Business; and, of course, Benedictine University. It is possible that this vast group of intercontinental students may even eclipse the 21-year MIT student collection in size.

While this may not be an all-inclusive list of Beckhard’s platforms of enlightenment, it is a good representation of where he was developing followers and indirectly impacting the development of the field. The more important thing to remember here is that even if this were all the institutions of higher academia from which Professor Beckhard had imparted his pearls of wisdom, this group would only be a slice of the legion that resulted from the direct expansion of his input. Additionally, if one could retrieve his grading list and calculate the total number of students he had encountered to ascertain the size of this army, it still would not account for the students who participated in reciprocity programs at Harvard (with MIT) and American University (with NTL). However, the list does not stop there. There needs to be a nondegree-seeking student component added (PSOD, manager, executive, and fellow training, as well as certificate and seminar) to capture an entirely different group of Beckhard disciples. Finally, it should be noted that each one of these disciples has the potential to produce an additional cadre. The moral to
the story is that it would be far too difficult to try to quantify this legion of disciples very quickly. It is safe to say that the “Beckhard disciple growth pattern” extends beyond arithmetic and geometric sequences to reach the level of exponential growth.

**Family Business Consulting**

The year was 1982. As Beckhard was approaching the age of retirement from MIT, he had yet another revelation: Over 90% of all businesses were family owned or controlled. Ironically, universities’ business programs, as well as research literature, were focused on big corporation management. As he studied this situation more and more, he became convinced that this misalignment of focus presented an excellent opportunity for research and development.

So, by the time Beckhard was ready to retire from MIT, he (along with his research assistant, W. Gibb Dyer) had discovered, save a small program at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, that there were no academic preparatory trainings for the promotion of family business. To address the disparity of focus, he recruited one of his students, Dyer, to help research the status of relevant management training. With the results of their research in mind, Beckhard saw his next big career opportunity. He designed a research study, to be funded by prior family business CEOs that he had supported, and began a three-year research project. As an outcome of this research, Beckhard and Dyer published “Managing Change in Family Firms” in *Sloan Management Review* and a working paper entitled “Challenges and Issues in Managing Family Firms” (Beckhard, 1997, p. 138).

Finally, at the end of the first year of the research project, W. Warner Burke (editor of
Organization Dynamics) requested Beckhard to publish a special issue of the journal, dedicated to family business. To comply, Beckhard recruited his wife, Elaine Kepner (a Gestalt and family therapist); Gibb Dyer; Ivan Lansberg, Jr.; and Harry Levinson to join him in contributing to the issue. These individuals would go on to be part of the founders of the Family Firm Institute.

Beckhard was convinced that he was on track to address a viable new field in management. From that vision, he and his wife, Elaine Kepner, collaborated with Barbara Hollander (a family therapist and close friend of Kepner) to form the Family Firm Institute and initiate the first conference to recruit family business scholars and practitioners of similar interest. Nancy Drosdow of the Wharton School agreed to host the meeting. This first conference was attended by approximately 50 people. Today, the Family Firm Institute is a viable organization and the leading proponent of family business practice and research in the world, with over 2,000 members in more than 80 countries. In 1992 the Family Firm Institute established its first practitioner award, The Richard Beckhard Practice Award, to honor this founding member and other distinguished practitioners in the family business field. The first award was presented eponymously to Beckhard himself. Apparently, many agreed that an organization to promote the scholastic and practical value of family businesses was one of Beckhard’s better ideas.

**Consulting to Consultants**

As Beckhard continued to advance in years, he continued to redefine himself. He called this process in his advanced years: “Adding Value, Senior Style.”
continuing to teach a professional development course at Teachers College, Columbia University, Beckhard was introduced to David Nadler, part of the faculty at Columbia. Nadler went on to become founder and CEO of Delta Consulting Group.

One day Nadler asked Beckhard to attend a retreat he was hosting, for his professional staff, to demonstrate some of his consulting techniques. Nadler’s staff found this training so valuable that Nadler arranged to have Beckhard visit Delta one day a month to review consulting techniques with his staff. Soon Beckhard found himself being a consultant to consultants (he called it “shadow consulting”), and a vibrant coaching career emerged—a career that would incorporate consulting to healthcare, education, government, the social sector, law enforcement, and, of course, corporate business consultants.

By the time Beckhard’s professional career had reached the stage of consultant’s consultant, he had run the gamut of achievements. His professional activities by then were a direct reflection of his two goals:

1. Influence large systems to be more effective and humane

2. Help in the development of future consultants to support Goal 1

Most of his career had been spent pursuing his first goal; however, by this time his focus had reversed and the majority of his efforts were clearly directed toward Goal 2. As a consultant’s consultant, Beckhard coached young OD consultants like a veteran athlete might perfect a young pro’s golf swing or tennis backhand. Additionally, he counselled and guided them like a true mentor develops his protégé. This process became so successful that it was almost legendary. In fact, Beckhard
continued to take his mentees to his cabin on Lake Kezar (that was Ironically known as Shangri La) to provide them very professional development in a very personal environment.

This technique produced such competent and distinguished consultants that, even today, the OD Network still hosts a session at its national conference entitled “The Dick Beckhard Mentoring Session.” This event is hosted by Frances Baldwin. Though Dr. Baldwin was primarily a protégé of the great Herb Shepard, yet she was also a beneficiary of the fruits of Shangri La, and she includes some of her memories of Beckhard and his mentoring session on Lake Kezar in her introduction at this mentoring session.

**The Grand Finale**

The life of Dick Beckhard is a story of the intersection where vision and unbridled ambition meet. He was the personification of the concept of action research or, as he labeled it regarding his personal philosophy and approach to life, “doing and learning.” His gift was the unique ability to fully utilize the cycle of the data utilization. This would be

1. Analyze data to obtain information
2. Arrange and coordinate information to develop understanding
3. Assess understanding to acquire knowledge
4. Use knowledge to support decisions
5. Transform decisions into action
It was this natural ability, when combined with an early developed compassion for humanity and valuable laboratory training from NTL, which yielded an extremely capable consultant. Then under the tutelage of McGregor and collaboration with the likes of Schein and Bennis at MIT, as well as Argyris, Kanter, and Zuboff at Harvard, Beckhard’s scholarly persona blossomed. The last major component of Beckhard’s development was the study of open systems theory, developed by James Clark, Charles Krone, and Will McWhinney at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), in the early 1960s. This last capability solidified his preparation as a pioneer in sociotechnical systems, an expert in large system change, and a world-class consultant. He was one of the first OD champions to acknowledge how fast the field would grow and how vital it would be to the field to have trained competent practitioners. This fact drove Beckhard, along with some of his colleagues, to create a four-week training program at NTL. This model became the framework for how universities teach the field of OD to this day.

In 1996 Stephen Samuel Vitucci completed a dissertation analyzing four of the founders of OD: Lewin, Likert, McGregor, and Trist. While each of these OD giants was definitively deserving of consideration, the body of work, though an excellent demonstration of a biographical historiography (and a valuable reference and guide for this research), has a distinct bias toward the scholar-practitioner over the practitioner-scholar. As Lewin once stated, there is nothing so practical as a good theory (1951, p. 169). It is undeniable that Beckhard’s life is a testament to the contribution of the strategic practitioner to the field of OD. In 1997 he provided that
testimony to the world, as he published his memoir *Agent of Change: My Life, My Practice*.

Dick Beckhard passed away December 29, 1999—his family by his side and, according to one of his close colleagues, handling one of his client’s issues earlier that week. The riches to rags and back to riches story is complete. Few people before or since have had such a pronounced impact on the field of OD. His is a legacy that shall transcend time.

**Development of the Field of OD—History and Prophecy**

Doug [McGregor] wanted to write up the program as a case study and needed a name for the program. “Human Relations Training” wasn’t right. Neither was “Leadership Training,” although that was one of the activities. “Management Development” was not appropriate because the program involved the whole organization. “Organization Improvement was too bland, so we named it “Organization Development.” (Beckhard, 1997, p. 73)

**Prologue—Eras of OD**

After completing a strong biographical depiction of the character of the historiography, the focus turns to the scope of the historiographical analysis. A brief review of the development of the field of OD will assist in developing the hermeneutic bridge between the past origins and future developments within the field of OD.

According to Cummings and Worley (2009), there are five stems of OD:

1. Laboratory Training
2. Action Research/Survey Feedback
3. Normative Approach
4. Quality of Work Life (QWL)

5. Strategic Change

Yet, the power of the positive organizational scholarship (POS) movement warrants inclusion in the sixth stem of this body of work. With the works of the likes of David Cooperrider, Ron Fry, Jim Ludema, Kim Cameron, and Fred Luthans leading the way, this latest addition to the seminal work of Cummings and Worley will prove itself a valid addendum to their stem concept as well as a valuable example of this dissertation’s expansionary theory. Because of the clear delineation of era between laboratory training and POS, the first three stems are placed in an era called “the Embryonic Era” and the second three stems in a second era called “the Enlightened Era.”

Finally, this dissertation will address a third era. This era is reviewed to discuss where OD is expected to be headed in the future. So, in keeping consistent with the design of the text, it was only fitting to name this final prophetic era as “the Envisioned Era.” In this era, paths of trajectory are predicted based on traditional OD developments and environmental, attitudinal, and technological attributes consistent with and based on contemporary demands.

The following sections will review the various eras of OD, starting with the Embryonic Era.

**Embryonic Era (The Awakening)**

The beginning of the field and the first stem of OD is usually traced back to the early works of a prolific theorist, researcher, and practitioner—a psychologist
named Kurt Lewin. He specialized in applied psychology, and the fact that he had to flee persecution in Germany inspired his work to find an effective way to combat religious and racial prejudices. His groundbreaking work in group dynamics and social change was the foundation of laboratory training, survey feedback, and action research. His work led to the creation of OD and is still considered to serve as a major source of OD concepts and methods (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 6). Lewin left his home in Germany to escape the devastation of the Holocaust; however, he maintained a deep sensitivity to social problems and a commitment to use his resources as a social scientist to do something about them. It was Lewin’s work at MIT for the Connecticut Interracial Commission and the Committee on the Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress in the summer of 1946 that essentially was the beginning of laboratory training (more specifically T-groups) or the study of participants’ reactions to data of their own behavior.

This study of participants’ reactions, when coupled with a corresponding response resulting from the data studied, was the link to the second stem of OD, action research. As a result of the study, the U.S. Navy, Office of Naval Research and the National Education Association agreed to provide the financial support needed to establish the NTL at the Gould Academy in Bethel, Maine, for the summer of 1947.

Unfortunately, Kurt Lewin suffered a massive heart attack and died in February of that same year. As a result of Lewin’s untimely death, the Research Center for Group Dynamics, now headed by Lewin’s colleague Ronald Lippitt, moved from MIT to the University of Michigan under the auspices of the great Rensis
Likert and the Institute of Social Research. Likert, a pioneer in the research of attitude surveys, had originally gained renown in the social psychology community for his doctoral dissertation at Columbia University which developed the widely used five-point scale that bears his name (the Likert scale). This feedback process incorporated emotional preferences into survey feedback and revolutionized the entire concept of survey feedback. It was this same Likert who would soon postulate the human relations approach to management as the best management style and introduce his theory of participative management, his four-system philosophy (exploitive, benevolent, consultative, and participative), as evidence of this fact.

The first U.S. Navy/National Education Association-sponsored Basic Skills Groups offered the summer of 1947 to accentuate laboratory training programs were so successful that the Carnegie Foundation agreed to provide financial support for the summers of 1948 and 1949. This resulted in a permanent program for NTL within the National Education Association. Now, NTL was established with a triad of leadership at the helm—Leland Bradford was appointed the director, while Ronald Lippitt (the director of the Research Center for Group Dynamics and former colleague of Kurt Lewin) and Kenneth Benne were designated co-directors of the organization. It was for the fourth year’s session, in 1950, that Bradford and Lippitt invited a well-established trade show consultant to help spice up the highly technical and somewhat dull general session presentations of the NTL annual training program. In return for his efforts, they would offer him a scholarship to attend the training. This trade show consultant was Dick Beckhard.
In the 1950s, there were three emerging trends with laboratory training:

1. The development of regional training laboratories
2. The expansion of summer program sessions to year-round sessions
3. The extension of the T-group into business and industry and the increasing involvement of NTL members in industry programs

Beckhard made the most of his time in Bethel: “Beckhard [was]…one of the first to reshape T-groups into new forms tailored to corporate managers” (Kleiner, 2008, p. 55). The most notable OD consultants participating in these industry efforts were Douglas McGregor at Union Carbide, Herb Shepard and Robert Blake at Esso Standard Oil (today known as ExxonMobil), McGregor and Beckhard at General Mills, and Bob Tannenbaum at TRW Space Systems. These applications of T-group methodology at these forward-thinking companies gave birth to the term “organization development.” Additionally, these efforts led corporate personnel, employee relations, and industrial relations specialists to expand the scope of their responsibilities to offer internal consultation service to corporate managerial staff (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 7).

**Enlightened Era (OD Comes of Age)**

With the foundation of OD securely established and the synergy of Embryonic Era stems clearly working together for the development of the field (i.e., using T-group results with survey feedback to assess the corresponding iterations of actions for future analysis), a transition from Embryonic to Enlightened Era stems was
observed through various means of expansionary development. These expansions focused on three additional stems of OD: QWL, strategic change, and POS.

The first stem of this era to manifest itself was QWL which appeared in two distinct phases of impact. The first phase of the QWL initiative to flourish had its basic roots from research done with workers in English coal mines by Eric Trist, Ken Bamforth, and Fred Emery of the Tavistock Institute (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 11). This endeavor led to European work design efforts aimed to better integrate technology and people. As these sociotechnical systems (as they are called) progressed to American operations, they manifested themselves as practices that improved personal satisfaction with work environment and personal needs. The revolutionary efforts of this first wave of QWL initiatives achieved job enrichment, self-managed teams, and enhanced labor relations until the mid-1970s (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 11).

About 1979, the second phase of the QWL initiative began to emerge as a result of productivity and quality output inability to compete with Japanese management principles (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 11). However, the story behind these deficiencies did not get its start in 1979; its origins may be traced back to and are a manifestation of General Douglas McArthur’s decision, many years earlier, to leave an American in Japan to assist the nation in rebuilding its industrial capabilities after Japan’s devastating defeat in World War II. The man who was left to spearhead the Japanese industrial revolution was the great statistician William Edwards Deming (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 359).
Deming (who was a protégé of the father of statistical quality control, Walter Shewhart) took his statistical analysis capability and applied it to the traditionally studied principles of management science developed by Frederick Taylor. Though these techniques were initially rejected by corporate America, after World War II, McArthur had brought Deming to Japan to assist with the reconstruction of the nation's economy. The results were so remarkably successful that Deming transformed the meaning of the term “Made in Japan” from being synonymous with poorly constructed and cheap to being well built and highly desired. Today, the celebrated Deming Award is the highest award issued to business entities by the Japanese government.

Deming took his management principles and statistical control and, along with contemporaries Joseph Juran and Philip Crosby, led the organizational development revolution called the quality revolution. With the introduction of quality circles, total quality management programs, and statistical process control/statistical quality control, new heights of quality operations previously unimaginable at Motorola were achieved with a process called Six Sigma. But it was Deming and his book *Out of the Crisis* (1982) that led this quality movement labeled the re-emergence of QWL. The Army quickly followed suit with its own total quality management training and certification process for Six Sigma black belt training. This training, along with Kepnor Tregoe logical decision-making process training, supported improved decision-making in business; however, Kepnor Tregoe was a close replica to the Army’s well-established military decision-making process. These efforts may be
summarized as a version of employee involvement or employee empowerment. These initiatives inherently move power and decision-making downward in an organization, so it can be more flexible, productive, and competitive.

Eventually, these remarkable increases in productivity improvement via process capability became apparent within the OD community to be applicable to productivity improvement via personnel capability. OD’s vision of a more humane organization was taking root and progressing from supplementing to overshadowing advances achieved by Taylor’s industrial engineered, physical process-oriented philosophy in more and more operations. Management was starting to embrace the theory: The more balanced their employees’ work-home life, the more satisfied their staff would be; and the more satisfied the staff was, the more productive their operations proved to be.

This foundational research was originally developed in Europe at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations by Eric Trist and his colleagues. Early practitioners in England, Ireland, Norway, and Sweden forged work designs that sought to improve the integration of social systems and technology to provide high levels of discretion, diversity of task, and results feedback. The most distinctive characteristic of these QWL programs was possibly the development of self-managing teams as a form of work design. These teams consisted of multiskilled members granted the requisite autonomy and information to design and manage their own task performances.
As the self-managed team philosophy made its way across the ocean to the states, the various concepts and techniques were Americanized for application. The result of such applications focused QWL on either job satisfaction (personal mental health) or job enrichment (work improvement). These techniques were popularized by the success of QWL projects at production facilities such as Gaines Pet Food plant, capitalizing on an effective and well-publicized participative management program (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 11). Additionally, as these QWL programs’ popularity skyrocketed, their scope expanded from work design to include reward systems, work flow, management styles, and physical work environment. This expansion of scope shifted the emphasis of QWL projects away from the individual focus on human dimension to an organizational efficiency concentration.

Today QWL activity continues under the auspices of programs such as employee involvement, employee empowerment, total quality management, and Six Sigma. All these varied programs and processes reflect characteristics of Likert’s participative system in his four-system management model. Each provides a demonstration of the expansion of capability from the early days of OD to date, as well as an example of the significance of this dissertation.

The next stem to be reviewed in the Enlightened Era is the one that is based on the linking of OD to organizational strategy, a linkage that expanded the power of the OD intervention process exponentially. OD had earned its stripes and was starting to be accepted as a valuable stand-alone field that merited some autonomy of functionality. It had begun to step out of the shadow of human resources, yet old
habits die hard. The training function and soft science skills that earmarked OD resulted in its placement squarely within the human resources realm. As organizations and their corresponding technological, political, and social environments become more complex, more global (as a result of the information age), and more uncertain, the magnitude and sophistication of their required changes have increased. This increase in complexity of organizational change scenarios, resulting from environmental triggers (such as regulatory requirement adaptations, technological breakthroughs, or a new CEO joining an organization) created a need to improve alignment between their operations and strategic planning. OD had to adopt a more strategic perspective.

By becoming more strategic in nature, OD’s change capability and utility were expanded. These strategic change interventions could better align an organization with its environment as well as its existing technical, political, and cultural systems. It is through this increased alignment of organizational operations that strategic changes in OD began to support organizational vision and mission as well as enhance its competitive advantage. However, this added capability came at a price to the practitioner. He or she had to now be familiar with competitive strategy, marketing concepts, and finance as well as the traditional team building, action research, and survey feedback. Nevertheless, ultimately the added synergy achieved via the strategic incorporation of OD into the organization enhanced not only the bottom line (financial), but the triple bottom line (social, environmental, and financial) as related to the organization’s prescribed short- and long-term goals.
One of the first applications of strategic change was Beckhard’s use of open system planning (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 12). In 1969 Beckhard published the seminal work *Organization Development: Strategies and Models*. He was credited as one of the first to operationalize the open system planning model theory—being developed by Jim Clark, Will McWhinney, and Charles Krone of UCLA (Beckhard, 1997, p. 49; McWhinney, 1992). Beckhard proposed that organizational environment and strategy could be used to describe, analyze, and improve performance based on variance analysis of the environmental and strategic data (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 12). Since that time, change agents have developed a variety of large-scale strategic change models. Each of these models recognizes the organization-wide (Beckhard’s specialty) and cultural (the specialty of Beckhard’s fellow MIT colleague and culture guru, Ed Schein) dependence of the change requirement.

Strategic OD provides some of the most current perspectives in the OD research realm. This dissertation would be remiss, however, if it failed to mention the fact that as a result of the technological advances of the information age, by necessity, companies are becoming more global in nature. An area of OD that resides in the shadow of strategic OD and is developing as a direct correlation of the international flavor strategic operations is global OD. Peter Sorensen, Thomas Head, Therese Yaeger, and David Cooperrider (2011) are among the academic giants making strides in this area. An important supplement to their efforts is the work of Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) and Trompenaars and Woolliams (2003) addressing the importance of understanding the role of culture in global operations and global OD.
The final and more recent highlight of strategic OD to be discussed here is the work of Worley, Hitchin, and Ross (1996). These researchers have picked up where Beckhard left off and extended his work throughout the functionality of an organization, with a concept called integrated strategic change. The premise of their research is based on the following determination: “…strategy and strategic planning have not lived up to their potentials. What’s really funny is that while we agree with this, it is not our conclusion. It’s the conclusion of no less a student of strategy than Henry Mintzberg” (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996, p. 1).

These researchers took the work of Beckhard and proceeded to build on it, extending the concepts to more contemporary issues and conditions. In their own words:

It is a more specific form of Beckhard and Harris’s (1987) transition state model. For example, instead of a generic “current state” or “desired state” that could apply to any organizational system, these states are represented by an organization’s strategic orientation, that is, its strategy (S) and supporting organization design factors (O). (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996, p. 17)

Worley, Hitchin, and Ross’ contribution to the manifestation of Beckhard’s original work in strategic OD is an exemplary testament to the focus of this study.

The final stem of the Enlightened Era capitalizes on a person’s positive mental attitude. This field is known as POS, and it is a study within the positivity movement. It focuses on positive outcomes, processes, and attributes of organizations and their members. POS is the compilation of many theories and is routinely described by words such as excellence, thriving, flourishing, abundance, resilience, and virtuousness. It represents an expanded perspective of organizational philosophy with
increased emphasis on goodness and positive human potential. It consist of enablers (i.e., processes, capabilities, structures, and methods); motivations (i.e., unselfishness, altruism, selfless actions); and effects (i.e., meaningfulness, exhilaration, high-quality relationships) associated with positive phenomena. This positive phenomenon differentiates itself from traditional organizational studies by seeking to understand what represents the best of the human condition (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003, p. 4).

POS is a fresh lens of perspective that offers a new view of an old phenomenon. It utilizes classic questions to uncover new understanding by examining positive processes that create patterns of excellence within behavior and interpersonal exchanges. Where POS does not deny the effects of organizational dysfunctions and dynamics that disable, harm, or at least produce negative results, it merely emphasizes the evaluation of factors that enable positive consequences for individuals, groups, and organizations.

An emphasis on positive phenomena is not unique to any one discipline. In fact, POS is gaining momentum in a diverse stream of literature and fields. Other traditions with a focus on the positive include positive psychology, community psychology, humanistic organizational behavior, prosocial motivation, citizenship behavior, corporate social responsibility, and, of course, OD (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003, p. 7). OD was founded on principles and strategies for changing, developing, and enhancing an organization by way of internal human capital. To have a movement within the field emerge that focuses directly on searching for the best in
people, as well as the organization, culture, and world in which they operate, provides OD a doorway into which the expanding genre of POS may enter. This doorway is called appreciative inquiry (AI).

AI is a powerful contribution to the field, which W. Warner Burke identified as the greatest discovery within OD in recent history (Burke, 2017). This stem has become so prevalent in the field of OD that its application has garnered the creator, David Cooperrider, audiences with stadiums of clients, an audience with the Dalai Lama, and the OD Network’s Lifetime Achievement Award. David Cooperrider’s concept of AI moved the world a little further from traditional Taylor management styles and a little closer to McGregor’s humane management style. It truly brought the positivity movement to the forefront of OD capability.

AI, though not the first theory established in this positivity movement, is one of the more celebrated theories. As POS continues to cite Cooperrider’s work as a seminal component of the expansion of the field, it was deemed worthwhile to take a moment to review the development of the theory. AI was the creation of David Cooperrider (a PhD candidate) and Suresh Srivastva (his dissertation chair), both from Case Western Reserve University, in 1987 and is based heavily on the European tradition of social construction. Its vocabulary is filled with magic and miracles, discovery, destiny, and dreams. In fact, “A favorite quote of AI from Albert Einstein captures the core beliefs of AI—There are only two ways to live your life. One is as though nothing is a miracle. The other is as though everything is a miracle” (Sorensen, Head, Yaeger, & Cooperrider, 2011, p. 621). The philosophy of AI
emanates feelings of hope, poetic principle, and a positive revolution as the basis theory. The following is a list of the underlying principles that capture the essence of the thought process behind Cooperrider’s vision, as he addressed the strength-based changes that would turn around the Cleveland Clinic housing dilemma and jump-start the phenomena of AI.

1. AI into “the art of the possible,” the appreciative approach, gets inspiration from “what is” and aims at valuing, learning, and understanding.
2. What is possible should be applicable; what is discovered in an organization should generate knowledge that can be used, applied, and validated.
3. What is possible should be provocative; an organization should be open-ended, learning how to take part in its own evolution.
4. Human potential of organizational life should be collaborative.

These underlying principles get to the heart of the positive phenomenon that is AI. It should be identified here that AI is a qualitative methodology that has its roots in the effective execution of interviewing techniques. The interviewer makes four key inquiries:

1. Describe a peak experience or high point.
2. Describe things valued most about (a) yourself, (b) the nature of one’s work, and (c) the organization.
3. Describe core factors that give “life” to the organization.
4. Describe three wishes to heighten vitality and health of the organization.
These four inquiries promote transformative dialogue that guides the change process in a positive direction, transcending individual and organizational culture to create new knowledge. From these interviews, themes emerge providing a pattern of an organization’s most positive experience, in an almost random fashion, as a map to organizational potential strength and health.

**Envisioned Era (OD, the Next Generation)**

The final section of review within the development of the field of OD provides a predictive component to look at the potential glidepath to where some of the OD developments are headed in the future.

The evolution of the field of OD has continued to make gains by leaps and bounds since Cooperrider harnessed the power of Seligman’s positivity to forge the initiation of the POS movement, but why would one believe that development of the positivity movement would stop at AI? While Cooperrider and Fry had their own visionary experience with their concept of “business as an agent of world benefit” (Weatherhead Faculty Profile, 2011), their disciples could be seen spreading the positivity doctrine throughout the highways and byways of the world. The expansion of the development of AI may be seen in Thatchenkery and Metzker’s appreciative intelligence (2006); Ludema’s work in positivity (Cummings & Worley, 2009); and Whitney, Trosten-Bloom, and Rader’s appreciative leadership (2010).

Advances in AI are but one path to progress within the field of OD. Another area of promise in OD is the continued manifestation of strategic change called agility. Agility is an advanced organizational capability that supports an
organization’s ability to react to changing circumstances in a more timely, effective, and sustained manner than its competition.

In the face of overwhelming operational environment pressures, according to Benedictine University professor Rachel Narel, agility is the next major development of OD (Sorensen, Yaeger, & Narel, 2017). But, becoming an agile organization is a process of OD. Organizations seeking to make such a transformation must engage in a process of planned strategic change.

When entertaining a matter of OD and planned strategic change, it is natural to look to Chris Worley for guidance, and his collaboration with Ed Lawler and Tom Williams, *The Agility Factor*, does not disappoint. The authors created a concept they called the Agility Pyramid to operationalize the capability. This Agility Pyramid demonstrates how an agile organization requires a set of interdependent agile routines, differentiated capabilities, and management practices to be effective (Worley, Williams, & Lawler, 2014; Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, & Savall, 2015).

This Agility Pyramid is a triangle divided into three sections (see Figure 1). The top section (the routines of agility) represents doing things differently to obtain a performance advantage. The middle section (the capabilities section) describes the ability and capacity to get things done better, faster, or cheaper than the competition. The bottom section or base of the triangle relates to the efficient execution of good day-to-day management practices. Agility and the Agility Pyramid represent a different way of thinking about OD. It helps OD practitioners answer the question: “What’s the next, best, right thing that needs to be done to make this organization
more effective?” (Worley, 2017). Once again, Worley continues the manifestation today of contributions provided to the world over half a century ago, via that novel idea of standing on the shoulders of the early pioneer of the field, Dick Beckhard.

![Agility Pyramid](image)

*Figure 1. Agility Pyramid*

The concept of standing on the shoulders of others is the driving force to discovery (the manifestation of new developments in the field) and delivery (the
proliferation of new vehicles of utility of traditional developments in the field) of expanding capability. This simple concept states that by standing on the shoulders of or building on the foundations laid by OD pioneer Rensis Likert and his theory on participative management, researchers such as Trist and McGregor were able to develop the basis for the QWL stem of OD. As Stephen H. Cady put it in his Communicating OD Knowledge Award acceptance speech at the 2017 OD Network National Conference, “by standing on the shoulders of giants, we can see a lot further down the road.” This increase in vision produces an increase in view, and the more we can see, the more we can know. Lastly, these advances in knowledge lead to new discoveries of capabilities as well as new means of learning and sharing these capabilities.

Given the natural progression of the advancement of science, it is only logical to expect that with the establishment of every capability (the result of standing on the shoulders of someone), there eventually is the possibility that there will be further advancement of the capability (the result of standing on the shoulders of someone who already standing on the shoulders of another).

**Summary**

OD was defined by one of its premier founders, Richard Beckhard, as follows: “Organization Development is an effort planned, organization-wide, and managed from the top to increase effectiveness and health [emphasis added] through planned interventions in the organization’s processes, using behavioral science knowledge” (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 2).
A close examination of this definition, with a concentration on increasing the organization’s health, leads to the terminology the author of this body of work has adopted for the Benedictine University PhD in Organization Development graduate: “Business Doctor.”

This research study examines the “development” of organization development, with a focus on answering the question: Does the original research in the field continue to impact the development of the field for today and tomorrow? This evaluation will be conducted by focusing on the inputs of one OD founder’s contributions in particular—Dick Beckhard. It will then, through an inductive analysis, take these specific developments acquired from the efforts of Beckhard and associate them to the development of the field of OD as a whole to deduce generalized answers to the research question posed by the dissertation.

The analysis will begin with a review of the many documented contributions accredited to Beckhard. This analysis will be followed by an assessment of contemporary advances in OD, as a result of these contributions by Beckhard, dividing this assessment into archetypes developed by the author. These categories have been labeled as manifestation and proliferation. Manifestations of an original concept are either the metamorphosis of the concept into a new advanced concept or the support of an advanced concept. Additionally, the next category for advances of original contributions to the field of OD to be discussed in this body of work will be proliferations. Proliferations capture advancements in capabilities of the field through the expansion of the footprint of capability by various people, processes, and
procedural phenomena within the field of OD. The following sections contain a more complete review of the two archetypes elaborated on in this analysis.

**Manifestations of OD**

When the word “manifestation” was Googled, the following definition was listed: “noun—an event, action, or object that clearly shows or embodies something, especially a theory or an abstract idea.” However, as stated by the author, the concept entitled “manifestations” of OD principles refers to advancements of the field via an evolution of capability. These advances are usually forged in one of what has been categorized as four delineated camps of thought: progressive, noncontiguous, noncoherence, or synthesized expansion of the field. These avenues of development are closely based on the works of Golden-Biddle and Locke (2007).

Progressive expansion seeks the natural extensions of research, as outlined by Golden-Biddle and Locke in their work regarding the development of novel research. A second stream of research is the identifying of gaps in the research and extending philosophy within these findings by filling the gaps of understanding with newly formed theory. This stream was called the noncontiguous approach, for it addresses areas of research that are consistent but incomplete. The third component of research development is the utilization of an established theory of development taken in a whole new direction to reveal new or extended capabilities. Examples of such expansions may be seen in Cooperrider’s AI research. His research went contrary to the preponderance of contemporary negative-based theory.
The other camp of manifestation is the combining of two (or more) established theories (i.e., a thesis and antithesis) to develop a new capability (synthesis). This camp is logically called synthesized. An example of such research is when Deb Noumair, a clinical psychologist at Columbia University, eloquently took the Burke-Litwin change model of OD and applied the principles of clinical psychology to the underlying concepts of transactional and transformational leadership. The resulting premise was entitled “Underneath the Burke-Litwin Change Model.” This concept addresses the psychological ramifications of applying the Burke-Litwin change model and provides clarity to understanding how the top portion of the model applied to a leader’s transformational train of thought, while the bottom portion of the model addresses the transactional aspects of the leader’s perspective (Noumair, 2017). The Noumair example provides an excellent demonstration of the power that exists in the synergy of synthesized theories and their manifestation of the field of OD.

**Proliferations of OD**

The concept of manifestation addresses the expansion of the field of OD via the evolution of capabilities, through the discovery of new conceptual, applicable, or technological use of a capability. However, there is another form of advancement within OD. This form of advancement is the mode by which OD capabilities are learned and shared with others. For the sake of this body of work, this mode of expansion has been labeled proliferation. A Google search of the word “proliferation” yields the simple definition: “noun—rapid increase in number”; however, as stated by
the author in this instance, the concept entitled “proliferation” is how the field of OD has continued to evolve through various avenues of expansion that extend the reach of OD beyond established boundaries.

A wonderfully powerful demonstration of proliferation was revealed when an OD professor from George Williams College read a paper from one of his young graduate students. He encouraged the student’s continued efforts in OD and began a mentor/mentee relationship with him. As a result, that grad student attended a lecture series and decided OD was for him. The grad student went on to make a major contribution to the field of OD and the world. That professor was Dr. Peter Sorensen; that young grad student was Dr. David Cooperrider; and, finally, that contribution was AI. How ironic, and yet fitting, that when I attended the OD Network 2017 awards ceremony, the Awards Committee had adeptly selected two individuals as the 2017 Lifetime Achievement Award recipients: Dr. Peter Sorensen and Dr. David Cooperrider. This demonstrates the power of proliferation in advancing the field of OD.

**Conclusion**

The introduction began by posing an overarching research question. This background chapter then provided a brief biography of one of the foremost pioneers of the field of OD, Dick Beckhard. The chapter continued with a historical account of the field, coupled with a predictive component as an addendum, to explain the development of OD from the past to present, and provided a potential glimpse of the future advancements in OD. Next, the chapter provided an explanation of the
categories and means of the expansion and advancement of the field of OD. Finally, the chapter closes with a recap of the introduction review as well as an introduction to the remaining chapters ahead in this dissertation.

Now, with a clear picture of the biography and history to be discussed, the dissertation will forge the essence of a biographical historiography. It will accomplish this by providing a list of contributing topics and authors that make up the diverse subject matter included within either the study of the life of Dick Beckhard or the content covered in the corresponding historical recap of the contemporary landscape surrounding his life.

Next, the body of work expounds on the research methodology adopted by the author in this study. It first explains the selection of historiography over other methodologies. It then highlights the strength of Obrien, Remenyi, and Keaney’s (2004) method over alternative researchers’ approach to historiography. This section also includes an explanation of the biographical focus attached to this historiography. Finally, this section concludes with a review of the value of pre-knowledge and rigor of the qualitative research methodology.

The fifth chapter will provide a discussion of the results of this research. It will elaborate on the reflections of the various aspects of Beckhard’s life with a historiographic emphasis of his accomplishments, reviewing these episodes from a longitudinal capability development and impact perspective. This chapter will provide evidentiary substantiation to the answer to the research question posed in Chapter 1.
The last chapter will provide an all-encompassing summary of the findings of the research. Additionally, this chapter will provide some future implications as well as areas of research that might be conducted as a complement of this work, to address gaps in knowledge uncovered by this dissertation.

In closing, this chapter laid the requisite foundation to go on a path of discovery and clarity in determining if the impact of early OD pioneers continues to have influence today.
Chapter 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is intended to achieve four purposes:

1. Position the research topic within the relevant body of literature
2. Distinguish the study by showing the gaps in the existing body of knowledge
3. Ground the study in the existing literature
4. Provide a clear focus for the study (Thomas & Brubaker, 2000)

The literature reviewed focused on the central research question, which served to guide this study: “Do the contributions made by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact today?”

Given this question, it seemed only natural to begin this review of the literature at the root of the question: Dick Beckhard. Fortunately, two distinctive advantages existed in the execution strategy of the research: personal consulting experience and informal meetings with peers of the subject matter. These two advantages produced what is referred to as pre-knowledge information and are the baseline for the development of the biographical component of the dissertation. After searching the literature for biographical insights, save for his autobiography, there existed minimal extant literature on the topic. Except for a couple of interviews (Conole, 1982 and Lansberg & Beckhard, 1983) and a few short tributes to his life (Fry, 2017; Lansberg, 2001; Schein, 2003), there was a glaring gap in literature regarding Beckhard’s life—a life that provided so much enlightenment. This confirmed the importance of this research to the field of OD and fulfilled the first two purposes of the literature review as identified by Thomas and Brubaker. The
following is a review of the pertinent extant literature that addresses the biographical component of the research topic.

**The Life of Dick Beckhard**

The stage was set to expand my horizon on this subject. So, I proceeded to review everything I could find that Beckhard had written: Beckhard, 1966; Beckhard, 1967; Beckhard, 1969; Beckhard, 1972a; Beckhard, 1972b; Beckhard, 1975; Beckhard, 1984; Beckhard, 1997; and his collaborations with Dyer (1981, 1983a, 1983b); Harris (1977, 1987); Hesselbein, Goldsmith, and Beckhard (1996, 1997); and Pritchard (1992).

Next, I sought as much background information as I could find, specifically addressing Beckhard’s work. Conole, 1982; Cummings and Worley, 2009; Fry, 2017; Hampton, 1997; Hillman and Varney, 1985; Kleiner, 2008; Lansberg, 2001; Schein, 2003; and Tartell, 2016 addressed various aspects of his work. From this body of literature, combined with his autobiography, it was possible to construct a fairly complete recreation of Beckhard’s life.

When the pre-knowledge information set (consisting of candid casual conversations with people who actually knew the character of Dick Beckhard) was combined with this acquired knowledge, a very clear picture of Richard Beckhard started to materialize and became the substance of the interpretive biography.

The next section of the literature review will address the literature relevant to providing a clear focus for the study within the time continuum. The section focuses the research topic within the OD venue, while establishing a chronological reference
base for exploring the research, thus addressing Thomas and Brubaker’s fourth purpose.

**The History of OD**

**Background**

Due to the exploratory nature of this study, an initial review of literature was performed prior to conducting the research (as part of the doctoral program’s candidacy qualifying process). This initial investigation had the following focus: OD theory, change management, family business, entrepreneurship, strategy, leadership, and governance. An additional literature review was conducted during and following data analysis to support discovery. This review added the following topics: Beckhard, POS and AI, open systems and system thinking, and strategic human resources. The original literature review was modified to better address the data analysis.

The scholarly setting in which this research was implemented is in the fields of entrepreneurship, family science, and consulting. The literature germane to this research crosses a vast and diverse span of topics, from Lewin’s change model (Cummings & Worley, 2009) to Likert’s participative management theory (Cummings & Worley, 2009), to Beckhard’s confrontation meeting theory (Beckhard, 1997). (For the next generation of OD icons, incorporating technology into the evolution of the workplace is a natural continuation of the work started by McGregor and Beckhard at General Mills as well as Trist, Bamforth, and Rice of the Tavistock Institute in the United Kingdom [Burke & Noumair, 2015]).
History

The literature covering the history of OD is almost unlimited, because the diversity of the subject could be as vast as the writings of every individual academic and practitioner one may encounter as well as the writings any of these individuals may recommend. While an all-inclusive OD literature review is not practical, a detailed analysis of the work of researchers such as Beckhard, Lewin, Likert, McGregor, Weisbord, Cummings, Worley, Schein, Beer, Burke, Litwin, Blake, Mouton, Robertson, Roberts, Porras, Pasmore, Woodman, Noumair, Hofstede, Golombiewski, Stringer, Galbraith, Buono, Cooperrider, Narel, Tenkasi, Yaeger, and of course Sorensen provides an adequate foundation to speak the language as well as develop perspective of the subject matter of OD, past and present.

Once sufficiently equipped with the information from the classics of Lewinian change model and force field theory, the scholar-practitioner would do well to become acquainted with the concepts of participative management systems and linking pin models, include a little Theory X and Y, as well as some T-group analysis, large scale interventions, sociotechnical systems, and managerial grid via Cummings and Worley (2009). One should be capable of differentiating culture (Schein, 2010) and climate (Stringer, 2002) to master the basics of OD. Next, the scholar-practitioner would learn modeling theory that would offer explanations of the mechanistic process of how change occurs (Burke, 2014; Robertson, Roberts, & Porras, 1993); study what some of the brightest minds in the field have to say about OD (Woodman, Pasmore, & Shani, 2010) as well as consulting (Block, 2011; Jamieson, Barnett, & Buono,
2016; Schein, 2016); and throw in some organization design (Galbraith, Downey, & Kates, 2002) and global (Sorensen, Head, Yeager, & Cooperrider, 2011) and strategic OD (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996; Yaeger & Sorensen, 2009) for completeness. Finally, take the most revolutionary concept to be developed in the field in the last 30 years, AI (Cooperrider, Sorensen, Yaeger, & Whitney, 2005), and look to see what’s next—agility (Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, & Savall, 2015) and how to develop the training models to get there—degrees, certifications, specialized programs, seminars, etc. (Sorensen, Yeager, & Narel, 2017).

After all this, and an extensive review of literature within fields complementary to OD, has been completed in support of a dissertation topic, a candidate is prepared to conduct the analysis of this study. Nevertheless, as a final audit of completeness, a review of The Palgrave Handbook of Organizational Change Thinkers provides insight on the thoughts of some of the greatest minds in the field of OD (Szabla, Pasmore, Barnes, & Gipson, 2017). A search of this data would highlight the researchers being recognized as the “who” involved in these achievements. Next, consideration needs to be made to address the “what” aspect of this analysis.

The initiation of the managerial and organizational behavior and leadership study would highlight the various stems of OD. Such research included Hesselbein, Goldsmith, and Beckhard (1996); Cameron, Dutton, and Quinn (2003); Cummings and Worley (2009); Drucker (2006); Kleiner (2008); Likert (1979); McGregor
(1960); and Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, and Savall (2015). These gurus on the topic bring a glass-like clarity to the “what” of this historical analysis.

**Historiography**

Another element in the history of OD segment of the literature review is the review of the body of literature required to have a mastery of the analysis methodology: historiography. Foundational views of the concept were based on the works of Gummesson (2000). This area was thoroughly elaborated upon by the writings of Elton (1989) and Mason, McKenney, and Copeland (1997). Additionally, there was the 2016 version of the online course for historiography by editor Okunade (2016) from the University of Ibadan Distance Learning Centre (in Nigeria), highlighting Barraclough, Carr, and Collingwood’s perspectives on the matter. Finally, the source that anchored the methodology of this dissertation (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004) provided a by-the-numbers exemplary description of how to execute an effective historiography to ascertain useful knowledge. This knowledge will support the development of a tool or means of establishing connectivity of multiple events through time.

Now armed with the knowledge to utilize this tool and the accumulation of the various information sets, a researcher would be well equipped to duplicate these efforts and analyze the impact of an Ed Schein while he is available to add his personal feedback to the analysis (one of the limitations and weaknesses of this study).
**Future Focus**

Since this study was by design a historiography, an evaluation ranging from the past to the present was the prerequisite for an in-depth analysis. However, to add a predictive component to the study, additional investigation had to take place. Hesselbein, Goldsmith, and Beckhard (1996) led this stream of research, but Burnes and Cook (2012), Pasmore (2015), and Sharkey and Barrett (2017) also provided the necessary grounding. Care had to be exercised with this segment of research. Due to the basic predictive function requirement, preference was given to the more contemporary and traditional tried-and-true literature.

Linda Sharkey’s latest book *The Future-proof Workplace* (Sharkey & Barrett, 2017) compares traditional versus evolving management practices to supply a path to effective longevity. This journey centered around six key factors: leadership, culture, purpose, inclusion, relationship, and technology.

These six topics are investigated through the works of multiple OD elites. As one might expect, the works of the tried and true in leadership theory for OD—Beer, Burke, Pasmore, and Schein, as always, proved invaluable. The connection between leadership and culture (Schein, 2010); the concept of transformational leadership and transactional management (Beer, 2009; Burke & Litwin, 1992); and leading continuous complex change (Pasmore, 2015) all provide support for Sharkey and Barrett’s assessment of the evolution of the future workplace. As a supplement, Jamieson and Gellerman’s (2014) work on values and ethics offered an outstanding area of future research for the organization process.
As one studies the content of this topic and relates the significance of the concept of time to the process of expansion, the use of historical and predictive characteristics presents a viable means of content categorization. This technique was mastered through the review of the works of Harris, Sorensen, and Yaeger (2018); Hesselbein, Goldsmith, and Beckhard (1996); Sharkey and Barrett (2017); and Pasmore (2015).

The balance of this literature review will address Thomas and Brubaker’s third component, grounding the study in the existing literature which can support the research topic. This support covers areas that are thematic to the research topic (Richard Beckhard).

**The Consultation Process**

This section of the dissertation demonstrates the impetus behind the author’s pursuit of doctoral studies and the Benedictine University PHDOD program. Armed with knowledge from the military that there were three categories of “qualified”—qualified, fully qualified, and best qualified—it was a conscious decision that to be part of that best qualified category, it meant obtaining a PhD. To secure a doctorate that specifically prepares one for an effective career in consulting, no choice is better than a scholar-practitioner program in OD.

The literature pertinent to this particular topic extends beyond the scope of OD into the various genre of business, management, and economics in the hard sciences and psychology, sociology, and philosophy in the soft sciences. Therefore, to limit the boundaries of this literature review, the author will reference Gummesson
(2000) and acknowledge that the development of consultative expertise has an expectation and prerequisite of some pre-understanding and pre-knowledge in various subject matters that may not be included in this section.

There are a few names that must be included in a literature review on consulting. Universally, the first one to come to mind would be the great practitioner Peter Block (2011). Therefore, this became the anchor literature of research on this topic. It provided all the practical knowledge necessary for an MBA-trained industrial engineer to become an effective consultant. Next, one needed to look beyond the practical aspect of consulting, to address the expectation and requirement of a higher theoretical understanding of the consulting process as a consultant moves beyond Taylorism behavior.

When examining the theoretical, conceptual aspect of consulting, there is none greater than Ed Schein (I was fortunate enough to have him as one of my professors). His seminal work Process Consultation Revisited (Schein, 1999b) is the anchor for my research on the theoretical aspects of consulting, and his Humble Consulting (2016) provides me insights to his over half century of consulting experience. To complement Schein’s work, research highlighted various theoretical aspects of “the process” that included works of Worley and Mohrman’s engage and learn model and Koller’s reframing the resistance-commitment paradigm, in addition to other exceptional theorists such as Robert Barnett, Glenda Eoyang, Mandersheid and Davidson, and Nancy Weidenfeller (Jamieson, Barnett, & Buono, 2016). These theorists have contributed to the latest edition of Jamieson, Barnett, and Buono’s
Consultation for Organizational Change Revisited (2016). Additional theoretical background as well as an understanding of the area was obtained via the latest work of the great W. Warner Burke in his collaboration with Deb Noumair (2015), the seminal textbook of Cummings and Worley (2009), and the works of Jamieson and Gellerman (2014). These considerations help forge a sound understanding of the concepts behind establishing various subcomponents for the overall theory of the organization consultation process. From this point, I could identify the importance Beckhard brought to the craft of consulting.

However, while it is true I was most fortunate to have Schein as one of my professors, it was not a unique occurrence. I was also fortunate enough to have Michael Beer, Warner Burke, Deb Noumair, Bill Pasmore, Dick Woodman, Tony Buono, Henri Savall, Gina Hinrich, Matt Minihan, and David Jamieson (my personal role model in developing my own practitioner-scholar model) all teach my classes. With a cadre of this caliber providing the basis of the consulting theory, it would be a tough task to not obtain a certain mastery of the topic. Beer (2009) provided insight on alignment of personnel and culture to accomplish simultaneous high performance and high commitment within an organization. Fitting commentary regarding Beckhard’s goals, roles, processes, and interpersonal relationship (GRPI) model was shared by Pasmore: “The big idea behind GRPI is that most of the problems teams experience are not because people can’t get along; in fact, the reason they sometimes don’t get along is because there is no alignment on goals, roles, and processes” (Pasmore, 2015, p. 172). Burke and Noumair (2015) provided a collaboration that
gave Block a run for his money. The book is filled with gems of wisdom for executing an OD intervention; however, I remain a huge fan of their “beneath the surface of the Burke-Litwin model.” It was this model, along with Stavros and Hinrich’s (2009) SOAR concept, that was the muse to my development of “modes of expansion” theory via the manifestation process (Burke & Noumair, 2015, p. 168).

Bill Pasmore, either with his perennial editing companions (Woodman, Pasmore, & Shani, 2010), with his latest collaboration (Szabla, Pasmore, Barnes, & Gipson, 2017), or alone (2015), provides valued contributions and counsel to the aspiring consultant.

The promotion of research within the organization consultation process included a major push in the “use of self” in the consultant’s analysis. This topic was the focus of Jamieson, Auron, and Schechtman, as well as one of the three primary areas of study for Jamieson, Barnett, and Buono (2016). Also, while Mandersheid and Davidson’s assessment of leadership transition did not make the “use of self” section of Jamieson, Barnett, and Buono’s Consultation for Organizational Change Revisited (2016), that did not keep the subject from easing its way into their writing. The issue is so germane to research today that Jamieson himself collaborated with Lesley McKnight on one of the articles within this section of the book.

Noumair actually builds “use of self” into her collaboration with Burke (Burke & Noumair, 2015). Dick Beckhard practically put it in the title of his memoir, Agent of Change: My Life, My Practice (1997). One of Beckhard’s former students and now an accomplished university professor mentioned that “use of self” was a
trademark technique of Beckhard’s consulting practice. In fact, Jamieson, Barnett, and Buono’s 2016 work provided valuable insight into this current research, supporting the basis for effectively supplementing Dick Beckhard’s work in the GRPI model with Rania Labik’s current research in family business emotions. This research synthesizes works in AI (Cooperrider, Sorensen, Yaeger, & Whitney, 2005); psychological capital (Luthans & Avolio, 2014); POS (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003); and now adds William Brendel’s mindfulness-based consulting (Jamieson, Barnett, & Buono, 2016) research into a platform that utilizes Labik’s research in emotions as the framework for supporting the interpersonal aspect of Beckhard’s GRPI model as applied to process consultation.

While on the topic of AI and since a prophet has no honor in his own country, I would be remiss to fail to acknowledge here the greatness of the consulting work presented by the triumphant trio recognized as three of the greatest 100 minds in OD according to The Palgrave Handbook of Organization Change Thinkers (Szabla, Pasmore, Barnes, & Gipson, 2017). They are Peter Sorensen, Therese Yaeger, and Ram Tenkasi (admittedly, I do have some bias on this topic). These great thinkers are also great doers and provided quality consultation on the topic of consulting. I found their writings such as Critical Issues in Organization Development: Case Studies for Analysis and Discussion (Johnson, Sorensen, & Yaeger, 2013; Yaeger & Sorensen, 2009) to be effective tools for consultant training. While each has his or her own research focus (Tenkasi—organization knowledge, Yaeger and Sorensen—strategic and global OD), they all are avid supporters of David Cooperrider and his famed
consulting technique AI. In fact, with Sorensen as his mentor, Tenkasi his protégé, and Cooperrider as a member of Yaeger’s dissertation committee, no one gets through Benedictine’s OD program without an appreciation for AI (Cooperrider, Sorensen, Yaeger, & Whitney, 2005; Sorensen, Head, Yaeger, & Cooperrider, 2011; Yaeger, Sorensen, & Bengtsson, 2005).

The final subject to be addressed under the consulting theme was the consultant’s ability to successfully influence culture. Robert Stringer’s *Leadership and Organizational Climate* (2002) is a seminal work on the topic of climate and a perfect complement to Edgar Schein’s *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2010). When these two foundational findings are supplemented by the works of Burke and Noumair (2015), it paints a picture that is captured by the following quote: “Schein (1997) expressed that culture and leadership are two sides of the same coin” (Jamieson, Barnett, & Buono, 2016, p. 95).

This analysis ultimately presents the value associated with the consultant’s understanding and appreciation of culture within an organization, a fact Schein clearly states was a quality acquired through his affiliation with Beckhard (Schein, 2003) and published in the article “What I Learned from Dick Beckhard.” Ultimately, the lesson one acquires from the literature is the importance of relationship as the key to effective consulting. This philosophy was the central theme of Beckhard’s consulting practice (Beckhard, 1997) and the primary impetus of Schein’s book *Humble Consulting* (2016).
It is here that my work will seek to connect the dots, establishing points (or nodes) of connectivity between Beckhard’s early contributions and his progression in the area of consulting. By taking the research question “Do the contributions made by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact today?” and directing its focus toward Beckhard’s consulting endeavors, one may develop the supplemental question: “Do the contributions made in the area of management consulting by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact to the consulting field today?”

**The Field of Family Business**

The next field of consideration to be reviewed is the literature to support family business. Family firms are now acknowledged as the predominant form of business enterprise in the world. This is particularly important when one considers the near complete neglect of family firms in management research before the launch of the Family Firm Institute and *Family Business Review*.

Today, family business research is a thriving field. The premier research teams for this area were either the combination of Chrisman, Chua, and Steier (2011) or a permutation of the team’s effort within a supplementary research team. As noted, these permutations often included additional prominent family business researchers such as Promodita Sharma, Mike Wright, Ezra Memill, Alfredo Demaisis, and G. T. (Tom) Lumpkin writing on topics from entrepreneurship and multigenerational enterprises to behavioral trends and heterogeneity makeup of executive management teams in family firms.
In addition to the impressive triad previously mentioned, this field of research presented the work of other notable scholars who never managed to publish with Chrisman, Chua, or Steier. The most prolific of these were Joseph Astrachan and Peter Jaskiewicz (2008). Their groundbreaking work concerning emotions within the family business is revolutionary and the target of some post-doctoral research ambitions. Both of these scholars’ work (collaboratively and separately) delivered great insight into the paradoxical relationship between family businesses and business families, through the use of family science. The “reciprocal relationships between family and organizational life” (Jaskiewicz, Combs, Shanine, & Kacmar, 2017, p. 310) demonstrate how the findings reinforce the belief in the field that it is the codependent role of family and business that distinguishes family business studies from other disciplines that only focus on issues of importance to either individual system (e.g., Astrachan, 2017; Jaskiewicz, Combs, Shanine, & Kacmar, 2017). Additionally, Thomas Zellweger (2017) provides great insight for governance within the co-existing systems of family and business.

This extensive literature search covered the field of family business quite completely, yet it took the research and writings of Beckhard to identify the prominent inconsistency in the alignment of business literature and the customary utility of management theory.

Connecting the dots or establishing what I call “nodes of connectivity” within the area of contemporary family business and this current study of Beckhard’s early contributions, the inquiry becomes: “Do the contributions made in the area of family
business development by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact to family businesses today?”

**Human Capital Development**

Ed Schein once wrote: “Organizations are increasingly catching on that people (human resources) are not an expendable resource and a cost factor in the economics of the firm but rather a capital investment to be valued and nurtured” (Vogelsang et al., 2013, p. 15).

With this perspective, it is easy to see these characteristics in the actions of Beckhard. His propensity for valuing, nurturing, and helping others was a highly documented fact and could be viewed in most of his writings (Beckhard, 1997, p. 159; Beckhard & Harris, 1987, p. 30; Hesselbein, Goldsmith, & Beckhard, 1996, p. 125), writings about him (Fry, 2017, p. 95; Lansberg & Beckhard, 1983, p. 32; Schein, 2003, p. 329); and historical accounts spanning his lifetime (Burke, 2014, p. 116; Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 283; Kleiner, 2008, p. 190). To state this is rudimentary to the topic; therefore, I could simply take a summary of this study’s references as documentation of Beckhard’s proclivity toward developing human capital. Nevertheless, I will take this opportunity to document the theory that has emerged, as a result of this particular theme of my study.

The matter of developing human capital covers a lot of ground. There is Beckhard as an instrument of education: as mentioned above, his writings, writings about him, and history’s account of him and his time. There is Beckhard as a consultant (Beckhard, 1997; Beckhard & Dyer, 1983a, 1983b; Block, 2011; Lansberg
& Beckhard, 1983; Schein, 1999a) as well as Beckhard assuming the role of leader (Beckhard, 1969). The point being made here is that attempting to summarize the many ways Dick Beckhard helped to promote the development of human capital is quite a body of knowledge. However, what should be noted is that his efforts back in the 1950s and 1960s continue to impact the development process today. The creation of seminars, degree programs, and organizations are all examples of this fact.

Now, while I can capture the efforts of his educational endeavors via Anderson (2016), Beckhard (1997), Fry (2017), or Schein (2003), I am unable to document his mentoring sessions nearly as well. This fact is a result of the personalized informal and confidential nature of these events (Beckhard, 1997, p. 67). The areas that were far more forthcoming in providing evidence of this specific contribution were websites (like the Family Firm Institute or OD Network), notes (Beckhard was known for adding a personal touch as a means of relationship development), and particularly personal conversations (an evidentiary bonanza, but with limited documentation).

No matter what the medium, Beckhard’s propensity for the development of human capital was very apparent in his life’s work. This became the impetus for the development of my theory of expansion (or as I labeled it, the proliferation of OD) by the transference of knowledge and skills, as well as the building of capacity to facilitate and enhance the management of change in the future. This magnification and extension of capability is accomplished through exponential growth via educational and professional society programs, counseling, consulting, mentoring,
and various other ways of information exchange management. This theory is the synergy of a truly hermeneutical analysis of Burke (2014); Cummings and Worley (2009); Kleiner (2008); McWhinney (1992); Smith and Berg (1987); Worley, Hitchin, and Ross (1996); and The Holy Bible as to developing a concept on how to share information and make it common knowledge.

Like the other contribution-focused theme, this one will be tested via the primary research question: “Do the contributions made in the area of human capital development by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact on the development of personnel today?”

**Ancillary Areas with Astonishing Impact**

This section of the study allows me to acknowledge streams of literature for anomalies that were encountered as part of this research but did not clearly align with any established category. Still, their relevance was deemed worthy of an honorable mention within findings. I will start with the matter I found most interesting: Beckhard’s impact on the field of POS, particularly AI.

**Positivity**

Beckhard’s writing had an openly observable propensity toward positivity. This was undoubtedly due to his great appreciation for culture and relationship building. His close affiliation and collaboration with his mentor Doug McGregor and colleague Ed Schein would account for this disposition toward his every interaction with a client (Beckhard, 1997; Beckhard & Harris, 1987; McGregor, 1960). It was the specific terminology and description of Beckhard and Harris’ “managing
organizational transition” (1987) that parallels the language of David Cooperrider’s AI “desired state” (Cooperrider, Sorensen, Yaeger, & Whitney, 2005).

The positivity movement presence appears in the creation of positive psychology, psychological capital, and AI. This movement continues to manifest itself today in Thatchenkery and Metzker’s appreciative intelligence (2006) and Whitney, Trosten-Bloom, and Rader’s appreciative leadership (2010). While it was fairly evident that Beckhard and Harris’ organization transition model can be traced back to McGregor (Beckhard, 1997), it was noted that AI traces its roots through Douglas McGregor’s Theory Y as well as Blake and Mouton’s managerial grid concepts (Kleiner, 2008) and that Cooperrider was a direct protégé of Beckhard’s protégé Ron Fry. Nevertheless, these links were not strong enough to validate that AI’s developmental path came through Beckhard. This was the topic of lively debate among the authors of the unpublished paper of Harris, Sorensen, and Yaeger (2018) presented at the 2018 Academy of Management Annual Conference.

As a result, I will be continuing this particular line of research via content and historical analysis (Beckhard, 1997; Beckhard & Harris, 1987; Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Cooperrider, Sorensen, Yaeger, & Whitney, 2005; Kleiner, 2008; Sorensen & Minahan, 2011). Additionally, building extraordinary organizations is not a matter of focusing exclusively on the positive; it is a matter of understanding how so-called “positive forces” (e.g., creativity, innovation, positive emotions, etc.) function in dynamic relationships with so-called “negative forces” (e.g., negative emotions, conflict, etc.).
With Bright and Miller (2012) in mind, I will turn my attention toward a manifestation analysis along a complementary line of research on emotions. Building on the previously studied works of Astrachan and Jaskiewicz (2008) as well as Labaki and D’Allura (2017), I will pursue this investigation; however, to fully develop this body of knowledge would be a dissertation in itself and will be addressed as a matter of post-doctoral research.

**Socio-economic Approach to Management**

A socio-economic approach to management or SEAM is an effective analytical tool developed by Henri Savall of ISEOR/University of Lyon in the early 1970s to assist organizations in becoming more efficient and profitable. I immediately embraced it because it appealed to my engineering and economics frame of mind, with quantitative results that were measurable.

The application capitalizes on an extensive history of success in more than 1,300 organizations to continue to develop successful historical and institutional knowledge, validate legitimacy of methodology, and expand its disciples and presence around the globe with every intervention (Conbere, Savall, & Heorhiadi, 2016).

SEAM is based on many of the behavioral principles that founded the field of OD (Conbere & Heorhiadi, 2011). Also, links to OD have been further enhanced over the last 10 years through the hosting of international doctoral conferences at the University of Lyon by ISEOR and the Organization Development and Change Division of the Academy of Management (Sorensen, Yaeger, Savall, Zardet, Bonnet,
& Peron, 2011). Savall created his approach to organizational change as a response to flawed management theory and incomplete accounting theory; and in this approach, calculating hidden costs became one of the cornerstones of SEAM interventions (Conbere & Heorhiadi, 2015).

The quantifiable benefits of the SEAM approach make it a formidable task to not be a fan; however, it was the writings of its co-creators that made it win a spot on this distinguished list. “The cornerstone that imparts strength and durability to our method is precisely the particulars we attach to human potential whose consideration is vital in all areas of activity...” (Savall, Peron, & Zardet, 2016, p. 3).

In the mold of OD, SEAM may be shown to promote the development of human resources by introducing SEAM theory that is rooted in the philosophy that the key to enriching an organization lies in developing its people. SEAM’s functionality is based on the dysfunctionality of people within an organization. These dysfunctions are working conditions, work organization, communication, coordination and cooperation, time management, integrated training, and strategic implementation (Savall, 2018). These dysfunctions are addressed using specific tools which are the periodically negotiable activity contract, the competency grid, the priority action plan, the strategic piloting logbook, time management tools, and the internal/external strategic action plan. This distinct set of management tools acts as agility factors to upgrade the assessment process.

Once one has assessed the human potential of an operation and developed agility factors to supplement organizational operations, finally, one can align these
actions with the organization’s strategic plan; suddenly, SEAM begins to look an awful lot like OD. With all the alignment to OD, it should come as no surprise that the literature for this stream of research would bring us back to Chris Worley (Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, & Savall, 2015).

When the extant literature of Worley is combined with that of the SEAM literature already discussed (e.g., Conbere, Savall, & Heorhiadi, 2016; Savall, Peron, & Zardet, 2016; Sorensen, Yaeger, Savall, Zardet, Bonnet, & Peron, 2011), the result is Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, and Savall’s *Becoming Agile: How the SEAM Approach to Management Builds Adaptability* (2015). This collaboration of work is a continued manifestation of contributions that may be traced back to Beckhard’s early work in developing strategy.

My efforts to bring this stream of research a full 360 degrees back to Beckhard, by extending the expansion of this theory to GRPI was the subject of an unpublished paper I presented at the 2018 ISEOR-AOM International Conference in Lyon, France (Harris, 2018). This completes my review of the literature pertinent to the analysis of SEAM. Though I did not deem Beckhard’s influence on the literature sufficient to develop a theme around this topic, I felt it presented an intriguing demonstration of the continued concept of manifestation expansion warranting mention and post-doctoral investigation.

**Diversity and Inclusion**

The final topic was the area of diversity and inclusion. This topic had the least amount of formal written documentation available for review; however, because of
my personal interest and the vital importance of the topic, it secured the final position within this section. My justification simply is that there are two forms of communication: active and passive. Words are passive.

An analysis of the written words (or passive voice) of Beckhard’s contribution to diversity and inclusion may be indirectly found in his comments within his memoirs (Beckhard, 1997, pp. 2-3). Other than the comments indicating Beckhard’s position on the matter, there is little else to go by. Therefore, an evidentiary assessment needed to be conducted based on his actions (or active voice) and the verbal account of individuals who encountered the times and actions of the man.

Beckhard was known for his affinity toward diversity (Kleiner, 2008) and the use of both his active and passive voice for social justice. Examples of this fact may be found in the literature, with historical accounts of his working relationship with John Carter (African American male), Billie Alban (Caucasian female), Ernesto Poza (Latino male), Edie Seashore (Caucasian female), Frances Baldwin (African American female), Juanita Brown (Caucasian female), Fredrick Miller (African American male), Ivan Lansberg Jr. (Latino male), and Carolyn Lukensmeyer (Caucasian female), although some of these examples were pulled from the Family Firm Institute or OD Network websites, as well as conversations or opportunities that presented themselves during my research (Beckhard, 1997; Bennett, 2006; Kleiner, 2008). All of these individuals worked with Beckhard and went on to have extraordinary careers in OD or family business.
The stream of literature to adequately cover the topic of diversity and inclusion included Jones and Brazzel (2014) and Miller and Katz (2002). In a time when it was not fashionable, mandatory, or even understood as value-added to do right, Beckhard did it, because it was the right thing to do. That, the author deemed astonishing!

**Literature Review Summary**

This study is located at the intersection of the bodies of literature related to OD, management consulting, family business, and leadership/governance and centered around the primary topic of Richard Beckhard. While a deep dive into due diligence will consist of extant OD literature, the investigation and review of the corresponding literature compels mention of these ancillary areas. This concludes the section on ancillary topics to identified themes as well as the literature review and sets the stage for the next chapter on methodology.
Chapter 4: METHODOLOGY

The first decision one must make in determining a methodology is: Does the research question call for a quantitative or qualitative study? Quantitative studies are confirmatory in nature, while qualitative research tends to be a discovery-oriented approach utilized for exploratory work. For the research question: “Do the contributions made by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact today?” the author decided the best research design for supporting this body of work was qualitative in nature to explore how meanings are formed and transformed within the context of history.

There are many options of qualitative research methods available to study historical methods: Biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, and case study are all viable methods of researching a qualitative topic according to Creswell (1998, p. 47). My choice was fairly easy; since I sought to center my research around Beckhard, I choose a biography. Since this research reviewed the aspect of relating OD to history, a historiography of the life of Dick Beckhard was selected to fit the topics of family business, management consultancy, positivity, etc. within the scope of this investigation and bring everything together. It should be noted that since the historiography had a biographical component to it, the result felt almost like developing a biography in the midst of grounded theory (one did not really know where the research would take you).

An analysis of data retrieved via a literature review of secondary information, expert consultation, and personal conversations provided an in-depth historical
reenactment of Beckhard’s behavioral science-based contributions to the development of various fields, such as OD, family business, and management consulting, to name a few. Finally, it should be noted here that this type of study will produce large quantities of data represented by words and ideas, rather than numbers and statistics.

This data is then compiled and compared to prevailing conceptual thoughts within these fields for alignment and relevance of the expansion of theory. Archival analysis is an assessment of information provided by a secondary research source, such as books, journals and publications, videos, and personal notes. This form of research is the foundation of discovery, since it reduces the physical limitations attached to the personal participation requirement of primary research and provides a springboard to future empirical experimentation and/or research. Primary research sources contributing to this dissertation consisted of personal conversations and related experiences. This research was reviewed by the author for relevance and rigor.

The balance between relevance and rigor is a timeless inquiry that presents various obstacles to a researcher’s progression. For far too long, traditional researchers and research programs have based their perspective of rigor on statistical significance. Fortunately, I selected a doctoral program and dissertation committee that recognizes the value of well-designed and correlated qualitative research. They were open to the possibility of historical research rigor, based on the integrity of presented evidence, avoidance of preconceived notions, a comprehensive and exhaustive supply of information sources, sound criticism of these sources, and intellectual honesty of argument, in lieu of mere quantifiable and acceptable
Cronbach alpha. There is no formula for finding the right balance between rigor and relevance; however, the enlightened perspective of my dissertation committee made it possible for me to confidently pursue research of increased relevance rather than statistical rigor. As a result, this historical analysis focuses on making meaning of Beckhard’s contributions, rather than merely documenting historical accounts and experiences of his life. Nevertheless, all research has the responsibility of convincing researchers and their audience that the findings are based on critical investigation. I am convinced this dissertation meets that requisite criterion and provides a significant contribution to the field of OD, filling a glaring gap in the previously documented history of OD as well as providing a guide of practical, reproducible applications of implementation of Beckhard’s historical success.

An interesting determination was uncovered while studying qualitative methods and applying it to the consultation process. According to Gummesson (2000), given sufficient pre-consultation, historical data and appropriate observations, analysis of the consultation process, as well as post-consultation performance, a sound qualitative research investigation could be conducted via a case study centered around historical analysis. Therefore, the author utilized all avenues of primary research sources to establish pre-understanding, as a precedent for growth in knowledge as a result of the secondary research sources. In turn, this new base of knowledge consistently became the pre-understanding baseline to all subsequent growth. The whole process followed an alluring cycle of action science.

According to historiography experts O’Brien, Remenyi, and Keaney,
Any understanding of phenomenon or a situation will usually have to be based on a knowledge and appreciation of the trajectory of circumstances which have led up to it. It is this ability of the past to inform the present which makes historical studies interesting to the business and management studies scholar. (2004, p. 136)

This dissertation concurs with O’Brien, Remenyi, and Keaney and proposes that Beckhard’s trajectory of circumstances of the past may not only better inform us of our present, but also enlighten mankind of the possibilities of the future. This fact is the impetus for the selection of historiography as the method of choice for this research project. Elton provides additional guidance as he points out “Knowledge of all sources, and competent criticism of them—these are the basic requirements of a reliable historiography” (1989, p. 69). Additionally, historiography can offer the management researcher an opportunity to acquire a rich understanding of a situation and the context in which it exists. Knowing the background to any issue enhances our comprehension and improves our ability to see what is important and what is not. (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 135)

Armed with Gummesson’s (2000, p. 98) concept of using history as a “hermeneutic bridge” connecting the past and present, I decided to pursue a historiography. With the decision made for historiography, I felt Gummesson would require supplemental guidance to meet my needs. To my good fortune, I found an online course on historiography from the University of Ibadan (Nigeria) edited by Professor Okunade (2016). It provided valuable insight as to how Barraclough (1955), Carr (1967), and Collingwood’s (1945) conceptual methodology would carry out the research design; however, only O’Brien, Remenyi, and Keaney (2004) provided a step-by-step road map for execution. For that reason, O’Brien, Remenyi,
and Keaney’s research design methodology was selected but reinforced with a corresponding biographical analysis. Equipped with this information, I felt ready to pursue my research.

The following is a summary of the nine steps that make up this method, along with an explanation of the step (in italics), and the author’s brief description of the step, as it relates to this project:

Step 1. The Research Question

_Historiography, like any other research project, begins with the need to focus on a specific research question. The characteristics required of this research question differ from others in this field of study in that there needs to be a specific expectation that a study of the past will throw light on the possible answers to the current questions._ (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 138)

To begin this research project, I originally looked at returning to my own roots of family business (as my father had been the owner of a few local stores). I felt the implications of such a study would have a great positive impact on micro-entrepreneurs of today. Then I was introduced to the Family Firm Institute and Dick Beckhard. As I studied the topic, it became obvious to me that I could not capture all Beckhard’s contributions in this singular focus. I was forced to widen my view. As I did, it became apparent that tracking the glidepath and impact over time of all Beckhard’s varied contributions would provide too massive a scope to adequately address in a dissertation. So, I identified potential spheres of influence; however, I concentrated my efforts on OD, to deliver a more complete and significant contribution to the field of OD.
Step 2. The Relevance Check

A historiographic approach to research in business and management studies will only be relevant in a limited number of circumstances, and therefore it is important for the researchers to check if they are on the right track. One situation suggesting that historiography is a useful approach may be a situation where there is evidence of a previous event having special importance on how current decisions are made. (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 138)

The relevance of this body of work captures the essence of the historiography. It recaps the highlights of OD’s past as a baseline of projection. It extends the boundaries of OD over the time spectrum to contemporary accomplishments. It even predicts future relevant areas of study for OD. Furthermore, this historiography provides the relevance of extending OD into other areas of business (i.e., strategy and consultancy) and even into alternative fields of study (i.e., family business). Additionally, as this research study flourishes, only time will tell what corresponding contributions will be uncovered, but that starting points addresses a gap currently existing in literature.

Step 3. The Scope of the Research

Having established a suitable research question, the next step is to determine the scope of research. At this stage it is also necessary to establish the unit of analysis to be used. The research may also look at an organization, an individual, or an industry. The results of this scoping exercise will be a high level plan highlighting the areas to be researched and the direct object or objects of the research. This gives the researcher a firm starting point from which to proceed. (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 138)

The scope of data for this study includes archival data, along with the contributions of a unique pre-understanding of the subject matter based on the concept of storytelling that was acquired in the predissertation phase of this project.
This supplemental information was worth mentioning because these informal conversations provided vast amounts of insight (both verbal and nonverbal—facial expressions, emotions, posture, voice pitch, etc.) regarding the character of the man, Dick Beckhard.

**Step 4. Sources of Evidence**

*History stands or falls on the researcher’s ability to obtain a range of reputable and credible sources of evidence. Evidence may be categorized into primary and secondary evidence.* (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 139)

Credible sources of evidence included multiple biographies (from different authors in different countries); Beckhard’s autobiography (memoir); published interviews; informal documented discussions; books; book reviews; journal articles; websites; videos; consultant reports; handwritten notes; an obituary; and the richest stories imaginable from personal colleagues, friends, students, and protégés of Beckhard. All the previously mentioned sources, save the rich storytelling component, would be categorized as secondary evidence. Storytelling would be considered a form of primary evidence.

In traditional empirical research we are ever cognizant of the importance of reliability, internal validity, and external validity in the substantiation of research evidence. However, due to the qualitative nature of the historiography, I will forgo such terms in lieu of the alternative constructs recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985), which are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability for the evidentiary substantiation process. Also, to varying degrees of specificity, bastardized forms of audit trails, member checks, and peer review or debriefing were used to
complement the triangulation process in confirming the adequacy and appropriateness of data collected.

**Step 5. Assessment of Methods Analysis**

The assessment of the specific methods that will be used in the research is the next step. As historiography is essentially interpretist, then the methods will largely come from this side of the research equation. If a hybrid approach is used incorporating some qualitative techniques, then perhaps content analysis may be used. (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 139)

After the data had been collected from all sources, the method of analysis incorporated to support this historiography research project was historical analysis. Historical analysis may be divided into three categories: chronological, thematic, and a combination of these two methods (Underwood, 1991). I utilized the combination method to connect the life experiences of Dick Beckhard to themes of OD growth and expansion patterns (manifestations and proliferations).

Convinced that historiography captures the essence of the glidepath of the OD phenomenon over the time continuum moving forward from the mid-1940s to the present, I realized I needed a way to explore the analysis of inscribing a body of experiences connecting the life of Beckhard to themes of this glidepath. I took favor with Creswell’s qualitative research work with biographies and, specifically, his endorsement of Denzin’s work in *Interpretive Biography* (Creswell, 1998, p. 50; Denzin, 1989). This utilization of collected personal life documents, stories, accounts, and narratives which describe turning points in individuals’ lives was determined to be an effective method to analyze Beckhard’s life story. A quick review of this
methodology will help clarify the research design. Creswell (1998, p. 50) provides five general steps to execute in an interpretive biographical analysis:

1. Note subject’s life experiences (either chronologically or as highlights)
2. Gather life stories on subject
3. Organize stories around pivotal event themes
4. Explore the meaning of these stories
5. Explain meaning of stories in themes of historical context

The synergy of these two methodologies combined for a powerful and informative historiography.

Finally, as an added supplement to the combined assessment of the historical and biographical analysis, I conducted a content analysis of the literature to uncover hidden potential connectivity and areas of interest. The combination of these three strategies rendered a complete method of inquiry.

**Step 6. Assembling the Evidence**

The next step is to assemble the evidence from the various sources to be used. This is a major component of the work involved. There are various techniques which may be used during this activity. Elton (1989) points out that the research may be drawn into all sorts of new areas and questions as the research proceeds. He makes the point that in historical research “(the researcher) becomes the servant of his evidence.” Here Argyris and Schon (1978) suggest that the historiographer needs to develop his or her own espoused theory at this stage. Each piece of evidence will have to be critically scrutinized and weighed carefully. (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 139)

Evidence was assembled by the emergence of various topics of interest via the following order of operations:
1. First—Biographical Analysis

2. Next—Historical Analysis

3. Finally—Content Analysis

With the initial biographical assessment, subcategories such as open systems theory, large group interventions, management transitions, confrontation meetings, and GRPI merged into one of four major findings:

1. Beckhard’s contributions to OD
2. Beckhard’s contributions to management consulting
3. Beckhard’s contributions to family business
4. Beckhard’s contributions to human capital development

Once the biographical analysis had developed a full picture of the major findings and subcategories from the life of Richard Beckhard, a historical analysis centered around these results was conducted to develop both a chronological and a thematic analysis. This evaluation produced an assessment that was essentially through an OD lens, yet encompassed the full spectrum of the biographical findings over a corresponding time frame. The resulting historical blueprint provided a complementary overlay based on pivotal turning points in Beckhard’s life around his contributions to OD. While this body of work acknowledges the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the evidence of Beckhard’s contributions to family business, management consulting, and human capital development, the project design will restrict its applications to the field of OD, addressing these alternate fields in post-doctoral research.
With the biographical picture sketched and the historical blueprint overlaid, patterns of correlations start to develop. At this point relationships are identified connecting what had been thought of to this point as unrelated occurrences, and content analysis may be employed to uncover additional hidden relationships buried deeper within the data. These actions produce relational opportunities for discovery that transforms unrelated collected data into information regarding the endeavors of Beckhard, relative to the efforts of others, both contemporary and in perpetuity, by way of some form of interpretive conduit. This is the initiation of the hermeneutic bridge.

**Step 7. Developing the Story**

_While the evidence is being collected, historiographers will be developing the story or narrative which is one of the primary products of the work. This requires the determination of patterns in and explanation of facts. For this part of the research to be credible, the historiographer needs to tell the story with the highest degree of integrity._ (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 140)

In accordance with the results of the analysis of Step 6, patterns emerge from information acquired in the analysis. It is the scholarly evaluation of this information that constitutes confirmable knowledge. Regarding the scenario selected for this dissertation, the story that emerged for the timeline under consideration is that Beckhard was a preeminent practitioner who became a premier MIT academician. His contributions not only revolutionized OD, but, as the historiographical exploration exposed, he had a history of greatness as a management consultant, a family business expert, and a human capital developer. Each of these capabilities that developed may be connected to his original contributions to OD. It is within this step that the
extraction of confirmable knowledge takes place. It is this confirmable knowledge that perpetuates the hermeneutic bridge.

Finally, as a by-product of the production of confirmable knowledge, this step yielded intermediate knowledge that developed sub-themes that presented clear indicators of additional potential areas for future investigation. These sub-themes included the following:

1. Team Building
2. Positive Organizational Scholarship
3. Leadership
4. Global OD
5. Diversity and Inclusion

Each of these areas may develop to fruition with the continued research and development of the field (and historiography) in totality.

**Step 8. Critiquing the Story**

*This step involves the major intellectual challenge of the research. Once the narrative has been developed, researchers need to apply the skill of critique. The type of critique employed may be wide ranging and may address the story or narrative at various levels. The researcher needs to be continuously aware of the problem of bias, the problem of preconceptions, and the problem of selective perceptions. It needs to be remembered that the historiographer seldom has a full set of information. At the end of this process, researchers need to feel confident that a credible story is being told and that the story helps add something of value to the body of knowledge. This is not a trivial task, but it is essential that the work receives recognition from those who are qualified to comment on the work. But like all other forms of research, the finding of the historiographers may not represent the final word in this area of research.* (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 140)
The purpose of my research went beyond taking collected data, analyzing it to obtain information, which I then evaluated to gain knowledge. It was my responsibility to use my intellectual capacity to process this knowledge to make decisions that may be depended on to provide value and, in this case, a contribution to the field of OD (maybe this is why the military calls this process acquiring intelligence). This process is achieved through an unbiased critical critique of my work.

The nine-step process specifically cautions here against bias. To avoid the potential of bias, I acquired the critique of my research from renowned OD scholars and practitioners acquainted with Beckhard, esteemed academicians I admired (both nationally and internationally), a world-class Benedictine academic staff, and other OD colleagues I respected, to obtain their views. Finally, an additional example of my critiquing process was presentations of this research to colleagues at professional conferences such as the Midwest Academy of Management Regional Conference, OD Network National Conference, Academy of Management National Conference, and the ISEOR-AOM International Conference (Lyon, France) to receive their critiques of the significance of my research.

**Step 9. The Outcome of the Research**

*The final step is the articulation of what this project has actually added to the body of knowledge and how this could be put to use by management. This will be the research findings and conclusions. In the field of management studies, this may also include some specific consulting advice.* (O’Brien, Remenyi, & Keaney, 2004, p. 141)
The outcome of this study added richness on the contributions of Dick Beckhard to the body of knowledge not presented before. This richness should expand our knowledge of Beckhard’s role in pioneering OD and provide the groundwork for developing similar analyses in the fields of family business, management consulting, and human capital development. Additionally, this study should shed new light on Beckhard’s contributions to some of the most thought-provoking stimuli for consideration of Beckhard’s efforts being at the root of some of the most prominent areas of research today (team building, POS, leadership, global OD, and diversity and inclusion).

Finally, the richness of this study should provide insight into the two modes of expansion in the field of OD and secure Beckhard’s place as a giant in OD history.
Chapter 5: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

How can we optimally mobilize human resources and energy to achieve the organization’s mission and, at the same time, maintain a viable, growing organization of people whose personal needs for worth, growth, and satisfaction are significantly met at work? (Beckhard, 1969, p. 1)

This chapter of the body of work provides a discussion of the results of the O’Brien, Remenyi, and Keaney (2004) nine-step historiography of OD pioneer Dick Beckhard. Following the path of this document will show a clear trajectory of how the field of OD developed as well as the prominent role Beckhard played in both the cause and effect of the development of the field of OD. Where does this path begin? With the establishment of a research question.

Step 1. The Research Question

To initiate this research project, the author reviewed OD applications within the family business field. After some in-depth investigation, and good counsel from the academic staff at Benedictine University on the topic, it was concluded that the utilization of OD applications extends beyond OD to fields such as management consulting and family business. The study of these extensions provided the formation of the research question as well as the boundaries of the inquiry.

From this investigation, the author formulated a research question asking: “Do the original contributions of the field of OD continue to influence the development of the field?” However, by giving consideration to the fact that these early contributions’ impact extended beyond the field of OD to the development of other fields (i.e., family business or management consulting), the scope of the research question could
be expanded by extending the research question to the contributions of Dick Beckhard.

By extending the question from the generic contributions of early OD founders to specifically directing it toward Beckhard, the research question accomplished progress down two avenues of pursuit: extending OD contributions to ancillary venues and researching a previously unresearched founding icon of OD, Richard Beckhard.

So, structuring the final research question as: “Do the contributions made by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact today?” supports the contributions of my research to the field of OD via these two paths of discovery, as well as extends across the time continuum from the past to the present and opens possibilities for the future. The answer to this question provides both doctoral and post-doctoral opportunities for investigation.

**Step 2. The Relevance Check**

The relevance check on my research covers two distinct areas: the relevance of this research to the development of the field of OD via synthesized coherence (bringing together concepts) and the relevance of this research to the field via noncontiguous coherence (filling a gap in the information).

**Synthesized Research Development**

The relevance of this research examines the views of the past as precursors and linkages to the present and indicators of the future. This research incorporates
previous OD work linking past contributions to contemporary capabilities as a baseline metric of continued investigative inquiry.

The accumulation and examination of original research in the field of OD is well documented; however, the relevance of this work increases significantly in value when the relationship between the developments of the past is connected to the emergence of theory and capability across the forthcoming decades of discovery. Such patterns of discovery encompass research that provides growth in enlightenment collaboratively across varied venues and continually across the time continuum for an individual venue.

By incorporating the accomplishments of Beckhard into the investigation, the research opened doors to relevance of discovery within multiple fields of management and expanded the realm of possibilities significantly. This expansion of capability resulting from extending OD into other areas of business, such as family business and management consulting, provides potential advancements in these coordinating fields by various means of expansion (i.e., progressive and noncoherence as well as synthesized and noncontiguous).

Finally, as this line of research yields results, time will determine the magnitude and extent of the true relevance of corresponding contributions that will be uncovered, as discovery evolves along the various avenues of approach.

**Noncontiguous Field Development**

As I initially reviewed the dissertation work available in scholarly literature, I found research centered around Lewin, Likert, McGregor, Trist, Burke, Alban, Edie
and Charlie Seashore, and many of the other great OD founders. A glaring gap in the literature was research highlighting the contributions of Dick Beckhard. Yet, an examination of the dissertation by John Bennett (2006) of the Fielding Graduate University on living legends that highlighted Burke, Alban, Edie and Charlie Seashore, and Schein as recently as 2006 indicated that, taken collectively, the one person deemed most influential to these legends as a group was Dick Beckhard. This is truly remarkable because the only other figure to influence every living legend’s life was the highly acclaimed Kurt Lewin and yet he was not found to be of significant influence to any one of these individuals. One additional noteworthy point of information was that three of these living legends distinguished Beckhard as having a major influence on them. No one else impacted these icons to such a high level, to include Lewin, who was not listed as significantly influencing any of the five (see Table 2). What was even more remarkable was that with all the acknowledgement and accolades rendered to Beckhard by these legends, no one had produced a dissertation highlighting his contributions.

Therefore, it was quite fortuitous that I was able to address my original research question by centering the study on this founding father of the field. This occurrence enhanced my research from only contributing to the area of synthesized coherence (the connectivity of contributions to the field of OD through time) to additionally filling a noncontiguous coherence area of the field (filling the glaring gap in OD research that highlights the contributions of Dick Beckhard).
Therefore, this research proves to be significantly relevant to the development of the field of OD in two distinct and independent methods.

Table 2. Adaptation of Bennett’s Key Influencers Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Billie</th>
<th>Warner</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>Charlie</th>
<th>Edie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckhard, Richard</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewin, Kurt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepard, Herb</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gildewell, Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, Carl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyris, Chris</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benne, Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford, Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornstein, Harvey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippett, Ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor, Doug</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Carl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allport, Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovalos, Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushnell, Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibb, Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, Filmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield, Florence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An “X” indicates this person was a recognized influence. An asterisk (*) indicates the participant considers this person to have had a major or significant influence on them.

Note: Adapted from Professional Work from Life: Lived-Experience and the Formation of the Professional Work of Scholar-Practitioners (p. 124), by J. L. Bennett, 2006, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Fielding Graduate University, Santa Barbara, CA.
Step 3. The Scope of the Research

The scope of the data collected included various forms of archival data that covered more than 70 years of OD history. Such an analysis is event-based and highlights occurrence of individual developments over an estimated timeframe of 1940-2018. While the total scope of the analysis captures the full time interval prescribed (and may have relevant input as far back as 1918), by focusing the scope around an individual, Dick Beckhard’s role in OD, the analysis originates in the time interval 1950-1999 and tracks developments from that duration through current times. To supplement the thoroughness and completeness of the research project, archival data was verified and enhanced by using research from distinguished colleagues and acquaintances of Beckhard to provide anecdotal data for pre-understanding and cross-validation of subject matter based on the concept of storytelling. This insight capitalizes on both active and passive forms of communications to highlight the enhanced scope reviewed over the allocated time. This supplemental knowledge provided an enhanced clarity to information within the scope of the analysis.

Step 4. Sources of Evidence

In order to proceed with the research, multiple and diverse credible sources of evidence were required. To capture historical accounts of the development of the field of OD, the author utilized a combination of books, articles, videos, and published dissertations that addressed the topic, as well as conversations with distinguished living legends who lived through the time period in question. The last source of discovery of OD history is a product of the information age. A plethora of
information was retrieved regarding the history of OD via various internet searches. These varied sources of detail allowed the author to construct a clear picture of the origin and evolution of the field of OD and support the historical analysis of the dissertation.

The second component of this assessment is the biographical analysis of the individual: Dick Beckhard. In addition to all the previously mentioned sources of information used in the historical analysis, the biographical analysis of this document added the use of memoirs, published interviews, informal documented discussions, book reviews, consultant reports, handwritten notes, and an obituary to provide increased insights to the discovery of details on the man, Dick Beckhard.

The final component of the assessment was the content analysis of both the biographical and historical analyses, to determine points of commonality that are a final source of evidence.

**Step 5. Assessment of Methods Analysis**

**Map and Overlay Process**

As part of my military training, I learned to read a map. As a military leader, I was trained to create an overlay to complement that map. The overlay normally was a piece of clear acetate that had grid coordinates marked on it to align the overlay with the grid coordinates of the map. This sheet of acetate contained lists of pertinent information on it, relevant to the corresponding information on the map. By properly placing the overlay over the map (aligning the corresponding grid coordinates), the
two instruments combined to tell a story that was essential to understanding and accomplishing the mission.

This research project utilized this map and overlay process to develop a method for correlating the pertinent biographical data of Dick Beckhard to a historical mapping of occurrences within the field of OD. By aligning the metaphorical grid coordinates of time, the two instruments of my research align to tell a story that is the basis of this dissertation.

**Analysis**

This project had a tri-modal analysis process. The first phase was a historical assessment of OD. This phase examined the origin of OD and traced its development through contemporary evolutions within the field. The scope of this analysis provided the basic topography of history, relevant to the field of OD. This is the construction of the map of the period of review.

The second phase of the research project conducted an analysis of the life and accomplishments of Dick Beckhard. This analysis provided an in-depth review of the highlights of Beckhard’s achievements and the overview of potential content to be correlated to the historical map.

The last step of the three-phase process provided a content analysis to produce a summary of categories for Beckhard’s contributions. These categories make up the themes for which the overlay is related to the map. This relationship forms the foundation of the premise that demonstrates the glidepath that connects early
achievements to current and future accomplishments, as well as the purpose of this dissertation.

Once one has completed the tri-modal analysis, the process of overlaying the themes over the historical mapping provides apparent connectivity of development through time (nodes of connectivity). These nodes of connectivity present the areas where early contributions have impact on specific developments. This can be a very precise science; however, the extrapolation of this information to predict future areas of development is not an exact science. Nevertheless, this process can provide relatively clear expectations of the glidepath of developments.

This concludes the initial portion of the Results and Discussion chapter. This initial portion has provided an overview of how the remainder of the chapter (which constitutes the bulk of this body of work) will be laid out and put together. This process will begin with the development of an overlay of information presenting the highlights of the accomplishments of Dick Beckhard.

**Step 6. Assembling the Evidence**

**Biographical Analysis—The Overlay**

This section of my research reports on the life of the great OD pioneer Dick Beckhard. It elaborates on the many contributions that emanate from his works. The Beckhard story is a riches to rags back to riches story that is well worth telling. He went from a life of great means to one of obscurity, finally rebounding to a life of great accomplishments in many fields.
Born to a family of great wealth in 1918, Beckhard lived and learned the life of privilege. Such a life introduced him to the benefits of prosperity. This life continued until the stock market crash of 1929, when the family lost practically everything (Beckhard, 1997). The importance of this event was the introduction of Beckhard to the value of diversity, hard work, and being able to relate to people at every level.

Additionally, at the age of 12, Beckhard was bitten by the acting bug. This occurrence impacted the life of Beckhard in ways he could not have imagined. The theater is how he worked his way through Pomona College (an elite institution of higher academia); the theater is how Beckhard worked his way up to the executive level of the Red Cross; and the theater is the means by which (after a stage manager career on Broadway) he became a staging consultant for clients like Ford Motor Company, the World’s Fair, the Girl Scouts of America, and, most notably to OD, the NTL. It was this last staging consultation that introduced Beckhard to the field of applied behavioral sciences and began his higher level of understanding of organizational operations. This allowed him to see the value of staging in the execution of an OD intervention.

In fact, OD great Ed Schein was quoted as saying this concerning Beckhard’s staging background:

If it is true that Dick’s great sense of design and process came from his background as a stage manager in the theater, then perhaps a stint in drama and stage management should be a part of all management training. (Schein, 2003, p. 332)
This concludes the preamble of Beckhard’s pre-professional life and leads into the four themes developed from a content analysis of his professional life. These themes provide the relevance of the various segments of the life and times of Richard Beckhard.

**Themes**
The evaluation of the content analysis of Beckhard’s life provided four dominant themes to base his life’s analysis: OD pioneer, management consultant, family business field of study founder, and developer of human capital. These themes categorized the highlights of Beckhard’s life into areas that demonstrate the impact of his early works on current developments. The results and discussion of this analysis will primarily focus on Beckhard’s contributions as an OD pioneer but will conduct thematic assessment for each of the identified opportunities to indicate potential for future research in ancillary areas as they become apparent.

**OD Pioneer**
In 1946, Richard Beckhard returned from his deployment to the South Pacific with the Red Cross, in support of the war. After a short, marginally successful stretch in the theater, he abandoned his theatrical pursuits and in 1947 began utilizing his staging talents in alternate ways. He began to stage meetings to enhance their effectiveness. Soon he was requested to contribute articles to a magazine (named *Sales Meeting*) whose purpose was to enhance sale meetings’ efficacy. Soon, he was labeled as an expert.
His big break came later that year, when Ford Motor Company was introducing a revolutionary vehicle and wanted a revolutionary industrial show to present it. Beckhard was able to secure a staging consultant opportunity and upon successful execution of the Ford industrial show, was offered a consulting job on the Chicago World Fair. This was followed by major projects with the Girl Scouts of America and The White House. By this time, Beckhard had gained a reputation as an expert in industrial staging and meeting enhancement, when into his office walks none other than Ron Lippett and Lee Bradford.

It had long been the goal of enterprise management to improve organization effectiveness, primarily by way of increased productivity via workers’ physical endeavors. In the 1920s Frederick Taylor introduced improved efficiency through industrial engineering methodologies. During World War II these efforts made the United States the highest producing country in the world. To achieve these levels of output, systems were put in place to maximize the productivity of each worker. The focus was on doing the job, with little attention given to psychological and emotional needs of those who performed the work. After the war, the United States economy boomed due to the purchasing power of the returning servicemen. To meet the increased demand, industrial production attempted to emulate the surge efforts of World War II by engineering approaches; however, American production management was stunned to discover that engineering principles that were effective during the war were futile now because labor and management no long shared a common cause. People wanted more recognition and rewards as well as realized that
only through collective efforts could there be a parity or balance of power between management and labor.

The concept of the boss as the “great man” commander simply was not working. Leadership training to provide supervisors enlightenment in self-awareness, skills in relating to others, and communications skills was required to promote the human aspect of leadership. Lewin was beginning preliminary work on the change process and force field analysis, while Likert and his companions at the University of Michigan’s Institute of Social Research were beginning survey feedback work. Nevertheless, to address the human component of management, Lewin, Lippitt, Benne, and Bradford initiated T-group research in 1946 and established NTL in 1947.

In 1950 NTL was going into its fourth summer of operations. Two of the three founders of NTL (Ronald Lippitt and Leland Bradford) came to visit Beckhard. Bradford was the director of the Adult Education Division of the National Education Association. NTL was established as a separate entity under that division, with Bradford as its director. Lippitt was an associate of Kurt Lewin. Since Lewin’s untimely death, he had taken charge of the Research Center for Group Dynamics at MIT. Lippitt had also been named one of the co-directors of NTL (Kenneth Benne being the other). These two OD giants eventually saw the value of Beckhard’s meeting staging skills and hoped to utilize this ability to help spice up the presentation of their somewhat dry group dynamics research theory training sessions. As compensation for his contributions to NTL’s summer session, they offered Beckhard a scholarship to attend the sessions and participate in a T-group. Little did
they know they were creating a force within the industry whose repercussions would send ripples throughout the waves of time. Yet, this was the result of equipping a “master of setting the stage” with mentorship from Leland Bradford and Ken Benne as well as training from Ron Lippitt and Alvin Zander (two of Kurt Lewin’s direct colleagues at the Research Center for Group Dynamics) and the tools of OD of the time (group dynamics).

As I [Beckhard] thought about the presentation on theories about effective group functioning and about the ways meetings were actually conducted, I realized there was little connection between the two. The knowledge and understandings that were being discovered were not being translated or applied to managers or leaders in organizations…. Perhaps what was needed was a “bridge” between the two worlds—someone who understood the principles and theory and who could translate and help apply them to the communications problems and challenges facing managers. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 22)

As Beckhard completed that first summer at NTL, he reluctantly realized that there was gap between theory and practice in group functioning and meeting execution. Beckhard hoped he could be the “bridge” between the worlds of theory and application. To that end, Beckhard studied the concepts of process, decision-making, power, and leadership. He studied the writings of Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Wesley on planning change. Finally, he made plans to return to NTL the next year to continue his growth in the area of group dynamics. Beckhard commented on this first-year experience:

Lee [Bradford] and his wonderful wife, Marty, had open houses after the evening meeting. Most faculty would go over there for drinks and what became interesting discussion. People would share significant events of the day, discuss how lab learning was being accepted, and discuss the learning community and adult education. I literally sat at the feet of these great minds as they discussed, debated, developed
new theories, and heatedly discussed the world situation and politics...I felt very humble and inadequate alongside these thought leaders and gurus—and lucky to be there...Those three weeks changed my life. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 35)

In 1951, Beckhard was managing a large-scale conference project (UNESCO Conference). He also returned to NTL to be in charge of its large meetings program and continue his development in OD. That same year, Beckhard picked up his first applied behavioral scientist consulting client (Bob Hood and Ansul Chemical Company) to take the learning laboratory to the field and begin his training on applying the theory he was learning at NTL in a practical application. Lastly, the working relationship with and mentorship from Doug McGregor began.

Beckhard’s comments on the next few years of experience at NTL follow:

Lee never let me be forgotten. He would engage me, ask my opinion, treat me as if I mattered. Through his behavior, other staff began to respect my contributions. Even though I had none of the formal training or experience the others had, I was accepted as a full-fledged member of the staff. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 35)

In 1952, Beckhard became a co-trainer for T-groups and in 1953 he joined the T-group staff. His transformation from meetings and conference planning expert to organization consultant was complete.

As a result of his development via the above NTL training, Beckhard had acquired a new set of skills that he was honing. He began to recognize the value of his abilities went beyond a specific subject matter (i.e., meeting or conference planning) to managing processes. He also realized that the primary focus of his practice and training was the facilitation of change. Additionally, he noted that most of these changes were connected to needed or desired organization change.
Management Consultant

Beckhard noted that “Lee [Bradford] always respected my practical side. He encouraged me to do some consulting with the central staff” (Beckhard, 1997, p. 35). Additionally, “My professional and personal relationship with Hood was my training school in consulting. It was my graduate education—and I was paid for it for over ten years. Probably I should have paid Hood” (Beckhard, 1997, p. 57).

As Beckhard continued to capitalize on his NTL experience, he started to realize how decisions are made in organizations; the communications and participation patterns, norms, and leadership styles in organizations are all processes to be managed. He began to understand that attention to these processes is fundamental to an effective consulting relationship.

Beckhard’s first consulting assignment was with Robert Hood and the fire prevention equipment company Ansul Chemical Company in Marinette, Wisconsin, in 1951. Ed Schein defined theory as the “mental model of how the world works that helps us perceive, understand, simplify, explain, predict, and control what is going on” (Schein, 1999a, p. 84). Ansul provided Beckhard a living laboratory in which to develop his theories of consulting, apply these theories, and get the most relevant feedback on individual and organizational capacity and capability increase (a scenario quite similar to Lewin’s use of Marrow and Harwood Manufacturing Company).

It was with Ansul that Beckhard honed his consulting skills, mastered systems thinking, developed concepts and frameworks that helped clients think about their
issues, and ultimately jump-started his extensive practice. It was here at Ansul that Beckhard had his first great revelations for consulting:

1. Bring learning from other experiences to each new client
2. Bring value as a change agent, rather than subject matter expertise
3. Bring importance of attention to relationships (Beckhard, 1997, pp. 65 and 66)

His next two clients came as a result of his work at Ansul. Hood was a member of the Young Presidents Organization and introduced Beckhard to George Raymond (of Raymond Industries) and Roger Sonnabend (of Hotel Corporation of America). Beckhard had adopted the Lippitt, Watson, and Wesley three-state change model—present, transition, and future states. Through his experience with these clients, Beckhard developed a way to manage each of these states:

The Future State: To define and develop the desired state, Beckhard used the scenario development concept to build the perception of how the desired organization behavior in the changed state should look. This perception takes the shape of the organization’s view of the best, most capable, and desired outcome of the organization’s appearance, design, and functionality formed by the management’s perspective.

The Present State: To analyze the present state Beckhard developed a series of diagnostic inquiries of present conditions in the context of the desired state. This present condition analysis included evaluation of prevailing attitudes, commitment, and requisite resource support for change to happen.
The Transition State: To manage the transition state, where all the changing takes place, Beckhard identified four major activities and structures: activity planning, commitment planning, change management structures, and managing the learning process during change. Beckhard analyzed the variables within an organization that influence change (i.e., communications, decision-making, reward system, work, etc.) and determined that work was the most critical parameter of study. He then devised a roadmap to capture the specific activity and events that must take place for change to be successful and called it the activity process (Beckhard & Harris, 1987; Cummings & Worley, 2009).

Beckhard knew that having a good change plan was no guarantee of successful execution of change management (1997, see pp. 62 and 176), so he devised a process to identify key individuals whose commitment was critical to change success. This was captured in a document he called a Commitment Chart (see Table 3). This document assesses requisite and current commitment, as well as the differential between these two variables.
Table 3. Commitment Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Players</th>
<th>No Commitment</th>
<th>Let It Happen</th>
<th>Help It Happen</th>
<th>Make It Happen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MG Wells</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Skubi</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Casey</td>
<td></td>
<td>(XO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Pickens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(XO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Bradley</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Solsberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(XO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Lars</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Trudeau</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSG Millington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(XO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSG Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
O—Represents required commitment from this person for this project
X—Represents current commitment of this person to this project
If X and O are in the same box, person has desired commitment; if not, strategy must be developed to adjust person’s commitment as needed.

In 1953, Beckhard was selected to lead a four-person leadership training team headed to Austria for the State Department—a team that also included Elbert Burr (vice president of personnel at Monsanto Chemicals Company), Robert Hood (president of Ansul Chemical Company), and Lee Bradford (NTL director). This successful experience introduced him to the nature and importance of culture to international consulting. Soon he began to acquire clients and engage in consultation in London (J. Lyons Ltd. and Imperial Chemical Industries).

As Beckhard’s consulting opportunities continued to grow, he continued to utilize the learning from prior consulting experiences to guide the actions taken with his new clients. Since his first four clients were all family businesses, it provided him
a great lead into that field (as outlined in the next section). As learning extended from client to client, patterns of organizational behavior and remedial interventions began to develop. Soon Beckhard distilled these patterns into a set of consulting principles. These five principles were:

1. Principle One: Joint client and consultant learning must occur
2. Principle Two: The relationship could not be time bound
3. Principle Three: Continuing and periodic feedback was required
4. Principle Four: Establishing a partnership with senior management personnel was necessary
5. Principle Five: Confidentiality is assured by client approval (Beckhard, 1997, p. 66)

**Family Business Field Founder**

In 1982, Beckhard’s life was operating like a finely tuned engine. He was teaching doctoral and master students, Sloan fellows, and senior executive classes at MIT. His consulting practice was thriving, both stateside and abroad. He continued to staff NTL programs, while enjoying his summer home, Shangri La, on Lake Kezar and writing his book. Yet, he was experiencing the paradox that is Dick Beckhard. His life was full, but empty. In other words, he was doing a lot but not learning very much. He decided it was time to revisit family businesses, where his career had got its start.

As Beckhard and his research assistant, W. Gibb Dyer, researched the field to see what was recorded about family business, they discovered there was very little
research work in the literature. This fact drove Beckhard to the next chapter of his life: family business research.

Their research revealed a great disparity between supply and demand of talent development. The business and management schools were training students to become senior managers in major corporations (i.e., GM, Procter & Gamble, and IBM); however, over 90% of all businesses in the United States were family owned or controlled. As Beckhard evaluated these facts, he realized the disconnect between the educational design and reality. This fact was confirmed when Beckhard conducted a study of the Sloan student body that indicated over 70% of incoming master’s students came from family businesses and 75% of this population eventually planned to return to their family businesses (Beckhard, 1997, p. 137).

Beckhard designed a three-year action research project that, in typical Beckhard fashion, analyzed the family business from a systems perspective: the family, firm, and CEO all as separate intertwining subsystems. It would be funded by several of his former consulting clients that were family-owned businesses, recruited by him to support the endeavor (funds were to cover Dyer’s salary and other expenses; Beckhard donated his time). These same clients would provide their companies as field sites for research studies. In return, the participating companies would receive full access to the resulting data of the research at the end of each year in an annual reporting meeting. These companies would then be allowed to provide guidance regarding corresponding responses for what would be the follow-on input to direct the next year of research.
The result of the first year of the action research project identified key issues of consideration for the participating family businesses. In preparation for the scheduled annual reporting meeting with the participating companies, Beckhard published the findings in articles in the *Sloan Management Review*. These articles included “Managing Change in Family Firms” (Beckhard & Dyer, 1983a). Additionally, Beckhard and Dyer wrote a working paper entitled: “Challenges and Issues in Managing Family Firms” (Beckhard & Dyer, 1981). The articles received so much attention that W. Warner Burke, editor of the journal *Organization Dynamics*, requested Beckhard be the editor of a special family business issue of the journal. He produced an issue entitled “Managing Continuity in the Family-Owned Business” in the summer of 1983 (Beckhard & Dyer, 1983b). This special issue was so well received by *Organization Dynamics* subscribers that Beckhard was convinced that this area had the potential to be an important field of study and practice to be developed.

By the end of the second year of the project, the group of participants met again to review the second iteration of findings coming out of the action research project. As he studied these results, Beckhard began to consider establishing an organization for researchers and practitioners in the family business arena to collaborate and network for the sharing and advancement of knowledge and research in the infant field. He also started to consider the need for education, a professional journal, and professional development within the field as vital components of this professional organization.
By the end of the third year of the action research project, Beckhard had collaborated with colleagues to form the Family Firm Institute. The organization was created to support the development of this budding field of management that became known as family business. Beckhard had been instrumental in the formation of both family business as a field of study and the Family Firm Institute as an organization to support the development of the field.

**Developer of Human Capital**

Beckhard noted, “I began to develop a conceptual framework that became a part of my own practice and that I was able to pass on to other consultants and students in subsequent years” (Beckhard, 1997, p. 59). For far too long, businesses looked at their workforce as sets of hands to accomplish their operations and profitability. Today organizations are increasingly recognizing that people are not an expendable resource and a cost factor in the economics of the business, but rather a capital investment to be valued and nurtured (Vogelgang et al., 2013).

This nurturing of human capital became a trademark of Dick Beckhard’s career. He had learned the importance of relationships through his consulting practice and been exposed to the value of a “socio” educational environment from his attendance at open house events at the home of Leland Bradford. Since Shangri La (Beckhard’s cottage on Lake Kezar) was only about 20 miles from Bethel, Maine, and NTL headquarters, Beckhard became known for his own open house events on weekends. He would have a relaxed environment of summer fun (drinking, grilling,
and lake activities—swimming, canoeing, etc.), but would use these retreats as mentoring sessions for developing the next generation of OD professionals.

While some of his techniques were known to be unorthodox (i.e., Navy Admirals in full uniform crawling on the floor, sailing boats around Bermuda, hanging out in nightclubs in London until 3 a.m., or skinny dipping in Lake Kezar), yet he managed to produce value-added learning and growth for his protégés from these experiences. His mentorship was so highly regarded that his students would argue and compete to take him to Boston Logan airport on Fridays, as he headed back to New York and his wife for the weekends. They would track whose turn it was to drive their professor and mentor. This one-on-one time with Beckhard was an opportunity to acquire precious golden nuggets of information that were composed especially for that individual driving that day. Once at the airport and on the plane, corporate executives would pay extremely inflated hourly rates (some estimated this number at $500 per hour in the 1960s and 1970s) to receive executive-level mentorship from the master.

For 21 years Beckhard took brilliant and sophisticated lumps of human clay and molded them into some of the most elite OD consultants in the world. These consultants were the distinguished alumni of MIT and Harvard University. His course requirements included a pensee—a thought paper on whatever the students deemed relevant to their personal meaning of the course—called: “The Meaning of the Course for Me.” Although writing the pensee could be a traumatic experience to many students, it would establish an interesting dynamic between the student and the
professor, as Beckhard gained a personalized appreciation for each of his students. Not only would the student get a grade, additionally, they would receive a critique from and establishment of a personal relationship with a world-renowned consultant. Beckhard would use this personal information and relationship as the basis of his mentorship to each of his students.

A final supplement to the proliferation of Beckhard’s instructional mentoring agenda was the expansion from MIT and Harvard to cover students at numerous institutions of higher academia and professional organization. This point of relevance both provided mentoring to the student as well as instructions on how to be a mentor.

Beckhard used mentorship as a means of addressing equity and fairness, before there was such a thing as affirmative action. Perhaps because of his living environment in Florida after the stock market crash of 1929 or maybe because of his personal shortcomings in height—Beckhard admittedly was always very short (Beckhard, 1997, p. 3)—no one can say what drove Beckhard to champion diversity and inclusion in an era where it was not a popular decision or course of action. Yet, Beckhard used mentorship to level the playing field. The result was the development of a diverse group of OD professionals (women and minorities) with extremely successful careers that range from running their academic departments, to running their own private practices, to running NTL.

Ultimately, mentorship was so important to Beckhard that research revealed it to be one of his major forms of proliferation in support of the expansion of OD over the years (Beckhard, 1997, p. 154). The impact of his mentorship cannot truly be
measured, only imagined. For example, his mentorship of just one of his students, W. Gibb Dyer, may be traced beyond his contributions of professorship and mentorship of students at Brigham Young University, to the start of a field of study (family business) and being a founding member of the Family Firm Institute. Yet, there is little ability to track the impact of the many OD students to be produced by Brigham Young University’s program or the influence they may have had on other OD programs and their students. The same may be said about Dyer’s influence on family businesses. However, as an indication of perceived value, Dyer was recently ranked one of the top 10 researchers in the world for the field of family business (Brigham Young University Website, 2018). Additionally, the OD Network, that Beckhard initially joined in organizing with the likes of Herb Shepard, Sheldon Davis, and Warner Burke, still today pays honor to Beckhard and applauds his efforts to develop future OD professionals with the “Dick Beckhard Mentoring Session” at its annual national conference.

In the 1990s, after years of successful consulting, Beckhard began a transformation from consultant to professional mentor. David Nadler, a former colleague at Columbia University, Teachers College, was founder and CEO of a major consulting firm, Delta Consulting Group, and asked Beckhard to begin coaching his consultants. Nadler found the mentoring of his consultants by an outside seasoned veteran had a significant positive impact on his practice. Soon Beckhard had a career developing and mentoring consultants. Additionally, Greg Parston, a former vice president of the Academic Health Center of New York, whom Beckhard had met
in the early 1980s while mentoring the Academic Health Center president, approached Beckhard regarding teaching master classes. As Beckhard described them,

[Master classes] are workshops for professionals, who want some coaching from a “master.” For example, Pavarotti might conduct a master class for professional singers…I have conducted master classes for local authority chief executives, education department executives, police constables, and health managers. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 152)

It did not take long for his responsibilities as a professional mentor to become about half of his successful practice.

Over the years, Beckhard helped a number of mentees aspire to greatness. As he reached his golden years, his perspective of the focus of his practice began to change. In his own words:

My professional activities in these years are a direct reflection of my two goals—(1) to influence large systems to be more effective and more humane and (2) to help in the development of the next generation to continue that process. In most of my career, my work was in the first goal. My professional responsibility was acted out in the second goal. Today, in my later years, this has been reversed. My “work” is in helping others...My rewards come largely in my interactions and joint learning with colleagues. These keep me growing and looking toward the future. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 154)

This perspective toward the future is the impetus of the mode for expansion of OD that I call “proliferation” in my research and this body of work.

**Historical Analysis—The Mapping**

…in the most progressive manufacturing circles, the P&G plants acquired a mythic, legendary reputation, bolstered by the exotic names of prosaic places where they had been located. There was Mehoopany, located in rural Pennsylvania, where Douglas McGregor came to consult on labor relations in 1963 and brought in his MIT colleague Dick Beckhard to conduct a thorough work system overhaul.
Beckhard, a former theater director, was an early and important leader of the new field of organization development, and one of the first to reshape T-Groups into new forms tailored to corporate managers. (Kleiner, 2008, p. 54)

The history of the field of OD provides a plethora of opportunities to review the highlights revealed via the adventures of ordinary men and women making extraordinary discoveries of organizational refinement and improvement through the study of the organization’s behavior. This section captures the efforts of OD greats ranging from Lewin, Likert, McGregor and, yes, Beckhard as early as the 1940s to Cooperrider, Schein, Burke, and Worley’s continued contributions today.

This recap of history will forge the baseline blueprint of occurrences that will form the map for tracing the contributions of Beckhard throughout the time continuum, to determine if the early contributions continue to impact OD today.

**Periods**

Period differentiates the focus of the era for the subject matter emphasized by OD. The titles of the “bands of focus” are indicative of the chronology of the designation of the period in which the subject matter gained popularity in use. The earliest period of OD is called the Embryonic Era in this work, for, in the beginning, the field was established by the efforts of some bold social psychologists who opted to supplement conventional academic research methods such as surveys, interviews, and the hybrid of action research with developed concepts of organizational reform by emulating and studying organizational behavior via laboratory work.

The content of the Embryonic Era is followed by that of the Enlightened Era of understanding of OD subject matter focus. This new focus highlights the expansion
of the quality revolution into improving organization behavior through the study of QWL. Next was an examination of how strategy and technology, combined with the information age, affected the globalization of organizations’ operations and the strategic planning of those operations. In turn, analysis of strategic planning yielded the corresponding investigation of how strategic concepts help to explain firm behavior (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996, p. 1). Finally, within this period of new thought within the field of OD comes insight from a different perspective. Until this point, the field had functioned from a deficit-based perspective, always fixing what was wrong with the system. Finally, the concept of building a solution based on what was right with a system (or simply from the positive view) was explored with remarkable results.

The final period to be introduced takes on a predictive persona, advancing the analysis from the Enlightened Era into a whole new era based on the power projection platform of OD capabilities, achievements, and potential called the Envisioned Era. This era examines the currently evolving concepts of OD such as POS and agility to suggest possible glidepaths based on the current trajectory of such research. Additionally, I address the areas of emphasis that some of the field’s foremost experts suggest may benefit most from the introduction of OD principles into their management philosophies. Finally, I provide commentary on my prediction of how OD will manifest and proliferate into the time period that David Cooperrider (2018) calls OD’s finest hour.
This historiography will start at the beginning with the establishment of the field, a period that has been labeled the Embryonic Era.

**Embryonic Era**

The segment of this document entitled Embryonic Era captures the results of the early contributions of the various founders of OD and reconciles them to Dick Beckhard’s significance in the establishment of the foundation of the field.

In the beginning, say the late 1930s and early 1940s, American businessmen were starting to question the philosophies of Taylorism as the ultimate concept of management theory. They were primed for change. Even the hardest driving, most autocratic operations had managers who believed it possible to come to work, achieve their expected metrics, and still feel recognized as well as welcomed as people. One of the most influential people concerned about this matter was a German-Jewish social psychologist named Kurt Lewin. Lewin focused his efforts on the social interactions of humankind—a revolutionary concept he called group dynamics.

Lewin and his disciples had begun to gain much recognition with their theories of group dynamics and their belief that one cannot truly know an institution until they try to change it. The problem was testing this concept. One needed to be able to fully study the culture of a company. Lewin finally got the opportunity for full immersion in an institution’s culture, via a pajama manufacturing company in North Carolina, through one of his former students, Alfred Marrow. Through this practical application experience, Lewin developed theories of human personality that synthesized the “Freudian views of the subconscious resonance of past trauma driving
people’s deepest feeling” with the behaviorist observations that “they could be programmed to respond predictably to stimuli” (Kleiner, 2008, p. 22). He argued that these were only two of the factors (or forces) that would affect a person’s mental and emotional state at any given moment. Lewin called this concept of helpful and harmful forces the human behavioral “force field.” Other factors that might contribute to the phenomena were one’s relationship with family members, neuroses and physical health, work situation, and network of friends (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 131).

Lewin discovered social groups were particularly highly influential forces on human behavior. He, along with his graduate student, Ron Lippitt, demonstrated how leaders of a group, by changing the operational climate, could dramatically change how the group functioned. They partnered with fellow researcher Ralph White to conduct the famous Boys Club experiment with 11-year-old, middle-class, public school boys. They organized the boys into five-member “G-Man Clubs” with a carefully trained college student leader. The leaders assumed distinctly different behavioral characteristics (autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire) to observe their team’s behavior. The results were an astounding indication of the effects of the impact of group dynamics in general and leader influence specifically (this experimentation would come to be known as Lewin’s leadership style theory).

As Lewin and Lippett contemplated the repercussions of some of their research, the United States entered World War II. The relevance of the relationship of these two topics is that war was generally an intense proponent of social science
advancement in the United States (and England). It pulled the greatest university
talent from their isolated havens of research and brought them together to work on
real-world problems: developing psychological operations, studying and enhancing
military morale, studying foreign culture, training counter-insurgency forces, and
coordinating impact of civilian activities on military operations.

During these years of war and enlightened social science awareness, Lippitt
crossed the paths of two other young psychologists from the Midwest: Ken Benne
and Leland Bradford. These three would eventually forge the leadership trio of the
NTL. Benne was a charismatic young political theorist, who strongly believed in the
democratic system, and one of the last graduate students of John Dewey. Bradford
was a natural organizer, dedicated to adult education. He believed that learning, not
some authoritarian instructor, should control the courses. Bradford’s stance on self-
directed learning would become the muse to Lewin’s noted concept of T-groups.

So, after immigrating to the United States, two brief years at Cornell, and a
10-year stretch at the University of Iowa, Lewin was able to raise the capital needed
to establish a research institute to conduct his desired research, without the problems
of academia, but he needed to find a university home for such an institute. He was
considering multiple options when the great talent cultivator Douglas McGregor came
and convinced him to establish his institution at MIT. So, in 1945 Lewin headed to
MIT to establish the Research Center for Group Dynamics.

As the varied forces of fate proceeded to bring these great minds together, the
culmination of their synergy began to manifest in an event still known, in group
dynamics circles, as the Connecticut Workshop. This event would spawn three concepts of ascending importance: T-groups, the NTL, and the field of OD. This leads to the first major discovery of the Embryonic Era: T-groups.

**T-Groups**

The concept of T-groups essentially began in the summer of 1946. Amid the deluge of returning soldiers from the war and conclusion of the defense industry economic boom, racial tensions began to flare up in some northeastern cities. Kurt Lewin and his team of researchers at the Research Center for Group Dynamics at MIT were asked by the Connecticut Interracial Commission and the Committee on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress for help in researching the training of community leaders. Lewin, Lippett, Benne, and Bradford planned a two-week workshop to create better ethnic relations, particularly between Blacks and Jews.

This workshop was held in a small city southwest of New Haven, named Bridgeport. The event had about 50 participants from varied backgrounds attempting to address various troubling socio-racial aspects of life using small discussion groups and role-playing, while researchers observed and documented participant behavior.

The pivotal moment of the Connecticut Workshop occurred one night during the second week. As Lewin and his staff conducted their daily ritual of reviewing the observations of the day’s session, four participants happened by the open door of Lewin’s hotel room and asked to listen in on the review being conducted. Lewin reluctantly agreed. Sitting in the corner, a social worker began to recognize herself
from the observation notes of Lippitt. When one of the graduate students, named Murray Horwitz, asked the shy social worker to expound on her thoughts of the observation notes and the occurrence of earlier that day, the openness and candor of her feedback was astounding. Lewin was delighted! He was convinced that they had stumbled onto something big in the field of participative psychology. He realized that by sheer coincidence he had found

…a simple, obvious solution to an eternal experimental problem: trying to guess a subject’s thoughts. Sure, you could ask them, but the interviewer’s biases (and the subject’s) made the answers unreliable. Now, in groups like this, answers would have much more validity. (Kleiner, 2008, p. 26)

The staff and participants continued their discussion of the day’s session, the barrier between them removed. They were all now just people comparing notes and providing feedback. Word spread quickly of this experience. The next night, all 50 participants showed up for the evening critique session. There in Bridgeport, the team of Lewin, Lippett, Benne, and Bradford had invented a powerful new type of tool. It was not a therapy group. Its purpose was simply to understand social dynamics. They called the tool the training group or T-group for short. Little did they know the magnitude of the reach of their discovery.

Lippett, Benne, and Bradford published their findings almost immediately. Their claim was drawing two conclusions from the experience: (a) Feedback about group interactions was a rich learning experience and (b) the process of group building had the potential for learning that could be relative to “back home” situations.
Soon, the Connecticut T-group discovery was famous within psychology and education departments. The young disciples of Lewin began planning the next summer’s group sessions. The National Education Association (via Bradford) and Office of Naval Research (via Lewin and Lippitt) committed the financial resources to continue their work. However, to submit the application for funding, the researchers needed to quickly form an institute. They hurriedly chose the name: The National Training Laboratories for Group Dynamics. Most people would simply call it NTL.

Lewin recommended holding this second T-group session in a culturally isolated environment, far away from participants’ homes and daily distractions, so the participants could enter a “Fortress of Solitude,” together. Bradford found a traditional New England school named the Gould Academy, in a small town in western Maine called Bethel. They began to plan for the descension of some 200 people upon this small remote location the following summer.

Unfortunately, in February of 1947, midway through the planning phase, at the young age of 57 years old, Lewin suddenly died in his sleep of a heart attack. His untimely demise gave the birth of NTL an almost mythical phoenix-like allure. Lewin had been a prophet of sorts. He had developed the theoretical foundations of social psychology. He had inspired a global community of practitioners to utilize a new set of tools and methodologies in their endeavors. He had presented the world with a whole new perspective of possibilities within management theory. Now Lewin was gone, and all eyes were upon his young protégés to answer the question: What’s next?
The absence of Lewin was quickly felt at NTL, as they initially struggled to attract participants. In fact, they were almost expelled from Gould Academy in those early days. However, the 1947 Basic Skills Groups at Bethel, Maine, was so successful that the Carnegie Foundation provided financial support for the program in 1948 and 1949. Soon, with the mentioned grants, supplemented by a solid business in training fees for nonprofits and an ongoing official existence as a division of the National Education Association, NTL had established a relatively stable financial existence. Additionally, the pleasantly humble personality of Bradford (the NTL director) was exactly what was needed to keep some of the egos and overbearing personalities of the psychology and social work research scholar-practitioner field communities returning to Bethel year after year, to collaborate wholeheartedly, as the legend of the T-group development session continued to grow.

In the spring of 1950, Lippitt and Bradford approached Beckhard for help with the flow of the presentation of theory and concepts, hoping to make these less exciting sessions more effective. In return, they offered Beckhard the opportunity to participate in a T-group. Here Beckhard had the opportunity to see firsthand what the T-group experience could mean to the participant. By the end of that summer session, he was a convert. Bethel was only 20 miles from Lake Kezar (which is where Beckhard wanted to be in the summers anyway), so he had a chance to learn the application of the T-group intervention as an aspect of the human relations concept and was able to meet his future mentor, role model, and friend Doug McGregor.
Beckhard felt honored when Bradford invited him back for the summer of 1951. He would join the afternoon faculty conducting skill practice sessions. His third year he was a co-trainer in T-groups; and in his fourth year, he joined the T-group staff as a fully trained T-group leader, overseeing the development of future T-group trainers. This summary is relevant to the matter at hand because it establishes Beckhard as an elite expert on the topic. Additionally, this fact clearly links Beckhard to the expansion of T-groups in business applications. During the first decade of NTL, T-group attendees had primarily been teachers, academics, social workers, and church group members (the unspoken focus of NTL was to prepare the social sector to assume power). In 1956 the NTL corporate audience increased significantly due to its director’s pursuit of this market (grant funding had begun to run out and Bradford was actively searching for clientele to replace those resources). Ultimately, this increased the T-group appeal in the business world and was a natural fit for Beckhard’s background. The more people explored their deepest feelings and discussed them, the more powerful the T-group seemed to get. Moreover, to some of the business T-group attendees, the practices of NTL revealed an entirely new way to think about managing people.

The man who was giving voice to that shift in attitude within the business community was Douglas McGregor. He had one foot in academia and the other in practice. In academia, McGregor was head of the Organizational Studies Department at the prestigious MIT Sloan School. He had also founded the MIT industrial relations program. He brought Kurt Lewin, Ed Schein, Warren Bennis, Richard Beckhard, and
so much more talent to the faculty of MIT. McGregor had also been the president of Antioch College. This provided him the chance, like Beckhard and Lewin, to utilize an organization (Antioch) as his field laboratory to test theory, an incredible asset to any theoretician. He participated in refining the T-group applications at NTL and sent them their most popular trainer, Edie Seashore. In practice, McGregor, like many MIT business professors, moonlighted as a consultant; however, McGregor, unlike Lewin, had the distinct advantage of having had the opportunity to be an executive, responsible for a profit-and-loss statement and organizational bottom line. He had the added distinct advantage of having been on the board of directors for a major corporation (Esso Oil Company).

It is noteworthy to highlight the fact that while Lewin was considered a scholar-practitioner and Beckhard was definitively a practitioner-scholar, McGregor had the rare quality of being an equally strong scholar and practitioner. As a result, McGregor had a unique perspective and enthusiasm for the information ascertained via the T-groups; however, he did not lead the process very often. Nevertheless, he had an uncanny appreciation for how practical application of theory contributed to and promoted the development of theory. This might explain the notable NTLers taking Beckhard with them to General Mills to consult and promote the T-group technique (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 7) and to Procter & Gamble to conduct a thorough work systems overhaul (Kleiner, 2008, p. 54).

Finally, in 1958, the techniques of NTL received their first full-scale mainstream corporation test. The team of Herb Shepard (an MIT professor and
protégé of McGregor); Robert Blake (a University of Texas professor and student of Tavistock Institute); and Jane Mouton (also a University of Texas professor, former student of Blake’s, and accomplished mathematician) successfully executed the intervention of T-groups. Their implementation was so well received that Esso sent 2,000 of its managers through the training to develop their management skills.

An intriguing point of information on commercializing T-group theory was that Lewin, who devised the three phases of change in his famous planned change model (the basis of action research), determined that although NTL did not quite understand how to refreeze, the T-group methodology clearly provided the most effective tool for the unfreezing process of his planned change model to date (Kleiner, 2008, p. 28). This in turn made T-groups a valuable tool for developing the action research process, a process that would become the cornerstone of OD and the next stem of OD to be discussed.

The T-group methodology’s effectiveness had been validated in a field laboratory/practical application. More and more practitioners were adopting its concepts. The “What’s next?” question had been thoroughly answered. T-groups would be a leading-edge source of group dynamics information well into the future. The successes of McGregor at Union Carbide, McGregor and Beckhard at Procter & Gamble and General Mills, and Tannenbaum and Beckhard at TRW Space Systems demonstrated the applicability of the T-group technique and launched a plethora of interest in T-group theory. This interest would be both a springboard to jump-start the
field of OD and remain a staple within the tool belt of OD practitioners for years to come.

An interesting example of the springboard effects from the application of the T-group methodology will appear in this document’s review of the Managerial Grid. This development out of the analysis of T-group applications would contribute significantly to the development of the normative stem of OD.

As many years have passed and T-groups have lost some popularity, yet it continues to remain a favorite of west coast OD practitioners and Stanford, UCLA, and Pepperdine. It also remains popular at American University, as well as at its east coast home of origin at NTL. The practical aspects of T-groups for organizations have gradually fallen under the auspices of team building (the means by which to make teams more effective in working toward a mutual goal). Today, team building is one of the most common forms of OD executed by the practitioner (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 8). However, it is extremely important to appreciate the modern-day office practice of falling backwards and depending on a teammate to catch the teammate to build trust or an Army team running with a huge log on their shoulders to learn to operate as a unit; both can trace their origin back to that little hotel room in Bridgeport, Connecticut, where Mrs. Brown (the social worker) was able to see herself in the observations of Ron Lippitt and describe her feelings of the observation.

Lewin and associates’ little Connecticut Workshop discovery had not only come of age, but had changed the world. Some NTLers described it as unconditional love, while others as some sort of mystical breakthrough. Some compared it to what
Maslow described as peak performance, the highest stage of his theory on hierarchy of needs: self-actualization or the need to achieve one’s full potential (Kleiner, 2008). Adler and Goleman (1975) wrote an outstanding article endorsing the significance of the use of T-groups to effect positive goal-oriented change among their students. In fact, the eminent T-group advocate Carl Rogers described the T-group as “...the most significant social invention of the century” (Fehr, 2003, p. 22), a statement that proves valid when one examines the impact the discovery had on further theory advancement. For example, McGregor confirmed, through a decade of corporate consulting, that the most effective managers were almost universally Theory Y. Unfortunately, if the critical mass of the management team was Theory X, no change could be fully recognized. McGregor became more and more excited about the use of T-groups to develop the appreciation of skeptical managers. They could see for themselves how their own intrinsic potential would develop and experience the impact of how others acted more powerful, free, and involved as a result.

However, McGregor was not an isolated incident. Repeatedly, the power of T-groups or some form of group dynamics utilization would show up in the development of OD theory: Blake and Mouton in the normative stem, Trist in the QWL stem, even Beckhard in the strategy stem; and the list goes on and on. The development of T-groups brought with it an impact on the theory of group dynamics that projected through time and concepts to form the foundation of what would become the field called OD.
**Action Research/Survey Feedback**

The Harwood study is considered the first experiment of group decision-making and self-management in industry and the first example of applied organizational psychology. The experiment conducted at Harwood was part of Lewin’s continuing exploration of participatory action research. Burnes (2007) stated that “…the Harwood studies can be seen as having laid the foundations of organization development (OD) and as having a continuing relevance to the challenges facing organizations today” (p. 213).

The concept of action research again highlights the greatness of Lewin. Action research and survey feedback trace their origin to the 1940s and the studies of Kurt Lewin. He first coined the term “action research” in 1944. It is either research initiated to solve an immediate problem or a reflective process of progressive problem solving. Action research is an iterative and interactive inquiry process that balances the researcher’s focus between either the actions taken or the research that results from the reflective understanding of the actions. Lewin felt that research should be closely linked to the action of an organization’s personnel, for that organization to be able to utilize the data in the management of change. He devised the famous three-step change model to demonstrate this fact:

1. **Unfreezing**: Faced with a dilemma or disconfirmation, the individual or group becomes aware of a need to change

2. **Changing**: The situation is evaluated and new models of behavior are explored and tested
3. Refreezing: Application of new behavior is evaluated and, if reinforcing, adopted

The war had been a catalyst for social science research in the United States, sparking a deluge of activity. An examination of these war activities validated Lewin’s action research concept. As a result, Lewin sought to apply his concept in a practical application by aligning his efforts with one of his former student’s, Dr. Alfred Marrow, president and chairman of the board of a family textile manufacturing company (Harwood Manufacturing Company). Lewin sought to demonstrate, in a field laboratory, that the motivation to change was strongly related to action: If people are active in decisions affecting them, they are more likely to adopt new ways.

Marrow had just moved his manufacturing operations from New England to Virginia. After 12 weeks of training, his 300 new personnel were producing at half the rate of apprentices performing similar tasks in northern factories. To address this shortcoming, as well as high turnover, resentment toward management, and absenteeism, Marrow allowed Lewin to utilize his organization and its members to collect data concerning the organization’s performance and plans for improvement. From 1939 to 1962, experiments in support of Marrow and the Harwood Manufacturing Company were conducted by Lewin, along with several psychologists (including Alex Bavelas, John French, and Lester Coch) assisting him or, after his death, conducting their own experiments. They embarked on a series of action research experiments to address issues like group decisions, self-management, leadership training, changing stereotypes, and overcoming resistance to change. The
results of these experiments were used to bring understanding to group behavior as well as identify the change process and how to manage it. These studies laid the foundation of action research as it is known today and helped to create many of the tools and techniques used in OD (Burnes, 2007).

After almost eight decades of action research development, this conflicting focus between the “action” and the “results” continues to be both an issue of contention and an impetus for discovery. This discovery includes participative and practical evolutions of theory by giants in the field like Richard Beckhard, Chris Argyris, Eric Trist, Mary Brydon-Miller, and David Coghlan. These efforts highlighted areas such as participatory action research, action science, and cooperative inquiry. In addition to iconic individuals were landmark initiatives utilizing action research. These initiatives include William Whyte and Edith Hamilton’s famous study of Chicago’s Tremont Hotel, John Collier’s action research efforts to improve race relations while commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and even Kurt Lewin’s 1946 classic work “Action Research and Minority Problems.” While each of these initiatives was seminal in its own right, none had precedent over the classic Harwood Manufacturing Company project for promoting action research.

Wendell L. French and Cecil Bell (1998) defined OD at one point as organization improvement through action research. These studies did much to establish action research as an integral component of organization change. Today, it is the backbone of many OD applications.
If action research is an integral component of organizational change, then an inquiry could be made as to what is the impetus of action research. While the addressing of such an inquiry could lead one to the power of T-groups, an alternative (or supplementary) course of action could be survey feedback. In fact, a key component of most action research studies was the systematic collection of survey data that was fed back to the client organization (Cummings & Worley, 2009). Granted there are many names that will be mentioned in the development of survey research as a valued component of action research, but none more prominent than Rensis Likert. He is generally acknowledged as the central figure in the development of the survey feedback branch of OD (Beckhard, 1969; Brown & Harvey, 1996; Burke & Hornstein, 1972; French & Bell, 1995).

Likert was responsible for the development of three key research methodologies in the field of OD: measurement of attitudes with the Likert scale, survey research methodology, and survey guided feedback. The balance of this section will touch on all three of these contributions.

The famous Likert (1932) doctoral dissertation, from Columbia University, on an attitudinal-based psychometric scale for surveys (called the Likert scale) garnered him instant recognition in the social research community. This recognition provided Likert multiple corporate and government survey research project design opportunities. After co-authoring a book on public opinion with his mentor Gardner Murphy (Murphy & Likert, 1938), he was invited to organize the Division of
Program Surveys for the Department of Agriculture and eventually was selected to direct the war efforts on survey research methodologies.

At the end of World War II, Likert and a select group of his team of notable psychologists decided to stay together, join the University of Michigan, and form the Survey Research Center. This “Band of Brothers” (which included survey research notables such as Floyd Mann, Angus Campbell, Leslie Kish, George Katona, and Robert L. Kahn) would go on to accomplish groundbreaking developments in the field of survey guided feedback research.

While some of the Survey Research Center research was of varying interest to the field (i.e., political, economic, as well as human relations), there were significant contributions to OD. For example, Likert and Mann’s Detroit Edison research provided an intuitive belief that it was a powerful process for change. By providing survey feedback to employees through interlocking chains of conferences at various levels of the organization, the researchers were able to optimize cross-level communication. This project also clearly demonstrated survey feedback potential for energizing the action research unfreezing stage. This intuitive belief was eventually statistically validated by the use of follow-up surveys, which provided documented improvements.

Likert’s well-deserved fame resulting from competence and accomplishments, coupled with his charismatic personality, made him popular on the lecture circuit. This fact is relevant to the history of survey feedback because it presents a means of expanding the laboratory/practical application opportunities in the field. For example,
it was through Likert’s personal relationships that survey feedback applications flourished at organizations such as Prudential Life Insurance, The Chessie Railroad System, Caterpillar, General Motors, Ford, Bell, and United Parcel Service (Vitucci, 1996, p. 135). The credibility of the techniques acquired through utilization at these premier organizations fueled the expansion of commercial use of this technique, which in turn resulted in the progress of the research of Survey Research Center, both regarding their financial and theoretical capabilities.

Following the death of Kurt Lewin, Dorwin Cartwright, the new director of the Research Center for Group Dynamics (and a former disciple of Likert at the Division of Program Surveys during the war) decided to move the center, to include Ron Lippitt, from MIT to the University of Michigan. In 1948 the Research Center for Group Dynamics merged with the Survey Research Center and formed the Institute for Social Research—the premier center for survey research methodology in the world (Costello, 1993). This move merged the capabilities of survey feedback and T-groups for enhanced efficacy in the administration of action research.

Likert describes its [survey feedback’s] first use: In 1947 I was able to interest the Detroit Edison company in a company-wide study of employee perceptions, behaviors, reactions and attitudes; which was conducted in 1948. Floyd Mann, who had joined our staff in 1947, was the director of the project...[we] worked on the problem of how the company could best use the data from the survey to bring improvement in management and performance. This led to the development and use of the survey-feedback method. (French & Bell, 1995, p. 48)

It was only fitting that one of the first practitioners to gain acclaim for utilizing action research applying these techniques was Richard Beckhard. He
incorporated this theory into his organization transition model (that he would later publish with Reuben Harris in 1977) and combined his process with open system theory acquired from his work with Charles Krone (who was one of the first Procter & Gamble people to attend a workshop at NTL in the early 1960s) (Kleiner, 2008, p. 56).

Beckhard’s synthesized work in action research and open systems would eventually contribute to the development of the field known today as sociotechnical systems (along with the research and practical work of Eric Trist).

**Normative**

The intellectual and practical advances of the T-groups and action research/survey feedback stems led to the final stem of the Embryonic Era: normative. The normative stem is based on the premise that a more humane and inclusive managerial process is the “one best way” to manage an organization (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 9). This premise had its beginnings exemplified in the research of Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid concept (9,9 system), Likert’s Participative Management Group System (System 4), and McGregor’s Human Side of Enterprise philosophy (Theory Y system). These three streams of research make up both the origin of the normative stem as well as the linking of the foundational work of OD to more contemporary applications of the field. With this fact in mind, this review will begin this explanation of the bridging process with the origins of OD as a whole: its manifestation from the T-group.
Managerial Grid

As previously discussed, Lippett’s commercialization of the T-group process sought to place the T-group technique within corporate America, for the betterment of organizations (information in this section is from Beckhard, 1997). He utilized NTL supporter Doug McGregor’s influence as a one-time member of the Board of Directors of Esso Oil to secure Esso as NTL’s first major practical application of the T-group as a field laboratory. Lippitt sent Herb Shepard, Robert Blake, and Jane Mouton forward with consultation efforts at Esso Oil, to provide practical applications of the T-group technique in an operational environment; however, a peculiar occurrence resulted.

Esso leadership required in-depth counseling as part of the process; therefore, Blake, who had taken time off from University of Texas to commit full-time field applications and observation at Esso, conducted and recorded these counseling sessions and sent daily reports to Mouton (who was pregnant at the time and could not support the research project in person) for detailed analysis and collaborative discussion. So, as he provided her with codified accounts of observations, she devised a mathematical framework for managers’ behavior. This system developed into a dual commitment analysis in respect to personnel and business result simultaneously, using the successful capabilities analysis of Alfred Sloan of General Motors, from his memoirs My Years with General Motors (1963) as a barometer for performance comparison.
A result of these discussions was an overall improvement in safety performance and labor problems of Esso Oil, as well as a diagnostic framework to quantify the management style of their personnel that would eventually become the foundation of a powerful OD instrument to promote achievement and human relationship. This framework looked like a nine-square-by-nine-square checkerboard. Their diagnosis had shown them that management attitude and behavior may be summarized in two components: concern for people and concern for productivity. Blake and Mouton proceeded to chart the two components of behavior as varying degrees of commitment reference points (from 1 to 9) on this checkerboard. By putting the two numbers together, one could chart any managerial style. For example, a 9,1 would indicate an individual who was totally task oriented with little concern for people, while a 1,9 would be considered a people pleaser who places inadequate regard on accomplishing the task at hand. Both personality orientations could be equally destructive to accomplishing the assigned objective (see the Managerial Grid in Figure 2).

It had become apparent to Shepard, Blake, and Mouton that they were not focusing their efforts on management improvement at the individual level. This improvement was focused organization-wide and all individual development would be a by-product of these efforts. Since the results provided organization development, the field of study adeptly took on that name, independently of McGregor and Beckhard’s General Mills incident.
Legend:

(1,1)—Poor Management: Productivity is poor because of a lack of emphasis on operational effectiveness. People are dissatisfied because the work environment fails to produce a climate of collaboration and trust.

(1,9)—Good Old Boys Management: Productivity is an incidental product of camaraderie but is not emphasized. Goodwill and trust exist to produce a collaborative climate workforce.

(5,5)—Safety Net Management: Productivity is encouraged and demanded but is not maximized. A firm but fair demeanor is maintained for a positive climate.

(9,1)—Task-oriented Management: Productivity is high at the expense of morale. This mode is based on Taylor’s scientific management theory and is effective in the short term, but it cannot be maintained as failure to manage the human side of business results in a negative long-term work climate and dissatisfied workers.

(9,9)—Teamwork Management: Productivity is high and sustainable due to proper emphasis on maximum production effort integrated with appropriate management of work climate and culture. The U.S. Army verbalizes this concept as simply: Mission First, Men Always.

Figure 2. Managerial Grid
As part of the Managerial Grid development process, Bob Blake was invited to join Dick Beckhard in the application of the program to the Young Presidents’ Organization as training to increase managers’ skills and understanding of their leadership style, team building, and intergroup relationship. While working with Beckhard, Blake refined the Managerial Grid. The results were so positive that Blake invited Beckhard to join Mouton and himself in promoting their OD program. Though Beckhard passed on the offer, his work with Blake provided valued continuation in the development of Grid OD (Beckhard, 1997, p. 74).

Blake and Mouton would eventually go on to gather data from a total of 198 organizations in the United States, Japan, and Great Britain on managerial and organizational effectiveness to support the development of this tool.

The Managerial Grid would go on to become one of the most structured interventions in OD (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 10). Yet it was noted by Beckhard

…again and again, NTL failed to have lasting effect because what would take them a year to accomplish, could be undone in a couple of months. This was the case with Esso Oil when the plant manager that supported the change initiative was promoted for his effective endeavors and the new plant manager did not support the initiative. (Kleiner, 2008, p. 45)

The grid had attempted to bring to light the importance of the human component of management. It is still in use today, but its popularity and influence have diminished since Mouton and Blake passed away (in 1987 and 2004, respectively). Nevertheless, the Managerial Grid was one of the essential movements of the normative stem and a driving force for consideration of human relations in leadership principles.
Participative Management

The next topic in the area of the normative stem of OD is participative management. Just as the Managerial Grid got its origin from T-groups, participative management’s origins evolved out of the development of survey feedback and the works of Rensis Likert. After a short tenure in academia, Likert became the director of research for the Life Insurance Agency Management Association and began a program of research comparing and evaluating the effectiveness of different modes of supervision. Here is where the foundations of his participative management philosophy were forged.

In 1947, Likert and his associates at the Institute for Social Research began a 14-year study on the interpersonal aspects of leadership and organizational life among their consulting opportunities. This study, which became known as the Michigan Studies, used survey feedback to collect and analyze data to answer the following questions:

1. Why do some managers get better results than others?
2. What do good managers do that bad managers don’t?
3. What do bad managers do that good managers don’t?
4. How can we measure what makes a good or a bad manager?

According to Stephen Vitucci, in his work *Patterns of Influence*, Likert and his team conducted

...a series of studies in business and government aimed at discovering the principles used by managers who achieve the highest performance and employee satisfaction and how these principles differ from those used by managers who obtain only mediocre results. Over succeeding
years, he and his major associates Robert Kahn, Floyd Mann, Stanley
Seashore and David Bowers directed a succession of surveys and
experiments which ultimately led to his well-known series of books on
participative management. (1996, p. 151)

Eventually, Likert discovered that a pattern emerged from his data, providing
him with empirical evidence for a theory of leadership. He wrote:

By 1961 a substantial amount of the research on leadership and
managerial behavior of the highest- vs. the lowest-producing managers
had been completed. When I summarized these results, I found that an
impressive pattern emerged, revealing an orderly, systematic
relationship among all the different variables that are important in the
management of human resources. The pattern was essentially the same
for the widely different kinds of work and industries studied. This
pattern was published...in *New Patterns of Management* in 1961. The
systems were labeled “exploitative authoritative,” “benevolent
authoritative,” “consultative,” and “participative group.” Since then I
have called them respectively System 1, System 2, System 3, and
System 4. The labels Systems 1-4 were used in *The Human
Organization* when it was published in 1967. (Likert, 1979, p. 153)

Likert utilized his expertise in survey feedback research and, like Lewin,
McGregor, and Beckhard, a field laboratory setting (his Institute for Social Research
consulting opportunities) to develop his theory. The components of this theory are
summarized by Cummings and Worley as follows:

Exploitive authoritative systems (System 1) exhibit an autocratic, top-
down approach to leadership. Employee motivation is based on
punishment and occasional rewards. Communication is primarily
downward, and there is little lateral interaction or teamwork. Decision-
making and control reside primarily at the top of the organization.
System 1 results in mediocre performance.

Benevolent authoritative systems (System 2) are similar to System 1,
except that management is more paternalistic. Employees are allowed
a little more interaction, communication, and decision-making but
within boundaries defined by management.
Consultative systems (System 3) increase employee interaction, communication, and decision-making. Although employees are consulted about problems and decisions, management still makes the final decisions. Productivity is good, and employees are moderately satisfied with the organization.

Participative group systems (System 4) are almost the opposite of System 1. Designed around group methods of decision-making and supervision, this system fosters high degrees of member involvement and participation. Work groups are highly involved in setting goals, making decisions, improving methods, and appraising results. Communication occurs both laterally and vertically, and decisions are linked throughout the organization by overlapping group membership. System 4 achieves high levels of productivity, quality, and member satisfaction. (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 9)

Likert’s System 4 theory was empirically proven to be the most effective of his systems. The participative nature of this concept is demonstrated as goals are established by group process and decisions are made by consensus. Subordinates’ ideas are encouraged, and they are fully involved in the decision-making process. Communications have little distortion because they take place in all directions and are enhanced by a fundamental element of Likert’s System 4 theory research concepts that link personnel in varying parts of an organization through mutual membership and collaboration, called linking pin theory. The theory is developed on Likert’s team survey of clients’ opinion of present versus ideal conditions of six organizational characteristics: leadership, motivation, communication, decisions, goals, and control (a scenario much like the initial and final phases of Beckhard’s organizational transition theory).
French and Bell highlight the value of Likert’s System 4 theory and present the future manifestations that would develop into what this body of work refers to as the Enlightened Era period of OD theory: QWL.

Many OD interventions are deliberately designed to increase involvement and participation by leaders and members of organizations. Self-managed work groups, quality circles, team building, quality of work life programs, strategic planning conferences and culture audits are all predicated on the System 4 belief that increased participation will lead to better problem solving. (Vitucci, 1996, p. 157)

The essence of Likert’s System 4 theory is that managers must focus on human factors to develop higher levels of individual and organizational performance. While the use of self-directed teams is an important application of Likert’s System 4 theory, the concept of participative management is the thrust of System 4 theory and the normative stem of OD.

The alignment of Likert (System 4) and Beckhard philosophies, such as GRPI, was incredibly similar. As Beckhard said in the preface to his seminal work "Organization Development: Strategies and Models:

...in our rapidly changing environment, new organization forms must be developed; more effective goal-setting and planning processes must be learned, and practiced teams of independent people must spend real time improving their methods of working, decision-making and communicating. Competing or conflicting groups must move toward a collaborative way of work. In order for these changes to occur and be maintained, a planned, managed change effort is necessary—a program of organizational development. (Beckhard, 1969, p. i)

This was written in 1969 and while much has been learned from both Likert and Beckhard, it is just as true today.
Theory Y

The final component of the normative stem is what I call the “more humane philosophy” of research work by OD pioneer Douglas McGregor. McGregor was the grandson of a Presbyterian minister who believed in the evil of man. Yet, McGregor opposed this philosophy, believing in the good of man, and clearly implemented this belief in the model of management he preached. He proposed that the task of the manager was to create the conditions such that the members of the organization can best achieve their own goals by focusing their efforts toward the success of the entire organization.

McGregor would go on to fully develop and publish his more humane philosophy in the seminal work *The Human Side of Enterprise* (1960). To avoid the perception of any type of bias based on labels, McGregor gave his theories the generic titles of Theory X and Theory Y. He postulated that one can greatly accelerate the rate of ability to increase influence, control, or change human behavior. Underlying the argument are two self-evident but widely ignored propositions:

1. Behind every attempt to influence others lies a theory (or a belief or a conviction) concerning cause and effect in human behavior.
2. The effectiveness of any attempt to influence or control behavior is a function of the adequacy of the theory of cause and effect behind it (Bennis & McGregor, 1966, p. 240).
McGregor was arguing for a greater belief in people and against the traditional management styles based on authority that implied negative assumptions about people.

Ed Schein posed in the introduction to McGregor’s posthumously published *The Professional Manager* that McGregor “wanted Theory Y to be a realistic view, in which one examined one’s assumptions, tested them against reality, and then chose a managerial strategy that made sense in terms of one’s diagnosis of reality” (Bennis & McGregor, 1967, p. xi).

Often, however, Theory X and Theory Y have been interpreted as two contrasting styles of management, not two opposing sets of assumptions about human nature. McGregor noted, “Behind every managerial decision or action are assumptions about human nature and human behavior” (McGregor, 1960, p. 33).

Most management literature, in the late 1950s and early 1960s (the period during which McGregor was publishing his research on this topic), was based on Taylor’s scientific management principles and could only have been derived from the underlying traditional management view of direction and control based on authority assumptions. Other beliefs about human nature would have inevitably led to quite different organizational principles. The following is a review of the assumptions that led to the premise McGregor designated as Theory X.

Theory X is based on three assumptions:
1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of original objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all. (McGregor, 1960, p. 33)

McGregor offered a new theory based on scientific evidence that shifted the pattern of management from direction and control based on authority to mutual support in pursuit of common goals. He developed a more cooperative theory to convince managers that their attitude toward their labor force should be warm, trusting, and collaborative. He called this Theory Y.

Theory Y is based on the following six assumptions:
1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. The average human being does not inherently dislike work. Depending on controllable conditions, work may be a source of satisfaction (and will be voluntarily performed) or a source of punishment (and will be avoided if possible).
2. External controls and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The most significant of such rewards, e.g., the satisfaction of ego and self-actualizing needs, can be direct products of effort toward organizational objectives.
4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition, and emphasis on security are generally consequences of experience, not human characteristics.
5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
6. Under conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially realized. (McGregor, 1960, p. 47)

McGregor utilized these six assumptions as the basis for establishing an alternative to the directive, controlling behavioral template offered by traditional scientific management made famous by Frederick Taylor.
The assumptions of Theory Y imply that unless integration is achieved, the organization will suffer. The objectives of the organization are not achieved best by the unilateral administration of promotions, because this form of management by direction and control will not create the commitment which would make available the full resources of those affected. The lesser motivation, the lesser resulting degree of self-direction and self-control are costs which, when added up for many instances over time, will more than offset the gains obtained by unilateral decisions “for the good of the organization.” (McGregor, 1960, p. 52)

McGregor then contrasts Theory Y with Theory X as a means of demonstrating its superiority:

These assumptions involve sharply different implications for managerial strategy than do those of Theory X. They are dynamic rather than static: They indicate the possibility of human growth and development; they stress the necessity for selective adaptation rather than for a single absolute form of control. They are not framed in terms of the least common denominator of the factory hand, but in terms of a resource which has substantial potentialities. (McGregor, 1960, p. 48)

McGregor classically concludes the chapter on Theory Y with the simple and profound statement: “Theory Y is an invitation to innovation” (1960, p. 57).

McGregor did not just preach Theory Y behavior, he lived it. Nowhere was this fact more apparent than in his own backyard of MIT. His intervention methodology, requiring people to challenge their assumptions and practices, that was used at MIT to teach Sloan fellows and high-potential managers is used today by senior-level executives. This examination by senior leadership has helped to bring about necessary changes within their organizations and form the basis of action learning and action science as used today in organizations. As Beckhard’s mastery of behavioral science expanded through the mentorship of McGregor, this influence
becomes more and more prevalent in the emphasis of his work (Beckhard, 1997, p. 71; Kleiner, 2008, p. 190). Since McGregor and Beckhard frequently collaborated on NTL senior executive training, this influence may very well have been the impetus behind the third of the five criteria for OD established in Beckhard’s definition: “Organization Development is an effort planned, organization-wide, and managed from the top [emphasis added] to increase effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organization’s processes, using behavioral science knowledge” (Cummings & Worley, 2009, p. 2).

In fact, throughout McGregor’s career, he integrated practitioners in industry into the academic learning community (Vitucci, 1996, p. 94). Beckhard recalled:

When I started in the management consulting field, in the early fifties, he helped me learn to use the knowledge from the behavioral sciences as a way of working with clients. Some years later, as a part of his continuing effort to integrate theory and practice, he asked me to join his faculty group at the Alfred P. Sloan School of Management at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (Bennis & McGregor, 1967, p. xv)

Beckhard believed that McGregor had a special mission of bridging the gap between the producers and the users of knowledge (Vitucci, 1996, p. 94). Perhaps this was McGregor’s means of aligning individual and institutional efforts.

The pioneering work done by Douglas McGregor in the study of organizational climate has been more thoroughly developed by practitioners and theorists of our day. Edgar Schein and Noel Tichy have taken McGregor’s earlier ideas and incorporated them into their works on organizational culture and cultural change interventions. There have been at least three attempts to build on McGregor’s
Theory X and Theory Y. Argyris (1971) emphasized behavioral change within a group context in his book *Management and Organizational Development: The Path from XA to YB*; in 1973, Louis Allen proposed Theory M in his article, “M is for Management: Theory Y Updated” (1973); and William Ouchi and Raymond Price also expounded on McGregor’s ideas in their article “Hierarchies, Clans and Theory Z. A New Perspective on Organizational Development” (1978). This manifestation of McGregor’s work was followed by Ouchi’s book, *Theory Z* (1981). While Argyris, Allen, Ouchi, and Price demonstrated viable examples of manifestation, considering the direct mentorship and development that McGregor provided to Beckhard, it was only natural that Beckhard would go on to be a strong advocate of McGregor’s Theory Y philosophy and proponent of the expansion of McGregor’s teachings. Beckhard described Douglas McGregor as “My Champion, Role Model, and Friend. He was a gardener. He loved to plant seeds and help the flowers grow.” Beckhard continued “I was one of the lucky ones who sprouted under his guidance and care. He…was probably the best friend I had in my adult life” (Beckhard, 1997, p. 51).

Over the years, Theory X and Theory Y have become a rudimentary component in understanding managerial behavior and instrumental in the training of young managers. Theory Y forms the basis of modern human resource policies in organizations. It supports the total quality management movement, in which organizational barriers are broken down in order to empower the employees to improve processes. This completes the review of McGregor’s Theory Y assessment and the section of this body of work known as the Embryonic Era of OD. The next
section to explore will be called the Enlightened Era of OD and will introduce new sets of OD theories and concepts.

**Enlightened Era**

The Embryonic Era provided OD personnel a solid foundation and appreciation for the human side of enterprise. As T-groups started to develop the theory behind group dynamics, survey research and action research continued developing models and methodologies to management science and principles. Finally, normative theory began to capitalize on applied behavioral thinking. These Embryonic Era concepts had a natural flow into the first component of the Enlightened Era: QWL.

**Quality of Work Life**

As previously mentioned, the QWL stem of the Enlightened Era of OD is a dual phased scenario. The initial scenario has a most intriguing origin that incorporates the efforts of Trist and his colleagues at the Tavistock Institute and the Norwegian resistance movement of World War II. The final scenario of the QWL stem is rooted in the analysis of management principles resulting from post-World War II Japan and the arrival of General Douglas MacArthur and W. Edwards Deming. The review begins in England.

**Phase I**

The initial phase of QWL is based on the foundational efforts of Eric Trist, Fred Emery, and their colleagues at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. Early practitioners in Europe constructed work design with the purpose of improved
integration of people (socio) and technology (technical) into a cooperative operation or system. Thus, the fitting name sociotechnical systems. Such QWL programs usually involved joint participation between unions and management to provide employees with a high level of discretion, task variety, and feedback about results.

Traditionally, the Tavistock Institute mentality believed that

…group dynamics, in itself, could not deal effectively with the hidden rage, frustration, and viciousness that inevitably emerged when people began to work together. It would take a redesign of the channels of power within the workplace. In the number-ridden industrial age, there was no persuasive model for how that redesign might look. And then Eric Trist stumbled into one. (Kleiner, 2008, p. 50)

In 1947, a post-doctoral student invited Trist to visit the British coal mine operations at Haighmoor. While most coal mining operations followed the standard industrialized assembly-line approach, Haighmoor was an exception to that rule. The mine was located in a geographic region that was not conducive to traditional assembly-line style equipment; therefore, the miners had to develop their own system. Their answer was to design a hybrid system of traditional techniques and contemporary technology. Instead of being specialized interchangeable cogs in an industrialized machine, each person at the Haighmoor mine site might be prepared to execute six or seven different jobs. They would organize in self-managed teams and operate as autonomous profit centers, fiercely competing against each other. The teams managed the mining and sold the coal—even taking care of the families of their injured or killed teammates. Since the miners were paid based on their productivity, they not only were encouraged to perform at peak levels, but they were motivated to cooperate and innovate as much as possible to optimize performance.
Trist was astonished by the incredible results of these teams. Their productivity was higher and operations safer than any other mine. Haighmoor had provided him a small glimpse of the true power of collaborative work teams and cultures. He was convinced that if he could harness the work design and business culture to make them fit naturally together, he could foster unparalleled potential.

Initially, the British government agency that managed the mines allowed Trist to study the various mining camps’ operations. However, when Trist began attempting action research endeavors that could replace managers’ jobs with self-managed teams, the managers complained. “Why try to instill freedom when the mines were becoming more controlled and mechanized? Why set up false expectations? They even forbade Trist to include the name ‘Haighmoor’ in his reports” (Kleiner, 2008, p. 51).

Now Trist knew what was possible. After this experience he desperately sought to develop team systems that capitalize on the synergy of the human technology as a system. A key group of his intellectual network consisted of Norwegians. These individuals had been part of the resistance movement during the war. Norway had been able to confront the Nazi onslaught using small eight- to ten-man independent teams (somewhat similar to the work design in Haighmoor). Each team acted autonomously, with no centralized command. If a team was ever captured, they could not reveal anyone’s intentions but their own. This structure allowed the teams to control their own objectives, tactics, persistence, commitment, and skill.
This freedom resulted in actions far greater than if they would have been taking orders.

In the 1950s and 1960s, some of these same resistance veterans became leaders of industry and government in Norway. These proponents of self-managed teams began to promote similar philosophies in their business operations. Trist, Emery, and their closest colleagues worked with these resistance leaders conducting research that aligned with capabilities seen at Haighmoor. They called this research industrial democracy, open systems, and sociotechnical systems. They were convinced they were on the forefront of something big.

Now in the United States and Britain, Taylorism and scientific management were still popular and effective in the short run. Trist was able to get a few companies to begin to listen, but his success was short-lived. However, a few forward thinkers could see the harm in the Taylorism management style and began looking at such shortcomings in the United States. The premier company practicing open systems in the United States during the 1960s was so secretive about their operation that even Trist had trouble getting information. This fact was because they had discovered this capability provided them a distinct competitive advantage over their competition. This company was Procter & Gamble.

In 1962, Procter & Gamble celebrated its 125th anniversary. It had much to celebrate. It was the predominant company in American marketing and an economic powerhouse (doubling its annual sales every 10 years since its start). Nevertheless, a few rebellious managers had begun to realize that the rigors of time-motion studies
and scientific management were taking a toll on their personnel. Led by manufacturing manager David Swanson, some senior managers began to seek an alternative system to Taylorism. Their first step was to call in Douglas McGregor for consultation. He had recently published *The Human Side of Enterprise* (1960).

McGregor introduced Procter & Gamble to some QWL practices. They were particularly receptive of some of the Trist successes. Procter & Gamble incorporated these methodologies in its new Augusta plant with great success in 1963.

The Augusta managers abandoned some of P&G’s most cherished practices. They banned incentive pay schemes, production quotas, and job classifications. There would be no more operators who ran the lines, mechanics who fixed them, electricians who handled the wiring, or machinists who tooled new parts. There would be only “technicians” working in teams, rewarded not for performance within the defined boundaries of their jobs, but for the skills they possessed…Dave Swanson dubbed the plants “high performance technician systems.” (Kleiner, 2008, p. 54)

Also, in this same year McGregor would visit the Mehoopany plant to consult on labor relations. He brought Dick Beckhard with him to conduct a thorough work system overhaul. This began a long-term relationship between Beckhard and Procter & Gamble. By 1967 these Procter & Gamble plants were so successful that every new plant was required to adopt the principles espoused by McGregor, Trist, and Beckhard.

And then there was the Lima plant. Lima was the philosophical crown jewel for the technician system, and possibly the only plant in the world where sociotechnical systems and thinking reigned supreme. In 1967 the Lima plant claimed production cost half that of a conventional plant (the actual ratio was even lower, but
Lima managers were convinced that no one would believe it). Fifteen years later Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman would present Lima as an example of what America does right on the factory floor and probably the best-managed plant in the United States in *In Search of Excellence* (1982). The man responsible for Lima’s legendary status was Charles Krone. Krone was one of the first Procter & Gamble employees to attend NTL in the early 1960s. He received in-depth training at UCLA, with eminent NTLers, in sociotechnical research, and with Eric Trist himself. Krone developed the sociotechnical systems and QWL operation into a long-standing source of competitive advantage and one of the best kept secrets in America.

In the late 1960s, it fell upon a much weaker, obscure division of General Foods to bring these practices to the public’s eye. In Kankakee, Illinois, the Gainesburgers plant had a young engineering manager (Ketchum), who understood the value of assembly line workers’ expertise and an operations manager trained in participative management (Dulworth). These two men were trained at NTL and began to pursue counsel and knowledge on the pay systems, facilities, and motivation studies. They did not realize they were about to create the first major factory showplace of the post-industrial era. They just knew they wanted to ask: Had anyone, anywhere in America or the rest of the world, ever created a plant like the one they imagined?

Fortunately, they had a long-standing consulting relationship with Purdue University professor Richard Walton. Walton was an NTL trainer, who had spent some time studying at UCLA and met Charlie Krone. Walton made the introduction
and arranged a meeting with Krone. Charlie Krone thought Procter & Gamble had a social responsibility to share their QWL practices. After this meeting, Ketchum and Dulworth were armed with the counsel of Krone and the Lima plant standard operating procedures and were ready to embark on developing a world-class QWL program. Eventually Krone introduced Ketchum to Eric Trist, as the final preparation for opening their Topeka plant.

Regarding QWL, the Topeka plant was big news. In 1971, Ketchum, Dulworth, and their adviser Walton were invited to more and more presentations, to report on QWL and sociotechnical systems program success. The world had begun to learn, accept, and adopt QWL programs.

Phase II

The next phase of QWL was the result of the quality revolution. This occurrence had manifested itself from the rebuilding of Japan by quality guru W. Edwards Deming. Deming had been brought to Japan after World War II to assist General Douglas MacArthur in rebuilding Japan. Though he had very limited success in the United States, his principles of a mathematically managed control method (statistical process control or SPC) for distinguishing ordinary, everyday ebb and flow of resulting data (which he called common causes) from systemic problematic variances in results (which he called special problems) were embraced in Japan. Deming would eventually tell a reporter that by understanding his principles on variance and being able to distinguish the two forms of variation in output data systems, one would know when to act and when to leave a process alone. In time,
they could make their operations, products, and services more effective, less prone to unwanted variation, and closer to their customers’ needs. This process was known as continuous improvement.

Deming principles were so well received in post-war Japan because the small nation was determined not to remain impoverished. He discussed the compounded effects of improvements being encountered at every work station and with every iteration, as well as the circular relationship between quality and cost—improve quality, reduce cost, use savings to improve quality (Phillip Crosby, 1979, would eventually coin the phrase: Quality is Free).

One of the leading companies for executing Deming principles as part of its own management philosophy was Toyota. The chairman, Shoichiro Toyoda, stated during the 1991 Deming Prize Award ceremony that “Deming is the core of our management” (Kleiner, 2008, p. 289).

One of the primary inventions credited to Deming and Toyota was the “Andon Cord.” This cord was literally a notification that an error had been found by one’s peers on a production line. While it could be a source of angst to a line worker slacking off on their responsibility, more importantly, the Andon Cord was figuratively a symbol of empowerment for every worker within the facility. It was a reminder of their personal ability and responsibility to shut down the production line should they discover a defect. This symbolic gesture was a powerful tool in acquiring employee ownership of their work processes and the beginning of the second phase of QWL.
As the total quality movement swept across Japan, a 1980 documentary thrust Deming into the limelight back in the states. His principles began to gain the acclaim in the United States that they had long received in Japan. Lean principles, Six Sigma, just-in-time production, and other quality-oriented practices became so commonplace in American companies that the concepts became known as the ideological movement. This embracing of the quality concepts delivered one specific technique that became extremely popular, called quality circles. Quality circles were groups of employees trained in problem-solving methods that met regularly to resolve issues and develop more efficient ways to work.

Eventually, these quality circles’ focus began to expand from focusing on just the quality of products and equipment processes to sociotechnical system considerations for improving the environment of the people tasked with making the products, by thinking of the process and the personnel as a whole system. This led to the second phase of the QWL effort. QWL activities continue today under the banner of employee involvement and employee empowerment, as well as TQM, Six Sigma, and lean programs. These initiatives, with the proper emphasis, demonstrate how employees can contribute significantly to an organization being more flexible, productive, and competitive; and the organization can contribute to the quality of its employees’ work life.

Beckhard’s definition of OD seeks to create a more humane work environment; therefore, it was only reasonable that by definition his consulting practice would align with the practices of QWL.
Strategic Change

Since the days of cavemen hunting for their supper, planning their attack on the prehistoric wooly mammoth, humans have utilized strategy to accomplish their professional endeavors. Therefore, incorporating strategy into business operations is not a new concept or practice. As famed former CEO of General Electric Jack Welch once stated: “Strategy means making clear-cut choices about how to compete” (Thompson, Strickland, & Gamble, 2007, p. 2). While this research uncovered some world-class strategy theorists (the pioneering and groundbreaking work of Henry Mintzberg, Michael Porter, and Donald Hambrick), the ones selected to complete this analysis of strategic change are Thompson, Strickland, and Gamble. In their classic text on the topic, they defined the concept of strategy as management’s action plan for running the business and conducting operations. They stated “managers face three central questions in evaluating their company’s business prospects: What’s the company’s present situation? Where does the company need to go from here? How should it get there?” (2007, p. 3). Thompson, Strickland, and Gamble went on to quote scholar and noted author Amar Bhide as they added: “An organization’s capacity to execute strategy depends on its ‘hard’ infrastructure—its structure and systems—and its ‘soft’ infrastructure—its culture and norms” (p. 414). This introduces the connection between strategy and culture, a connection that provides a natural bridge to strategic change and one of its key creators, Dick Beckhard.

The strategic change stem of OD is a more recent influence on OD’s evolution within larger complex entities. Strategic change is the proper alignment of an
organization’s strategy, design, and environment (both external and internal systems) to improve performance. One of the first scholars and practitioners to capitalize on the enhanced understanding of organizational culture, unveiled by the new capabilities presented through the use of T-groups and OD, was Dick Beckhard.

Beckhard combined his vast theatrical background (on and off Broadway) and extensive experience consulting to organizations in the planning and execution of successful meetings and conferences (Ford, Girl Scouts of America, The World’s Fair, The Red Cross, The White House, and NTL) with his newly acquired knowledge of behavioral science and T-group applications to gain a mastery of the influence culture had on organizational performance. His unique skillsets made him a favorite collaborator of McGregor. This gained him an invite to co-consult on the large-scale bottom-up projects at General Mills and Procter & Gamble. It was with Procter & Gamble that he was introduced to Charles Krone and open systems planning. With this final piece to the puzzle in place, Beckhard became one of the leading authorities of his time on large-scale organizational change efforts.

He used all the tools at his disposal to facilitate an advanced understanding of how organizations functioned. Beckhard proposed that one could describe and analyze an organization’s environment and strategy based on the entity’s core mission and the differential between the environmental demands and the organization’s ability to respond. By managing these factors, organizations could improve their performance. Since Beckhard opened the doors of strategic change, many have followed with various models involving multiple levels of the organization, a change
in its culture, high powered executive champions, and important measurable effects on performance.

While it is interesting how closely Beckhard’s change model aligns with the three questions posed by Thompson, Strickland, and Gamble concerning strategy, one must note that Beckhard identified the importance of an ordinal analysis of these factors. He specifically addressed the future state first. Beckhard and Harris stated: “We have found that the greatest single threat to successful change results from inadequate early attention to defining the end states…” (1987, p. 46). They went on to make a fitting and whimsical quote from former New York Yankee manager Casey Stengel: “If you don’t know where you are going, you might end up somewhere else” (Beckhard & Harris, 1987, p. 45).

After Beckhard completed the determination of his desired future state, he then turned his sights to a diagnosis of the current state. Thompson, Strickland, and Gamble’s concepts identify that an organization’s present culture and work climate may or may not support the effective implementation and execution of their management’s selected strategy. They added the logical corollary that

When a company’s present work climate promotes attitudes and behaviors that are well suited to first-rate strategy execution, its culture functions as a valuable ally in the strategy execution process. When the culture is in conflict with some aspect of the company’s direction, performance targets, or strategy, the culture becomes a stumbling block.” (2007, p. 426)

Beckhard’s grasp of the behavioral sciences provided him distinctive competence in this area and was probably a viable attribute of his successful consulting practice. Beckhard knew the importance of assessing the present state of
the organization, with respect to the desired future state, before determining any change tactics or action plans. He and Harris devised the following criteria for diagnosing the present state of an organization:

Anyone who is managing a change and attempting to identify what aspects the present state needs changing must take the following diagnostic measure:

1. Identify and set priorities within [groups] of change problems
2. Identify relevant subsystems
3. Assess their readiness and capability for [desired] change (1987, p. 59)

Finally, as in any change, there is the future state and the present state, which have been discussed, and the transition state or the path leading from actual to desired conditions (the period where all the change takes place). In this state Beckhard identified the activities required to move from present to future state, then managed the structure and process of execution of all work within this state. To this end, Beckhard developed tools and processes to guide and support this activity. The results were instruments to manage commitment and responsibility, as well as a successful change process, getting from where they are to where they want to be.

As stated by another General Electric CEO Jeffrey R. Immelt, “Seeing people in person is a big part of how you drive any change process. You have to show people a positive view of the future and say ‘we can do it’” (Thompson, Strickland, & Gamble, 2007, p. 414).

Beckhard’s change model became so popular that it was soon being used as the foundation of revised theories by change agents developing their own models.
Some of the more notable examples, as deemed by this author, were the Yaeger and Sorensen theories that take into consideration the effects of technology and globalization on strategic OD. A more specific globalization consideration is varying global culture. While this topic is effectively addressed by icons such as Hofstede, Trompenaars and Woolliams, and Golembiewski, the author, for obvious reasons, chose this quote from the Peter Drucker Future Series edited by Hesselbein, Goldsmith, and Beckhard to demonstrate the effects of global culture on strategy:

The Human Resource Manager of a global pharmaceutical company who took on an assignment in the Far East discovered, to his surprise, that one of his biggest challenges was to persuade his company’s managers in China, Korea, Malaysia, and Taiwan to accept promotions—their cultural values were such that they did not believe in competing with their peers for career rewards and personal gain, nor did they relish breaking ties to their local communities to assume cross-national responsibilities. (1997, p. 291)

It becomes apparent, if it is a global company from the United States, that facing such cultural differences could require an adjustment of strategy.

Additionally, Worley, Hitchin, and Ross’ integrated strategic change model successfully extends Beckhard and Harris’ work by incorporating the specificity of organizational structure into the three-step strategic change analysis, yielding the enhanced ability to use organization change as a competitive advantage. This is accomplished, per these authors, as follows:

It [the integrated strategic change model] is a more specific form of Beckhard and Harris’s (1987) transition state model. For example, instead of a generic “current state” or “desired future state” that could apply to any organizational system, these “states” are represented by an organization’s strategic orientation, that is, its strategy (S) and supporting organization design factors (O). The ISC model is slightly different in that the strategic change plan (SCP), which documents the
activities that will move the organization from its current strategic orientation [S1/O1] to its future one [S2/O2], is less a state than a stream of activities. Over time, the desired strategic orientation (S2/O2) becomes the old strategic orientation [S1/O1] and the process is begun again when appropriate. (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996, p. 17)

Thus, it links the strategic change process to environmental factors (either internal or external) that regulate competitive advantage.

Chris Worley would eventually go on to align the power of his ISC model with the proven effectiveness of Savall’s SEAM model to address one of the hottest areas within strategic OD today: agility. This particular manifestation is most intriguing since, in this microwave generation in which we exist, scholars seek to reduce the time required to change the culture of a large organization to less than two years. While Thompson, Strickland, and Gamble stated it can take from two to five years to accomplish such a change, Beckhard was unwavering on the position that to change the culture of a large organization took a minimum of seven years (per conversation with Dr. Therese Yaeger). It would be fascinating to see how he would address the agility model.

Lastly, a final review of strategic change would be remiss to fail to identify Charan’s (2005) work in strategically employing corporate governance to go beyond compliance to achieve competitive advantage. Also, a requisite honorable mention goes to the team of Vogelsang et al. (2013) for their extraordinary work in compiling applications to strategically align human resources and OD. Each of these developments, in some way, can trace its origin through the efforts of Beckhard and strategic change. Ultimately, both strategic change and its noted pioneer Dick
Beckhard significantly influenced OD practice. For instance, implementing strategic change today requires OD practitioners to have competence in team building, action research, and survey feedback, but it also requires skills in competitive strategy, finance, and marketing (and there are currently efforts to revive the prominence of management accounting to a position of competitive advantage, as discussed by Johnson and Kaplan in their classic: *Relevance Lost: The Rise and Fall of Management Accounting* (1987). Together, these soft and hard skills have combined to improve OD’s relevance to organizations and their management, demonstrating the importance of strategic change efforts. The advancing of capabilities to think strategically and systemically caused Beckhard to be widely acknowledged as the architect of planned change theory and practice (Hampton, 1997).

Beckhard’s innovations were legendary: inter-group confrontation meetings; responsibility charting; team building, all in service of large strategic goals for business leaders. For nearly 50 years, Beckhard helped organizations function in a more humane and high-performing manner, and to empower people to be agents of change. (Foster, 2012)

**Positive Organizational Scholarship**

Traditionally, OD is deemed to have emerged from five main backgrounds or contributory stems, as this document has discussed (T-group, action research/survey feedback, normative, QWL, and strategic change); however, this final area to be discussed has made such an impact on the field of OD that the author has deemed it warrants a contributory stem of its own. With this fact in mind, in the late 1970s, at a small little-known institution within the suburbs of Chicago called George Williams College, a professor calls through the hall to his student: “David, can you come to my
office?” As the student enters the office, the professor advises him of how impressed he was with his paper and they go on to discuss the student’s work. Eventually, the professor invites the student to attend a lecture series event, where one of the country’s foremost OD experts was speaking. The student did attend the event and as a result decided that OD was for him. The student completed his master’s and went on to do a PhD at Case Western Reserve University. On August 17, 1985, he completed his dissertation entitled: *Appreciative Inquiry: Toward a Methodology for Understanding and Enhancing Organizational Innovation* (From personal conversation with Sorensen and Cooperrider’s 2017 OD Lifetime Achievement Award acceptance speech). From that day at George Williams College, this student changed the field of OD and the world: AI and the positivity movement within OD had begun.

Cooperrider’s dissertation argued three main points in support of AI:

1. It critiqued the problem-solving approach that, at that time, dominated action research, arguing that problem-solving, as a tool for social innovation, did not do a very good job and might, in fact, be counterproductive.

2. It argued that organizations were best viewed as socially constructed realities and that forms of organization were constrained only by human imagination and the shared beliefs of organizational members. As socially constructed realities, forms of inquiry were potent in constructing the systems they inquired into and that problem-solving approaches were just as likely to create more of the very problems they were intended to solve.
3. It argued that the most important force for change were new ideas.

Cooperrider highlighted the lack of new ideas generated by conventional action research and proposed AI as a method that was more likely to create new ideas, images, and theories that would lead to social innovation. These propositions were based on research conducted in a world-class medical facility in Ohio, called the Cleveland Clinic. The Cleveland Clinic project is generally cited in literature as the starting point for AI thought and action (Yaeger, Sorensen, & Bengtsson, 2005).

In the early 1980s, the Cleveland Clinic purchased the Omni Hotel, a low budget hotel located across the street from the clinic. The idea was to provide a convenient place for the families of clinic patients to stay. The clinic completely restored the hotel facilities, retaining the original management and staff. Although the restoration provided a good opportunity for business growth, the staff and management were locked in a setting of distrust and backbiting. The staff constantly bickered and service was poor.

The clinic hired a Case Western Reserve University PhD student, David Cooperrider, to resolve the problems. The conventional approach would have been to hire a new management team to turn around the performance of the low performing hotel or send the current management team for hotel management training to improve their performance, but Cooperrider had a different idea. He asked the staff to spend a week in a highly rated, five-star hotel. They were not supposed to think about their hotel. Their only job was to write down everything the hotel staff did well that made their stay more enjoyable. At the end of the week, they wrote a report and presented it
to the five-star hotel manager. The manager was so pleased, the hotel put on a celebratory banquet for the Omni managers. The Omni hotel managers returned to their hotel inspired and full of ideas of opportunities for improvements.

Miraculously, the management team incorporating these new ideas brought about immediate changes in staff attitude and service. The Omni quickly gained four-star status (Jakes & Miller, 2018), but far more important to the rest of the world was the fact that strength-based change had been scientifically and statistically proven to be effective.

So, it had been established: AI was a proven process based on search and discovery. It was designed to value, prize, and honor an individual, group, or system. This objective was achieved by touching the positive core of an entity through the asking of questions (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003). The concept was published to the world in 1987: Cooperrider and Srivastva’s “Appreciative Inquiry in Organizational Life.” However, everyone did not just accept this new theory. Since the positivity-based theory of AI was counterintuitive to the traditional deficit-based mindset of the business community, the concept was not immediately embraced. More evidence and a paradigm shift in corrective action process were required.

The following is an examination of some of this evidence by Yaeger, Sorensen, and Bengtsson (2005):

1987: The first field application of AI was conducted as part of the Roundtable discussion session.
Project: An initiative designed to facilitate the development of the next generation of executive leaders by sharing with the candidates the firm’s history, tradition, success plan, and success factors.

1992: Imagine Chicago became the first application of a major community development effort. Bliss Brown led a project in the heart of Chicago that (much like Lewin’s leadership style study using the G-Man Club) capitalized on the purity of the behavior of children to assess the observations of AI in a community development study.

According to Yaeger, Sorensen, and Bengtsson (2005), between 1986 and 1994, 34 publications were published on AI. By 1995 AI was considered the most important advancement in action research since its creation 10 years earlier (Bushe, 1995). The process was based on a 4D cycle developed by Cooperrider:

1. Discovery—Mobilizing a whole system inquiry into the positive change core;
2. Dream—Creating a clear results-oriented vision in relation to discovered potential and in relation to questions of higher purpose, i.e., “What is the world calling us to become?”
3. Design—Creating possibility propositions of the ideal organization, an organization design which people feel is capable of magnifying or eclipsing the positive core and realizing the articulated new dream; and
4. Destiny—Strengthening the affirmative capability of the whole system enabling it to build hope and momentum around a deep purpose and creating processes for learning, adjustment, and improvisation like a jazz group over time. (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005, p. 5)
There was a growing use of AI around the world, thanks in part to the countless successful applications with businesses and other organizations. But in 1996, AI was catapulted to a new level of global fame.

1996: Avon Mexico was recognized for its application of AI to gender issues by receiving the Catalyst Award.

1996: The first issue of a journal devoted completely to AI is published. This issue featured Peter Sorensen as guest editor, the first application of AI to survey guided change, one of the first articles on the use of AI in a global social change organization by Thatchenkery (acclaimed coauthor with Metzker of *Appreciative Intelligence*, 2006), and even an article contributed by AI creator Cooperrider himself.

According to Yaeger, Sorensen, and Bengtsson (2005), AI was gaining acclaim as an effective new tool for enhanced cooperative change. Then one day in 1996, His Holiness, the Dalai Lama proposed that if the leadership of the world’s religions could get to know one another, the world would be a better place. The Dalai Lama called for a series of meetings to convene these leaders. AI was chosen as the method to attempt this formidable task. Led by Bishop William Swing, and arranged in conjunction with former President Jimmy Carter, Cooperrider and a team of AI experts were brought in to organize dialogue among the world’s top religious leaders—an action that would lead to a global initiative that was probably the most important application of AI to date: the pursuit of world peace.
Soon the project transitioned from the planning to the execution phase. A large group of religious leaders of every faith began to gather in hope of creating an environment conducive to conversations in a secure, small, private, relatively unstructured setting. These conversations provided religious leaders the opportunity to talk with and get to know one another in mutually respectful ways. Additionally, the conversations offered a chance to reflect upon the world’s most challenging issues without committing any institution to another.

The first sessions started with pairs of individuals, randomly formed across religious lines. Visualize a Jewish rabbi and Muslim imam or Hindu sage and Greek Orthodox priest all coming together in a non-threatening discussion to explore each other’s feelings. To facilitate these conversations, each participant was asked:

One could say a key task in life is to discover and define our life purpose, and then accomplish it to the best of our ability. Can you share a story of a moment or a period of time where clarity about life purpose emerged for you—for example, a time where you heard your calling, where there was an important awakening or teaching, where you felt the touch of the sacred, or where you received some guiding vision? Now, beyond this story, what do you sense you are supposed to do before your life, this life, is over? (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003, p. 230)

Within an hour, participants were introducing their partners to the group at large by describing their strengths, personal meanings, and vision for a better tomorrow, obtained during their dyadic conversation. The process inspired exciting spontaneous interpersonal interactions and positive emotions. Despite the short-term nature of these sessions, their impact was significant. The hope of this effort was to embark upon the end of religious violence in the world, based on the logic of
theologian Hans Kung: “There will be no peace among nations until there is peace among religions, and there will be no peace among religions until there is dialogue” (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003, p. 230). The appreciative conversation resulting from this inquiry led to the creation of a United Nations-like organization among world religions called the United Religions Initiative.

In 2004 the United Nations asked Cooperrider to facilitate a summit on global corporate citizenship with Secretary-General Kofi Annan and 500 business leaders. In the halls of the United Nations that year, an AI Summit launched the UN Global Compact. After a powerful gathering that brought business leaders together with nonprofit and government leaders from around the world, then-Secretary-General Kofi Annan wrote to Cooperrider saying,

I would like to commend you for your innovative methodology of AI and to thank you for introducing it to the United Nations. Without this, it would have been very difficult, perhaps even impossible, to constructively engage so many leaders of business, civil society, and government. (Champlain College Website, 2019)

Another admirer of the process is Admiral Vernon Clark, the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, who brought AI into the Navy for a multiyear project on “Bold and Enlightened Naval Leadership.” This process utilizes the technique to develop leadership skills in an audience that ranges from admiral to petty officer (Champlain College Website, 2019).

Eventually, acceptance began to rise with the demonstration of successes in various businesses’ and other organizations’ use of AI. Soon, the skepticism initially faced by AI dissipated as successful implementation, after successful implementation
demonstrated the effectiveness of the technique. As the focus on the positivity movement increased, new ways of comprehending the processes and dynamics of the concepts rapidly emerged. OD was on the forefront of this shift in focus from traditional perspective to a social construction to the positive extreme through the marriage of OD and AI (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Yaeger, Sorensen, & Bengtsson, 2005).

Cooperrider’s work on AI helped bring about today’s POS, strengths-based leadership models, and positive psychology movement (Cooperrider, 2019b). Positivity’s roots can be traced back to 1954 and Abraham Maslow’s vision of a positive social science as captured in his first edition of Motivation and Personality which was published with a final chapter titled “Toward a Positive Psychology.” Beyond the seminal work of Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987), the other two strong sources of the strength-based revolution in management include Martin Seligman’s call for a positive psychology (Seligman, 2019) and Peter Drucker’s effective executive efforts (Drucker, 2006; Cooperrider, 2019a).

In 1998, the new president of the American Psychological Association, Dr. Martin Seligman, declared the pursuit of research in positive psychology a priority of the psychological profession. This declaration made positive psychology a major focus of the psychology field. This resulted in synergy between two fields, which provided an added thrust to the positivity movement’s research efforts (Seligman, 2019).
Peter Drucker, known for his metric-driven philosophy Management by Objectives (MBO), provided a way of cultivating accountability within the management structure. Drucker had become friends with McGregor and familiar with Lippitt and NTL’s “preferred future” exercises to envision a desirable long-term future state. However, Drucker felt this perspective too distant a view from the day-to-day goals of an organization. He therefore developed the MBO concept as a more concrete cousin to sensitivity-based generic techniques and their results. Drucker’s MBO was the predecessor of Odiorne’s version of MBO and the later expanded metric version by Kaplan, called the Balanced Scorecard. While the latter two versions attempted to use more quantitative measures to control operational manageability and accountability, Drucker remained more behaviorally based in his concepts. This would appear a result of his relationship with McGregor as well as the impact of Dick Beckhard on his training of executives. Beckhard would eventually form close ties to Drucker, join the board of directors of the Peter Drucker Foundation, and become a co-editor on the Peter Drucker Future Series (Kleiner, 2008, p. 195).

In a classic conversation between Cooperrider and Drucker, they found something in common: a realization that strengths do more than perform, they transform. For Drucker, the development of an appreciative eye is the first task of great leadership. That is what AI does: It provides the theory and tools for (a) the elevation of systemic strengths; (b) the unification and configuration of systemic strengths; and (c) the magnification of systemic strengths outward into society, that is,
the discovery and design of positive institutions that bring our highest human strengths, such as love and courage, into the world.

Finally, when asked by Cooperrider: “Peter…can you put it in a nutshell, what is the essence of management and leadership?” Drucker’s response was: “David, that is simple and it’s ageless in its essence; the task of leadership is to create an alignment of strengths in ways that make a system’s weaknesses irrelevant” (Cooperrider, 2019a). It appears that this conversation accentuates a link between Drucker’s executive education efforts and AI in the area of POS as well as is indicative of Beckhard’s influence on at least two of the three primary driving forces of this area.

Together, AI, Drucker’s management theory, and positive psychology have created a society-wide positive-strengths movement “because it works” (Cooperrider, 2019b). Next, this body of work will look at the prophetic or potential of extending the hermeneutic bridge into the future.

**Envisioned Era**

Now equipped with a more complete picture of the full spectrum of OD, the last part of this section provides insight of what appears to be coming down the pipe for the field of OD. The final period to be reviewed by this document is called the Envisioned Era. The section allows the author to don the hat of a modern-day Ezekiel (prophet) or Paul Revere (watchman); however, I will speak to the direction the field of OD is headed and the impact Richard Beckhard’s contributions had on that vector along the hermeneutic bridge.
**Future Manifestations**

As the Enlightened Era analysis has directed, the glidepath of OD would appear to be continuing with fervor along the strategic and POS avenues; although there will always be some form of investigation and development in the traditional areas of inquiry (i.e., employee empowerment or QWL stem and action research/survey feedback). The author will briefly review some potential avenues of approach to stimulate the reader’s inquisitiveness.

The first unit of investigation will be strategic OD. As the world continues to get smaller and information technology continues to advance, it is a good bet that one of strategic OD’s components, global OD, will continue to see advancement in research. While the opening of new markets will generate cultural considerations worthy of analysis via Hofstede, Lewis, Trompenaars, or Golembiewski methodologies, especially around the emerging countries arena, there will also be the matter of cultural change to be addressed (i.e., traditional Chinese culture’s comparison to open market Chinese culture). However, these advances will not be limited to geography. An advancement of global OD could very well be realized via enhancements in big data technology capability.

Another potential stream of strategic OD opportunity follows the path of agility. In the time-sensitive world in which we live, the potential for increased expediency will almost always provide a point of interest. While Worley and Savall have initiated collaboration regarding strategic OD and SEAM to achieve agility, there would have to be complementary avenues of research opportunities, such as the
aligning of Beckhard’s GRPI team-building innovation to varied steps of the underlying components of the collaboration to acquire synergistic enhancement.

Meanwhile, alternate concepts of the utilization of strategic OD might include alignment with Charan’s work with governance to provide boards that contribute competitive advantage rather than just enforce compliance. Such a course of action could build on and very much benefit from Beckhard’s “managed from the top” focus on consulting efforts.

Finally, there exist internal and external alternatives for potential advancements within strategic OD based on the evolutionary advancement of the topic of business strategy. According to Thompson, Strickland, and Gamble, “…a company’s strategy must be matched both to its external market circumstances and to its internal resources and competitive capabilities” (2007, p. x). An examination of the internal option will be reviewed first, then the external alternative. As the field of OD matures and OD-minded leaders ascend to the helm of their organization, one might anticipate a shift in the resource-based view of operational execution, due to changes in the organization’s dynamics as a whole. Two examples of this type of manifestation would be

1. Today, Magnetrol International, Inc., with applied behavioral scientist Dr. Jeff Swallow as president and chairman of the board, utilizes applied behavioral scientist Dr. Chris Fernandez to promote enterprise-wide OD capabilities (similar to the Harwood Manufacturing Company, with applied behavioral scientist Dr. Alfred J. Morrow as the president and chairman of the board, use
of applied behavioral scientist Dr. Kurt Lewin to promote enterprise-wide OD capabilities in the 1940s). The scenario incorporates the power of OD to permeate throughout the company due to the belief that it is the cultural basis of the business.

2. Dr. Matt Minihan speaking at the Benedictine University Spring 2018 Lecture Series described his OD experience at the World Bank as fulfilling and productive because the OD function was under the finance department. The resulting enhanced strategic OD capabilities were the complements of the evolution of cultural alignment based on organizational design. I suspect this capability to become more prevalent as OD personnel rise to positions of authority over organization design. Minihan and the World Bank’s design may have benefitted from their exposure to Beckhard during a planning meeting. This model should provide guidance to future generations.

In addition to operating internally within organizations to promote strong OD-focused behavior, there is the example of external environmental evolutionary strategy that may duplicate the model of the Norwegian resistance movement soldiers effectuating OD principles through companies by becoming captains of industries to promote enlightened behavior as a result of innate culture industry-wide. This may explain the more positive attitude generally experienced by the Scandinavian culture. Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) discuss in their book *Cultures and Organizations*. An interesting point of information is that Beckhard had a major impact in establishing the OD culture in that part of the world. As a result of his
consulting efforts, his impact in the following areas was well documented and received from the Dutch Training Association, Danish Employers Association (which was conducted in Sweden and included a Swedish contingent), and Finnish Management Institute. Based on the natural expansion of cultural development and organization design, it would appear that both the internal and external options present viable and promising opportunities for future discovery in the field of OD.

The final stem of OD that the author predicts to experience significant growth in the future is in the positivity movement. At the Benedictine University 2017 Fall Lecture Series, Warner Burke proclaimed AI the most significant contribution to OD in the last 40 years. What I can state with confidence is that the positivity movement will continue into the foreseeable future. This comment is based on the fact that as AI has spawned, or at least influenced, concepts such as SOAR, appreciative intelligence, and appreciative leadership, OD appears skewed toward positivity.

Of course, when you consider the emergence of Luthans’ psychological capital research (Luthans & Avolio, 2014) and the American Psychological Association research concentration in positive psychology, there became a synergy between organization behavior and psychology that provided added incentive toward the positivity movement’s investigative prowess. Finally, on top of all this, the recent increased focus in social awareness has influenced manifestations in areas from corporate social responsibility, triple bottom line, and value-driven leadership to sustainability and business as an agent of world benefit (Cooperrider’s next great concept in social entrepreneurship). When one adds up all the cerebral power being
concentrated toward the positivity movement and its manifestations, the preponderance of evidence is indicative that this research area will continue well into the future. Showing Beckhard’s connection and impact to this area is the focus of my first post-doctoral research project. This concludes the section on future manifestations and leads to the one on future proliferations.

**Future Proliferations**

The final section of this peek into what will be is a look at the means and methods of continued proliferation. Established channels of delivery will continue to progress in some diverse manners. Online knowledge (such as the historiography course from University of Ibadan) will become more prevalent as a means to acquire knowledge at minimal cost. Additionally, much like a physician’s assistant or engineering tech, a semi-professional (technician-level) practitioner program is expected to materialize to support the duties and offset the cost of an OD professional.

Now moving to the proliferation of the evolution of strategic OD, at the Benedictine University Fall 2017 Lecture Series, Warner Burke identified the fields of healthcare and education industry-wide as the next two areas of significant gains in OD. These two fields are expected to become more and more receptive of OD principles, as their management becomes more and more OD savvy. While Beckhard began establishing such training programs for hospitals and universities in the early 1970s, today scholar-practitioner programs like the one Beckhard helped to establish
at Benedictine University provide valuable OD background to powerful education and healthcare practitioners to cultivate their OD acumen.

The development of more corporate internal and/or industry-specific, online self-study, and technician-level OD practitioners training will result in the need to assure candidate proficiency and capability. An industry-wide accepted certification process may be developed to better qualify the abilities of the “Certified Organization Development Consultant” and distinguish them from their academically prepared counterpart the “Registered Organization Development Consultant” which has already been established. Therefore, a standardized certification exam may be developed to authenticate these new avenues of proliferation for compliance, quality, and effectiveness. This type of qualification process takes the field full circle as it almost returns exactly to the original certification training process that Beckhard originated in 1967, the PSOD program. The more things change, the more they stay the same. This concludes both the section on future proliferations and historiographical analysis. The next and final part of this section is a brief assessment of content analysis.

**Content Analysis**

To summarize the picture created via the biographical sketch of the life of Beckhard, the topography of the overlay shows intermingled activity within four distinct areas of operation: OD pioneer, management consultant, family business field founder, and human capital developer. It is interesting to watch how each supports the development of the other. It all begins with the establishment of a sound OD
foundation. This foundation had its basis in three primary components: self-training, laboratory training (both controlled and field), and academia. Beckhard utilized this foundation to begin consulting to businesses. He focused his OD consulting analysis toward leadership, based on the perspective that change is executed from the top. This top-focused consulting eventually supported his consulting practice as management consultant (progressing the evolution of his practice toward executive consulting). As the overlap of OD pioneer merged into management consulting, the topography again extended into specific areas: first, family business and corporate, but eventually adding healthcare and education (areas still very open to OD infusion). Finally, as his subject matter expertise and reputation received wide acclaim, Beckhard was poised to extend the boundary of his practice into the consultant-mentor interface of the topography. The result is an in-depth description of how the life of Dick Beckhard lays out over the time continuum. Such topography could be used to fit over the corresponding topography of the development of the history of OD in general to provide points of commonality, or what I call nodes of connectivity, for the purpose of analysis. The next section will develop the corresponding historical topography to conduct such analysis.

**Step 7. Developing the Story**

In the social cataloging website Goodreads, Winston Churchill is quoted as saying: “The farther backward you can look, the farther forward you can see.” The purpose of this section is to demonstrate and explain the process utilized to connect the contributions of the past to present activity and project areas of interest and
potential for the future. This content analysis process is called “mapping and overlay analysis.”

Figure 3 (the mapping) shows a diagram of a timeline of the noteworthy contributions highlighted for the field of OD throughout history. At a glance, the reader can view a continuum of the occurrences that impacted the field as they developed. Figure 4 (the overlay) is a diagram of the corresponding timeline of noteworthy contributions of Dick Beckhard on an overlapping continuum that parallels the time intervals recorded in Figure 3. Lastly, Figure 5 (the map and overlay) is a timeline that shows commonality of the corresponding events. It highlights where Beckhard’s contributions show up in the annals of time, amidst other developments of the time period. Figure 5 also lends itself to a visual tracing of the connections of these two sets of data.
Figure 3. Historical Analysis (OD Mapping)
Figure 4. Biographical Analysis (Beckhard Overlay)
Figure 5. Content Analysis (Map and Overlay Process)
As the map and overlay commonalities are highlighted, a story is forged of connectivity of developments over the time spectrum. The story highlights Beckhard’s role in the development of various theories, models, and formula. It goes on to tell how other theories, models, and formula developed from the influence Beckhard had on scholars, both his contemporaries (such as Ed Schein) and over time (such as William Pasmore). An example of such a scenario of influence would be the work of Beckhard’s initial efforts in applying behavioral science analysis to the improvement of business at the highest level resulting in consulting on the strategies of organizations. The influence of this technique is quoted in the work of Worley, Hitchin, and Ross’ *Integrated Strategic Change* as being connected to the impetus of their advanced synergistic model as a form of progressive coherence development within OD (1996, p. 17).

Ultimately, although Beckhard had a relatively successful career in the performing arts, both on and off Broadway, as well as in radio as the voice of Henry Aldrich, history still deems these periods of his life as preparation for his destiny. When all has been said and done, the content analysis of Beckhard’s life provided four dominant themes to tell the Dick Beckhard story: OD pioneer, management consultant, family business field of study founder, and developer of human capital. Though Beckhard’s character made him acquire as much learning as possible out of every opportunity leading to the four themes (actor, director, columnist, organization executive, and meeting planning consultant), these four dominant roles within his life are the ones that made an indelible mark on history.
The Dick Beckhard story composed from this analysis paints a picture of an OD pioneer. His roles as MIT OD scholar, NTL OD trainer, and OD practitioner consultant all will contribute to this theme in promoting the development of the field. Beckhard brought together these three components of his life as an OD pioneer to make a significant contribution to the field of study of OD, while it was in its infancy stage. He applied the principles of OD in the execution of management consulting techniques, using these skills to connect and further develop OD, develop other fields (i.e., management and family business), and develop OD practitioners in the fields.

It was through the study of these contributions in a historical analysis over the time continuum that established nodes of connectivity between Beckhard’s model for strategic organizational transitions in the 1950s and Worley, Hitchin, and Ross’ model of integrated strategic change in the 1990s. This node of connectivity correspondingly is experiencing contemporary linkage of synthesized coherence via Worley’s work in integrated strategic change and agility in cooperation with ISEOR’s Zardet, Bonnet, and Savall’s works on SEAM to deliver a current collaboration in one the hottest fields in North America and Europe, respectively (Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, & Savall, 2015). Ironically, as my current synthesized coherence research moves forward with Beckhard’s GRPI and Savall’s SEAM, if the practical application testing proves positive, a natural progressive-synthesized coherence might be the next logical step in this developing theory.

The final linkage to be examined is the proposed node of connectivity that has yet to be confirmed between the positivity aspect seen in Beckhard’s future state of
the organizational transition model and Cooperrider’s dream phase of AI. These two concepts closely parallel in appearance, and ironically Beckhard’s protégé Ron Fry was a mentor to David Cooperrider and on his dissertation committee. These facts provide an intriguing scenario for the linkage between Beckhard’s and Cooperrider’s concepts. Establishing this linkage is the focus of post-doctoral research.

These few stories capture the essence of the early contributions of Beckhard as well as the impact these contributions made on continued and potential future developments in the field. A quick review of the content analysis of the discussions highlighted here indicates the following:

1. Laboratory Training: Nodes of connectivity indicate strong confirmation of Beckhard’s continued influence in the analysis

2. Action Research/Survey Feedback: Nodes of connectivity indicate strong confirmation of Beckhard’s continued influence in the analysis

3. Normative Approach: Nodes of connectivity indicate strong confirmation of Beckhard’s continued influence in the analysis

4. QWL: Nodes of connectivity indicate moderate confirmation of Beckhard’s continued influence in the analysis

5. Strategic Change: Nodes of connectivity indicate strong confirmation of Beckhard’s continued influence in the analysis

6. POS: Nodes of connectivity indicate moderate confirmation of Beckhard’s continued influence in the analysis
This concludes the content analysis of this body of work and moves it into the critiquing process.

**Step 8. Critiquing the Story**

The validity or dependability of this research project demands the scrutiny of the academic community’s critique of its legitimacy and viability. To that end the author developed a series of first private, then public, displays of various segments of the research to subject the work to the assessment to viable scrutiny for validation of legitimacy.

The critiquing process began with small presentations of the contributions of Beckhard to 15 PhD candidates to assess their acceptance of the research’s value. While the most intense counterpoints came to Beckhard’s focus from the top-down versus bottom-up approach, we were able to agree that there was more than one way to skin a cat and that Beckhard’s applications of OD principles remain today significant contributions to the current development of the field of OD.

Next, a segment of Beckhard’s work within the field of family business was presented on the regional conference level with no significant challenges to the viability of the contributions to the field. This both introduced my research to a world outside of the walls of Benedictine University and legitimized the extension of Beckhard’s OD principles to the field of family business. First, since the presentation had to be peer-reviewed by an outside regional governing body (Midwest Academy of Management) for acceptability to the conference, it legitimized interest in my topic as a viable contribution. Second, this governing body validated that this topic in OD
was viable within the realms of the regional Academy of Management community (one of the most highly regarded scholarly organizations existing in the field).

To continue elevating the level of scrutiny to which I subjected my work, my research was required to face its next big test, at the national level. I submitted a presentation on Beckhard’s work in family business leader development concepts (along with three PhD candidate colleagues) to the national conference of the OD Network. This work was accepted by OD Network and by the noted scholars attending the presentation as a valuable piece of research.

As part of my introduction to the man and efforts of Dick Beckhard, I spoke with many of his distinguished colleagues and students to gain insight on the true character and benefit of the individual. The results of these conversations created an image of Beckhard that was larger than life. I could not help but become an admirer of this legend. This fact endangered my research, for I could feel myself being biased by admiration of the man rather than his contributions. Fortunately, I realized that my positive preconceptions of Beckhard’s significance opened me to the problem of selective perception, and that forced me to work even harder to guard against bias. To this end, I wrote a paper to submit to the national conference of the Academy of Management, the highest level of scrutiny I had to date experienced. I had decided on presenting a small portion of my research content, along with the basis linking contributions of Beckhard to continuing developments in the field of OD. I believed it to be a viable concept and wanted to put it to a more rigorous scrutiny than I had previously encountered.
At Benedictine a requirement before submitting a paper to the Academy was a faculty review. One day I was called into a meeting with the program director and associate program director. Upon entering the meeting, my academy submission paper was ripped to shreds as they challenged my concept. After almost an hour and a half of defending my work, smiles came across their faces and they said they wanted to co-author the submission to the Academy of Management with me. Admittedly, their contributions made the article markedly better, and I was allowed to defend the validity of the paper at the Academy of Management national conference. The minor challenges to methodology were far less grueling than the marathon defense I had encountered, trying to get past the Benedictine PHDOD program leadership to submit to the Academy. This composite experience was the intricate scrutiny and highest form of critique I would face prior to dissertation defense.

I submitted my research to and was accepted at an international ISEOR-AOM conference in Lyon, France. Here I presented an aspect of my own synthesized coherence research on combining the capabilities of Beckhard’s GRPI model and Savall’s SEAM concept. I also introduced my concepts of modes of expansion (manifestation and proliferation) for the first time with huge success and acceptance.

I had now presented my research for critique at the local, regional, national, and international level. I was convinced of the legitimacy of my work, when I received one final endorsement. When the team in charge of delivering the Dick Beckhard Mentoring Session determined they needed one more speaker on the importance of effective mentoring, I received an unsolicited invitation to speak at the
national conference of the OD Network to address Beckhard’s role as a developer of human capital. Once again, this presentation was well received as a viable area of research providing legitimate contributions to the field of OD and confirming this research could withstand the critiquing process at any level.

**Step 9. The Outcome of the Research**

The outcome of this research provided the following analysis for consideration: It introduced two archetypes for expanding the field of OD, exposed nodes of connectivity between the biographical and historical analysis, and presented an opportunity to execute the practical application of this research. A review of this step demonstrates the purposefulness of the research project, as it confirms the hermeneutic bridge.

**Modes of Expansion**

The field of OD has experienced continued growth since the early contributions of Lewin, McGregor, and Beckhard. The following section provides explanation and examples of the two archetypes by which the author has categorized the growth of the field of OD: manifestation and proliferation.

For clarity, the author deems it important to mention that these terms (as defined earlier) in general are heavily used in the field of OD. PhD candidate Anne Reino entitled her 2009 dissertation *Manifestations of Organizational Culture Based on the Example of Estonian Organizations*, when studying the expansion of organizational culture in Estonia, at the University of Tartu. Bailey W. Jackson wrote a powerful chapter on social justice and social diversity as a component of the
manifestation of multicultural organization development in the *NTL Handbook of Organization Development and Change: Principles, Practices, and Perspectives* edited by OD Network Lifetime Achievement Award recipient Brenda B. Jones and Michael Brazzel in 2014. Finally, Ed Schein outlined the manifestations of culture as “the way we do things around here,” “the rites and rituals of our company,” “the company climate,” “the reward system,” and “our basic values” in one of his heralded works on culture, *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide: Sense and Nonsense About Culture Change* (Schein, 1999a, p.15).

Similar examples could be presented for proliferation. While these terms are used explicitly as outlined for this body of work, they are not original or isolated uses in the field of OD.

**Manifestations**

Manifestation is identified as an advancement in the field of OD based on new discoveries of the capability of OD. As assessed and redefined by Dr. Kathy Schroeder, a manifestation is a theoretical advancement in the perpetuation of the field of OD. This type of advancement is divided into four subsets: progressive, noncontiguous, noncoherence, and synthesized. Beckhard’s early work had a profound impact on the development of the field of OD to some extent in every category of manifestation. The following is a synopsis of this fact.

Progressive advancements of Beckhard’s early work in the area of strategic OD (Beckhard & Harris, 1987) may be viewed in the work of Worley, Hitchin, and Ross’ (1996) concepts of integrated strategic change. A review of the literature
clearly shows that the latter builds a more detailed version of the former for clarity of application throughout the organization (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996, p. 17).

Next, for a demonstration of noncontiguous development, one may examine the work of Beckhard’s change formula (which was actually created by David Gleich and published by Beckhard) that provides a formula of the required environmental factors needed to promote change:

$$C = [ABD] > X$$

Where:
- $C =$ Change
- $A =$ Level of dissatisfaction with the status quo
- $B =$ Desirability of the proposed change or end state
- $D =$ Practicality of the change (minimal risk and disruption)
- $X =$ “Cost” of the change
  (Beckhard & Harris, 1987, p. 98)

This formula was then taken by Kathie Dannemiller and redefined to yield a more comprehensible equation, which most students of OD would recognize

$$C = D \times V \times F > R$$

Where:
- $C =$ Change
- $D =$ Dissatisfaction of how things are now
- $V =$ Vision of what is possible
- $F =$ First concrete steps that can be taken toward the vision

If the product of these three factors is greater than:
- $R =$ Resistance to change
  (Cady, Jacobs, Koller, & Spaulding, 2014, p. 34)
As a result of the noncontiguous research work of Dannemiller, the change formula gained significant acceptance.

An interesting case of noncoherence was observed recently when again the Beckhard change formula (Beckhard & Harris, 1987, p. 98):

\[ C = [ABD] > X \]

was re-evaluated by David Cooperrider in a lecture series (2018) to critique the validity of the equation. According to Cooperrider, the negative-based dimension of change being dependent on organizational dissatisfaction is contrary to the POS movement. To extrapolate on Cooperrider’s concept, a more positive-based equation may look as follows:

\[ C = [BD] > X \]

The derived formula focuses the impetus for change on the positive “B” term and bases the will to change on the change agents’ ability to drive up “B” through the various modes of promoting desirability (which may need to be added to the equation to yield:

\[ C = [BDP] > X \]

Where: 

\[ P = \text{Promotion of the dream or desirability of the change} \]

While an interesting concept, more importantly it is an extraordinary example of noncoherence.

Finally, there is an area of manifestations called synthesized discovery. Again, in this subset of manifestations, the researcher is approaching discovery by the combining of multiple established theories for some form of synergistic improvement.
in OD capability. While there are more established examples by more prolific scholars such as Worley and Savall’s combined research on strategic OD and socio-economic approach to management that provides a tightly wrapped package for synthesized discovery (Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, & Savall, 2015), I prefer to present a more personalized example. Therefore, I will note the presentation of my initial research at the 2018 ISEOR-AOM Conference in Lyon, France, in June 2018. I presented an intriguing synthesis concept paper that incorporated Beckhard’s GRPI model into the SEAM philosophy. My hope is to test this concept in an amenable transportation company over 2019 and provide a report of the preliminary results of the trial at the 2020 ISEOR-AOM Conference. Nevertheless, this example demonstrates a viable opportunity for synthesized discovery.

**Proliferations**

Proliferation is the second archetype of growth or extension of the field of OD. This extension of OD is captured by the advancement of the field via enhanced modes of delivery (or learning) of OD capability. A corresponding restatement by Schroeder in a personal conversation would be that a proliferation is a practical advancement in the perpetuation of the field of OD. While manifestation of OD would be considered an evolutionary, slow process—making advancements through the painstaking process of research discovery—proliferation is a revolutionary process that is ongoing and continuous advancement of OD capability. My research revealed absolutely fascinating and diverse results of proliferation of the contributions of Dick Beckhard.
Early demonstration of the proliferation of Beckhard’s work would include his weekend open houses. The gathering of the most prolific talent in Bethel was an unparalleled opportunity to extend the learning process via a social encounter. Beckhard recalled how he himself similarly developed in his early days in OD, at the feet of Bradford, Lippitt, and Benne, while attending similar open house sessions at Bradford’s home (Beckhard, 1997, p. 35). While most of his peers had obtained formal advanced psychological training to prepare them to operate at an adequate level of proficiency to be able to meet NTL expectations, these open houses were a valued source of development for Beckhard.

For Beckhard, sources of delivery of appropriate level preparation to provide value-added contributions at NTL consisted of three primary forms of OD training: self-education (reading Lippitt, Watson, and Wesley’s book on planned change [Beckhard, 1997, p. 60]); laboratory training (conferences and NTL presentations and observations, as well as field observation analysis—like Ansul Chemical Company); and informal training sessions (such as at Lee Bradford’s home in the evenings or Shangri La on the weekends). He knew the importance of informal training as an advancement of OD capability and regularly provided such opportunities to capitalize on practical and/or theoretical enlightenment to others, as needed.

A second form of proliferation for which Beckhard was famous was his mentoring of personnel for the development of the individual and the field as a whole. As a consultant to consultants, it is almost impossible to measure the reach of the
proliferation of his hands. Each consultant went on to impact either systems or
personnel or both.

The final form of proliferation I will address in this body of work is that of
formal education. If one examines the multitude of institutions of higher education
where Beckhard has been on staff, a visiting scholar, a guest lecturer, etc. (MIT,
Harvard University, Columbia University, Pepperdine University, Yale University,
Case Western Reserve University, Kings College [London, England], London
Graduate School of Business, and Benedictine University), it would be a formidable
task to account for the full impact Beckhard’s influence has had on the field. For this
reason, I will limit my example on the proliferation of OD via formal education to
only my favorite story on the topic.

In the early 1950s Dick Beckhard would bring the greatest OD scholars of the
time (who were visiting the NTL) to his Lake Kezar cottage (called Shangri La), to
share their wisdom with a group of future OD scholars and practitioners, for their
continued development. Fast forward about four decades, Peter Sorensen and the
Benedictine University MSOD program continues this tradition, with one of the last
bastions of Shangri La—called the lecture series. This particular lecture series
featured Dick Beckhard. After an awe-inspiring presentation, Sorensen was driving
Beckhard to the airport and began to discuss the challenge presented to Benedictine
University by the higher education certification board: to establish a PhD OD
program. After Sorensen asked Beckhard his thoughts on the matter, Beckhard
thought for about 60 seconds and responded: “It could work” and proceeded to tell
Sorensen exactly how to design the program. Fast forward a couple more decades or so: Benedictine has a thriving PHDOD program that has produced over 200 PhDs in the field of OD. These are alumni who are making significant impact across the country and around the world, alumni who are champions of industry. The alumni are professors, program chairs, program directors, deans, and university vice presidents who continue to proliferate the teachings of Beckhard to more and more future OD scholars and practitioners. The proliferation of the various means and methods of sharing the delivery of OD capability continues to expand exponentially.

**Nodes of Connectivity**

As one travels the re-creation of the time continuum throughout this analysis, points of commonality occur relating an event in one era to that of another era. I have labeled these points of commonality nodes of connectivity. These nodes are a means of demonstrating relationship of events from the past to the present or future and providing evidence on which the conclusion can be drawn of continued influence or impact resulting from contributions made by Beckhard, for confirming the answer to the research question.

When this research is put into practice, it becomes a very viable opportunity for applicability. These components of the mapping and overlay concept suddenly transform into a treasure map that, when followed properly, can lead to a wealth of success. One may even say the overall outcome of this research project is a reader’s guide to professional success.
Research in Practice

A final outcome of the research on the life of Dick Beckhard and his contributions to the field of OD is enhanced practical application. The research provided a plethora of opportunities to expand the body of knowledge in a multitude of various areas. As a result of this diverse intellectual acquisition, the research provided far more than data regarding Beckhard or OD interventions. The research provided vast insights and preparation on how to establish and grow a family consulting practice. Additionally, it reminds one of the necessity of the planning process as well as the value of relationship building and introduces one to the importance of staging a consulting meeting.

While the collection of facts about Beckhard may lead one to learn about this OD icon, this research allowed the opportunity to better understand the learning cycle and comprehend the dividends of human capital development resulting from the analysis of the life of Dick Beckhard. It is important to note that knowledge may be a direct or ancillary result of investigation; either way, the process of learning takes place. The acquisition of knowledge follows a path:

1. Collect background data
2. Process data to acquire information
3. Evaluate information to obtain knowledge
4. Utilize knowledge to make informed decisions

This learning cycle provides the building materials to advance from familiarization to expertise. To better reference this process, I will demonstrate the
power of following the execution of the cycle fully: from obtaining the data, through effective employment of the resulting decisions, to extracting maximum return on the knowledge acquired.

The term data may be defined as facts and figures collected for reference or analysis; however, the singular term datum is a unitary collected fact regarding some matter. Therefore, to conduct an investigation means to collect a multitude of fact or datum. So, if one desired to duplicate Beckhard’s success as a consultant, their investigation might make the inquiry: What was the key to Beckhard’s successful consulting practice? One might begin by examining the fields of inquiry detailed in the following section.

**Collect Background Data**

1. Fact 1: Beckhard was mentored by McGregor (so choose a great mentor).
2. Fact 2: In 1950 Beckhard attended NTL and read the book *The Planning of Change*, both of which influenced his thought process on change management.
3. Fact 3: Beckhard studied open system theory, developed by James Clarke, Will McWhinney, and Charles Krone (and worked with Charles Krone).
4. Fact 4: Beckhard developed a system of relationships.
5. Fact 5: Beckhard’s consulting practice began in the family firm arena.
6. Fact 6: Family firms make up approximately 90% of all businesses.
8. Fact 8: Beckhard’s first consulting client in 1951 was Robert Hood and his family firm, Ansul Chemical Company.

9. Fact 9: Hood was a member of the Young President’s Organization.

10. Fact 10: Beckhard aligned his consultation efforts with leadership support.

**Process Data to Acquire Information**

These 10 individual datum points provide foundational facts about Dick Beckhard and his consulting practice. These details, when combined, form the basis of data to be analyzed for the development of information regarding Beckhard’s consulting practice habits. Examples of such points of information (POIs) that may be acquired due to analysis of the above data follow:

1. POI 1: Beckhard used open system and process thinking in his consulting efforts.

2. POI 2: Beckhard used relationships to effectively manage consultation processes.

3. POI 3: Beckhard’s work with McGregor gave him an advanced understanding of the power of participative management principles.

4. POI 4: Beckhard first trained to be an effective family firm consultant working with Hood and Ansul Chemical Company.

5. POI 5: Beckhard acquired many consulting clients through the Young Presidents Organization via Hood.
**Evaluate Information to Obtain Knowledge**

The acquisition of knowledge comes from the processing of both information (analyzed data) and facts (unanalyzed data) for utilization. Until information and facts can be assessed for application, they do not provide their possessor knowledge. In the case of the above information, one might accumulate the following potential knowledge addendums (PKA) to the body of knowledge. One may take the following actions to learn from Beckhard consulting practice information:

1. PKA 1: Initiate an OD consulting practice specializing in family business.
2. PKA 2: Establish and manage client relationship from the top of the organization.
3. PKA 3: Apply open system theory during consulting process to capitalize on sociotechnical systems.

**Utilize Knowledge to Make Decisions**

Finally, equipped with the knowledge of Beckhard’s consulting theory, one could use this knowledge to support the decision-making process for creating a consulting practice today. An evaluation of the knowledge developed from Beckhard’s lessons led to the following decisions for promoting my consulting practice:

1. Decision 1: Join a family-owned business association.
2. Decision 2: Join a professional directors association.

When put into practice, these two decisions have resulted in the cultivation of the following relationships: mentoring with a successful family business consulting
firm in Chicago, research opportunity with a major family-owned casino in Detroit, and a personal relationship with an association of family business presidents in Boston. Additionally, joining the board of a Chicago-based transportation company and an Atlanta-based nonprofit music foundation (where I have a personal relationship with its president) allows me to utilize these organizations for practical application growth. The supporting of these organizations’ governance oversight and ongoing longitudinal studies provides the personal field laboratories that will be my training ground, similar to Ansul for Beckhard or Harwood for Lewin. The true value of the review of this learning cycle analysis is it provides empirical evidence of the reproducibility of Beckhard’s concepts.

To summarize, as a researcher, this project directly taught me the significance of Dick Beckhard’s contributions to OD, family business, management consulting, and human development. As a practitioner, this project taught me how to utilize the findings of my research as well as my behavioral science doctoral education to practical applications of the contemporary consultation process. Given this example of early OD pioneer contributions impacting development in the field today, it becomes clear that the manifestation and proliferation of Beckhard’s contribution will be showing up in not just my, but any true Beckhard disciple’s, future. With the future in mind, finally, this paper takes a look at the expected results of predicting the glidepath of manifestations and proliferations.
Extending the Hermeneutic Bridge

This body of work has shown the connectivity of the hermeneutic bridge from the past to the present; however, do the effects of Gummesson’s bridge extend into the realm of the prophetic? This section addressed the mapping’s indications and overlay’s predictions for the future of OD. An analysis of the Envisioned Era would suggest a confirmative response.

Summary

This concludes the chapter of discussion on the results of my research. The overall assessment of the biographical, historical, and content analysis of the development of the field of OD combined to yield a topic that has proven incredibly interesting and valuable to the development of both the field of OD and an individual’s personal growth as a consultant. With all this insight shared, the project moves to the final chapter and provides an overall summary of the findings, their implications, and applications to provide correlated insight into the story told by the generations after this dissertation.
Chapter 6: CONCLUSION

The Past as Prologue

Being active meant thinking ahead, using past experiences as a basis for future thinking…Several themes, or consistent perceptions of the future, have appeared…

- Decisions will be made and managed close to the problem and based on knowledge, not status.
- Managing dilemmas will be a primary skill for leaders and managers.
- Innovation and creativity will be among the top criteria that will measure the success of management.

The organization will be an open system…All these changes will require effort and thought—thought by which we can benefit by putting in today. In all my endeavors, and in this book, I hope to stimulate people’s thinking about their professional work and its intersection with their personal life. My professional and personal lives have certainly meshed in a way that continues to be full and stimulating; may yours as well. (Beckhard, 1997, p. 166)

Select the Right Topic and Research Method

This research project has proven to be the culmination of my educational and professional development. The selection of a biographical historiography awakened an excitement within my soul that linked me to management history, the field of OD, and the man himself—Dick Beckhard. This made it most difficult to find a saturation point with my data, because there always appeared to be another development that was directly or indirectly the result of contributions made by Beckhard, that just had to be added to the document. Though this chapter indicates the conclusion of my dissertation research within this body of knowledge, I am certain that my fascination
with the proliferation of Beckhard’s legacy will yield further post-doctoral discovery and enlightenment. This hermeneutic bridge remains under construction.

**Foundation of Dissertation**

The development of this study was evolutionary rather than revolutionary. I wanted to address leadership (I am a soldier), governance (I completed board of director training), economic development (resulting from OD), and consultant operations (since I wanted to become a consultant). My solution: family business governance consulting. By studying Beckhard, my topic allowed me to utilize my investigation into family business, governance, leadership, business, and consulting through an OD lens. While I can honestly validate O’Brien, Remenyi, and Keaney’s statement that the researcher “becomes the servant of his evidence” (2004, p. 139), to limit the topic to impacts in OD was quite a challenge; nevertheless, it provided an intriguing research question and dissertation topic that would add value to the field of knowledge: “Do the contributions made by the early OD pioneer Dick Beckhard continue to provide impact today?”

By studying the contributions of Beckhard and comparing this information to a path of the evolution of OD, the author clearly demonstrates how Beckhard’s contributions of the 1950s and 1960s continue to influence the developments of the field of OD today and into the foreseeable future.

**Findings and Implications**

The findings of my study confirmed clear connection between contributions of Beckhard and continued developments today. Additionally, my research uncovered
two viable modes of expansion within the field of OD, manifestations and proliferations. These two archetypes for expanding OD cover expansion of the field by way of enhanced capability and capacity in theoretical and practical ways, respectively. Enhanced capabilities may be manifested by the expansion of theory based on natural or contrarian paths of growth, filling gaps in knowledge, or identifying synergy in diverse concepts of knowledge. Alternatively, enhanced capacity is proliferated by means of advances and expansions in the delivery, communication, and sharing of established knowledge.

Through the bridging of a particular area on the OD historical map to an overlay of Beckhard’s biography, coinciding to a corresponding interval of time, one may deduce the vital role he had in the development of the field. For instance, a look at the development of T-group theory coming from NTL clearly includes the work of Beckhard in the training of its practitioners. Additionally, the commercial applications of this theory were spearheaded by Beckhard’s efforts. While survey feedback theory was definitely developed under the supervision of Rensis Likert and his colleagues, the coupling of it with action research, within the field of OD, was pioneered by Lewin, McGregor, Trist, and Beckhard.

Beckhard’s efforts in participative management were so prevalent in the work of McGregor at Procter & Gamble and General Mills that he is credited as one of the individuals that named the field of OD as a result of the General Mills effort. As history demonstrated in the importance of Procter & Gamble’s contributions to the development of the QWL movement, it equally presented the direct influence of
Beckhard on the consultation of Procter & Gamble as well as the indirect impact of Beckhard’s relationship with Charlie Krone, a key figure in the development of the QWL evolutionary process.

Another area of OD development that lands clearly on the shoulders of Professor Beckhard is the matter of using OD to influence corporate strategy. His strong practitioner background and affinity to top management as a part of his practice naturally attracted him to innovators applying these skills, thereby influencing the strategic activity of major clients directly and competitor clients indirectly. This influence appears in component after component of OD development; however, it does not stop there. No one has been more influential in developing a practical theory for management consulting than Peter Block. This work shows the indirect influence Beckhard had on Block’s development via Schein. Now while the direct effects of Beckhard’s influence on the development of human capital within OD may have been touched on, the extent of his influence resulting from the secondary and tertiary order effects of Beckhard’s will probably never truly be determined. This fact is the result of how deeply rooted, vastly diverse, and far-reaching within the history of the field of OD his effects manifest and proliferate. Seldom will one see a single individual have such an overarching impact on an entire field.

Finally, the direct influence Beckhard had on David Cooperrider through his teachings at Case Western Reserve University and the indirect influence he had on Cooperrider through his impact on his protégé, Ron Fry (Cooperrider’s mentor), is
sufficient grounds for an entirely separate dissertation. The one thing that anyone
would be hard pressed to deny is that, to some degree, Beckhard influenced the
development of Cooperrider’s AI concept.

Given all these bridges between OD history and Richard Beckhard’s
biography, it becomes quite evident that Beckhard had an impact on OD history.
Next, this body of work examines the potential ability of such influence to transcend
time and continue to have impact today.

Understanding who Richard Beckhard was and how he developed into
greatness should make room for readers to chart a similar path for visualizing and
arriving at their own individual objectives. Such a roadmap should present some
paths of least resistance and other paths less traveled; nevertheless, and irrespective of
the twist and turns along the way, the study of Beckhard’s path provides one a
treasure map to realized and continued potential. My final demonstration of this fact
will be captured in a bridge that connects the development of the field of OD to the
manifestation and proliferation of Beckhard’s contributions via the OD Network.

The OD Network’s purpose, per the mission statement on the OD Network’s
website, is as follows:

We exist to advance the science, practice, and impact of organization
development. This means that we make evidence-based decisions
based on research in behavioral science; we practice OD within
organizations in order to improve an organization’s sustained
effectiveness and health; and we make an impact by introducing
solutions and interventions that impact an organization’s strategic
objectives and bottom line.
To that end, even though the biographical historiography clearly demonstrates Beckhard’s linkage to the establishment, manifestation, and proliferation of the field of OD, the following demonstration will be a fitting conclusion to highlight the influence and impact of this individual’s contribution to the development of the field. Every year OD Network selects a Lifetime Achievement Award winner as the person or persons who have spent their lives advancing the field of OD. Per the OD Network website (Hall of Fame page), the award’s purpose is as follows:

This award is given in recognition of a Network member who has made a significant and lasting impact on the field and practice of organization development through their professional accomplishments, served the profession over an extended period of time, has earned the respect and admiration of professional colleagues and has freely engaged not only contemporaries, but also been committed to maintaining a dynamic connection to all generations of OD practitioners.

By way of deductive reasoning, it is a reasonable assumption to believe that if Beckhard had an impact on any of the identified recipients, that could constitute either a direct or indirect impact on the field of OD. It is important to understand the significance of this section; since, in addition to his direct impact on OD, this demonstration of Beckhard’s influence exemplifies the power of his indirect impact through the concepts of manifestations and proliferations. It is the indirect impact of his contributions that act as academic compound interest, continuing to exponentially grow the wealth of OD’s body of knowledge. The following is a list of the recipients of this prestigious award and the influence Beckhard had on their careers:

OD Network Lifetime Achievement Award recipients who were influenced by Dick Beckhard are as follows:
1999—Billie T. Alban: Alban was rejected the first time she applied to NTL. When she appealed to the admission board to reconsider: “Dick Beckhard had read my letter and he said, ‘Take her.’ That really was a turning point in my career” (Bennett, 2006, p. 114). She went on to achieve such greatness that she received the very first Lifetime Achievement Award (along with Bob Tannenbaum).

1999—Bob Tannenbaum: He co-consulted with Beckhard in the early consulting of TRW. Together, along with Charles Ferguson and Ed Schein, they made TRW a model for organizations trying to become more efficient and more human (Beckhard, 1997, p. 79).

2000—Richard “Dick” Beckhard: Received the award himself.

2001—Edie Seashore: She went to work for Dick Beckhard whom she had met through NTL. Through her work with Beckhard, she gained valuable experiences that later served her as a consultant in the field of OD (Bennett, 2006, p. 86). She would go on to claim Beckhard as a key influence in her life (Bennett, 2006, p. 124).

2001—Kathie Dannemiller: She was a classic case of manifestation. She refined the famous change formula created by Gleicher and published by Beckhard and Harris in 1977 and went on to make the equation a staple for organizational change: \[ C = D \times V \times F > R \]

2002—Peter Vaill: After acquiring a DBA from Harvard, Vaill was hired by Bob Tannenbaum to work at UCLA. There, he was introduced to the TRW project, influenced and “informed by pioneers in the fields of…Organization Development
(Beckhard, Shepard, Tannenbaum, Trist). Vaill crystalized a line of thinking that would be unwavering” (Jamieson & Milbrandt, 2017, p. 8).

2003—W. Warner Burke: Burke was among that second wave of great social scientists to make significant contributions to the field of OD. Burke studied under Beckhard at NTL and eventually collaborated with Beckhard on developing the famed PSOD program at NTL. Burke listed Beckhard as a major influence in his career in Bennett’s work with living legends (Bennett, 2006, p. 124).

2004—Charlie Seashore: A noted psychologist and the son, grandson, and even husband of noted psychologists, as well as a major impetus behind the survival of NTL, Seashore listed Beckhard as a key influence in his life in Bennett’s work on OD living legends in 2006 (p. 124).

2004—Marvin Weisbord: Weisbord acknowledged the value of and extended gratitude for the “hours spent talking with the late Richard Beckhard…” in preparation for the 2004 publishing of the revision of his acclaimed book Productive Workplaces, demonstrating the inclusion of the great Marv Weisbord among the Beckhard disciples.

2005—Edgar Schein: In a tribute to Beckhard, entitled “What I Learned from Dick Beckhard” (2003), Schein acknowledged that “I have considered Richard (Dick) Beckhard my primary mentor” (p. 329). There is not much one can add to a declaration of this magnitude, considering Schein was at MIT with McGregor, Bennis, and a cast of other great minds.
2006—Chris Argyris: Argyris was a contemporary of Beckhard, teaching at Harvard while Beckhard taught some of the same students at MIT. The indirect collaboration of proliferation was summarized by Argyris at the Dick Beckhard Day celebration at Beckhard’s retirement from MIT, where Argyris called Beckhard “the best teacher at Harvard” in reference to the reciprocal program between Harvard and MIT (Beckhard, 1997, p. 112).

2007—Frederick A Miller: Miller was an African American introduced to a field dominated by European American men. Therefore, even if indirectly, he was a benefactor of Beckhard’s early push for diversity, inclusion, and social justice.

2008—Peter Block: One of the most powerful testaments to Dick Beckhard and his contribution to management consulting may be found in the consultant’s bible: Flawless Consulting by Peter Block (2011). Block stated:

All of us who consult today owe a debt of gratitude to the work of Ed Schein. He was an early beacon of light to those of us who contemplated working in the field of organizational change. He made understandable and explicit the process consulting path that later became a central part of how I operate, and for that I am very grateful. (Block, 2011, p. xxiii)

While Block never mentions the name Beckhard in his seminal book on consulting, if one returns to the comments of Ed Schein, it may explain the proliferation of Beckhard’s essence throughout the writing of Block.

2009—John Carter: Beckhard’s belief in inclusion as well as appreciation of Gestalt psychology and its importance to the development of OD was demonstrated when he invited John Carter (along with Carolyn Lukensmeyer), two of the founders of the Gestalt Institute, to co-teach with him a course on implementing large-scale
change. Carter would go on to specialize in applying Gestalt psychology in open system operations.

2010—Dick Axelrod: Axelrod was ironically cut from a quite similar cloth as Beckhard. His work in meeting productivity parallels Beckhard’s early work in the area. Axelrod’s work in large-scale change parallels Beckhard’s later work. Axelrod’s conference meetings even seem to build on Beckhard’s original work in the confrontation model. Axelrod would be hard-pressed not to experience some manifestation and/or proliferation of the foundational work of Beckhard.

2010—Edwin C. Nevis: As of January 2019, Nevis’ Lifetime Achievement Award profile identifies one of his achievements as a co-trainer of senior-level executives at MIT, identifying by name his co-trainers as Dick Beckhard and Ed Schein.

2011—Jane McGruder Watkins: Watkins is a distinctive example of the indirect proliferation effects of Beckhard. She received acclaim for her efforts in AI, as a protégé of Cooperrider, who was a protégé of Ron Fry. Since Fry, ultimately, was a protégé of Beckhard, his influence can easily be traced through this lineage.

2012—David Jamieson: With the exception of Block, Jamieson is truly the most Beckhard-like Lifetime Achievement Award recipient in the history of OD Network. He is the final individual who must be studied in a course on consultant development (along with McGregor, Schein, Block, and, of course, Beckhard). If these iconic consultants were set in an academic-practitioner continuum, it would place Jamieson squarely in the middle of the pack, as the most balanced scholar-
practitioner of the group. (If one would rate them from academically to practically oriented consultants, the list would range from Schein to McGregor to Jamieson to Block to Beckhard.) While his academic prowess more so emulates McGregor, ultimately Jamieson followed the path blazed by Beckhard as a world-class practitioner, turned academic.

2014—Judith Katz: Katz is another indirect benefactor of Beckhard’s passion for social justice. However, she benefits from more than just the advancement of diversity and inclusion within the field of OD, but, additionally, as the junior partner of Fred Miller at the Kaleel Jamison Consulting Group, Inc.

2015—Barry Oshry: This scholar and educator is renowned for his advances in systems thinking within organizations through his power lab research laboratory and corresponding writings on its use. Oshry was allegedly quoted as “not studying other’s theories” (2001, p. 45). Beckhard’s early work in systems thinking (along with Trist, Clark, McWhinney, and Krone) may not have been Oshry’s impetus; nevertheless, their work provided a starting point for implementing noncoherent or noncontiguous research methodology, even if that methodology was independent and/or contrary to their original thinking.

2016—Sandra Janoff: Janoff is a colleague of and co-author with Marv Weisbord of *Future Search* (2000), a work that builds on Weisbord’s book *Productive Workplaces Revisited* (2004) and therefore has an indirect proliferation to Beckhard. Additionally, *Future Search* closely parallels and bears an uncanny resemblance to the work of Beckhard, Hesselbein, and Goldsmith’s Peter Drucker
Future Series; however, this could merely be the result of Beckhard’s influence on Weisbord.

2017—David Cooperrider: Cooperrider was influenced by Beckhard’s teachings at Case Western Reserve University and George Williams College (the predecessor to Benedictine University). He also was influenced by one of Beckhard’s premier protégés, Ron Fry, who happened to also be one of Cooperrider’s mentors. Cooperrider, like Peter Block, appears to be the result of second-order effects of Beckhard.

2017—Peter Sorensen: Beckhard’s impact on Sorensen has been well documented throughout this body of work and the proliferation of over 200 PhD disciples of Beckhard’s influence and the development of the country’s first and one of the premier doctoral programs in the field of OD.

It becomes quite easy to see a positive correlation between the individuals that the OD Network (an organization formed to promote the advancement of OD) identifies as persons who have dedicated their lives to the advancement of, and providing the largest impact on, the field of OD (and thus worthy of the OD Network Lifetime Achievement Award) and individuals identified as influenced by Beckhard’s contributions to OD. This fact is clearly indicative of the manifestation and proliferation of Beckhard’s continued influence, both today and in the foreseeable future, on the field of OD.
History has long been recognized as a predictor of the future. It is no great surprise that this research revealed the continued importance of the past. Life has provided many indications of this possibility.

Noted OD and Gestalt consultant Frances Baldwin provided an introduction to the sankofa bird that flies forward, while looking backwards to represent the African belief that it is not wrong to go back for that which you have forgotten (Willis, 1998). This bird has been adopted as an important symbol in African American context as the need to reflect on the past to build a successful future.

Also, the great Chinese philosopher Confucius advises one to “Study the past if you would define the future” (Goodreads Website, 2018).

There is no shortage of sayings relating the past to the present and/or future. The social cataloging website Goodreads listed 2,401 quotes referencing the past to the present or future. In fact, as my military experience has shown me, the very premise of the Army CALL (Center for Army Lessons Learned) Program is to draw precious wisdom from the golden nuggets of shared experience via the Army’s transformation of individual knowledge into institutional intelligence.

The significance of my research project was identifying the clarity of the linkage that constitutes the hermeneutic bridging of the past to the present and future: manifestation and proliferation of the actions of a few phenomenal individuals in the development of an entire field of study. To this point, more specifically, few have been more vital to the building of this bridge in OD than Dick Beckhard. While this body of work has been based on this fact, I will summarize my findings as
verification of this claim. There is no denying the great contributions of the father of OD, Kurt Lewin, or the gardener of humanity, Douglas McGregor. I acknowledge the fact that either of these individuals would be a fitting topic for a supplemental study of the hermeneutic bridging of the past and present through the exploration of their lives. Both men’s academic preparation dwarfed that of Beckhard’s. Though Beckhard may have the edge on Lewin in practical application, McGregor could stand toe to toe with Beckhard in this aspect of preparation. Nevertheless, one significant difference found in the comparison of these OD icons is the fact that Lewin passed away at 57 and McGregor at 58. Beckhard had nearly an additional 25 years of refining his craft to influence the field. Additionally, he had the beacon of both these legends to light his path. It is only fitting that in his book with Frances Hesselbein and Marshall Goldsmith, *The Leader of the Future*, when Beckhard noted past great leaders in understanding human nature, he referenced Sigmund Freud and Kurt Lewin; and for referencing powerful leaders of thought, he identified Peter Drucker and Douglas McGregor (Hesselbein, Goldsmith, & Beckhard, 1996, p. 127).

Given the above parameters, it becomes quite understandable that the manifestation of theoretical advances would be the moon or lesser light and proliferation of applied advances would be the sun or greater light of Beckhard’s glorious career. While he was a renowned theorist, he primarily advanced the applied and practical theories and assured others possessed and developed a firm grasp of these theories. This is the true legacy and proliferation of Beckhard’s contributions to posterity.
As I come to the end of my “Conclusion,” a final examination and recap of my findings shows:

1. Beckhard’s contributions continue to directly and indirectly impact the manifestation and proliferation of OD is confirmed.

2. Beckhard’s contribution to OD continues to directly and indirectly impact the proliferation of management consulting is supported (additional research is needed to confirm).

3. Beckhard’s contributions to OD continues to directly and indirectly impact the manifestation and proliferation of family business theory is supported (additional research is needed to confirm).

4. Beckhard’s contribution to OD continues to directly and indirectly impact the proliferation of human development is supported (additional research is needed to confirm).

These results make it quite apparent that Beckhard’s contributions were so great that they will continue to make an indirect impact on the field of OD; however, the field of OD is itself so young that some of the most important personalities in the field even today can be traced back to the direct impetus and effects resulting from the persona of Dick Beckhard’s direct influence (i.e., Ed Schein). These facts are summarized in Table 2. No other person in history was regarded as more key to the development of the OD icons: Ed Schein, Warner Burke, Billie Alban, Edith Seashore, and Charlie Seashore, and very possibly to the field of OD. In 2017 Palgrave published a book of the 100 most influential people in OD history. Of
course, the name Dick Beckhard was mentioned, but the words used in the book by an OD icon himself, Ron Fry, only resound as evidence of my findings: “Dick Beckhard deserves to be regarded as a pioneer, if not co-creator, of the field of Organization Development” (Fry, 2017, p. 103).

The last couple of days of Dick Beckhard’s life best summarize the character of the man as well as his dedication to duty, as reported by one of Beckhard’s close friends and co-editor of the Peter Drucker Future Series, Marshall Goldsmith:

I was lucky enough to be with one of the most respected consultants in organizational change, Richard Beckhard, a couple of days before he died. Dick was a great coach and mentor to me, as well as an inspiration for many people in our field. When I last visited him, Dick knew that his life was almost over.

As I watched Dick answer a series of phone calls, I found him not only saying good-bye. He was continuing to help other people. I was amazed at the excitement and enthusiasm he was able to convey. He was working with people in the same caring and effective way he always had.

Dick was still smiling, still able to laugh, still filled with passion… He was still doing a great job—even from his deathbed. In that instant, I made a decision. I decided that I wanted to be like Dick Beckhard when I grew up. (Goldsmith, 2019)

It is this character and passion that exemplifies how a stage manager and meeting consultant became one of the foremost authorities in the world on managing organizational change. At 58, not only am I older than most doctoral students, but I am also older than Kurt Lewin or Douglas McGregor when they died. Yet, by the completion of this research project, like Marshall Goldsmith, I too wanted to be like Dick Beckhard when I grow up.
The final quotations to be reviewed come first from former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau: “The past is to be respected and acknowledged, but not worshipped; it is our future in which we will find our greatness” (Goodreads Website, 2018), while taking heed to the comments of Mary Ann Evans, better known as famed English novelist George Eliot: “I desire no future that will break the ties of the past” (Goodreads Website, 2018). Last is a quote from Beckhard that became the basis of this body of work: “I had always been a catalyst. Perhaps by applying what I knew about the dynamics of groups…I could provide the necessary bridge and improve meetings” (Beckhard, 1997, p. 22).

Undoubtedly, the bridge that ties the past of OD to its future greatness clearly runs through the path of some great men. Obviously, one can see from his many early contributions and continued manifestations and proliferations of the field, that one of these great men was the illustrious Dick Beckhard.

Professor Richard Beckhard, this dissertation is a salute to you and the legacy of your contributions to the field of OD and the world. It will be exciting to see how the next generation of OD professionals continues to benefit from and expand on the academic and practical foundation you have established.
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