RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

Edited by Abraham B. (Rami) Shani, Debra A. Noumair, Danielle P. Zandee, David Coghlan

RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

VOLUME 31

RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

Previous Volumes:

Volumes 1–30: Research in Organizational Change and Development

RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT VOLUME 31

RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

EDITED BY

ABRAHAM B. (RAMI) SHANI
California Polytechnic State University, USA

DEBRA A. NOUMAIR
Columbia University, USA

DANIELLE P. ZANDEE
Nyenrode Business University, The Netherlands

AND

DAVID COGHLAN
University of Dublin, Ireland

United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Emerald Publishing, Floor 5, Northspring, 21-23 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 4DL

First edition 2025

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-83708-749-5 (Print)
ISBN: 978-1-83708-748-8 (Online)
ISBN: 978-1-83708-750-1 (Epub)

ISSN: 0897-3016 (Series)

CONTENTS

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Jean M. Bartunek holds the Robert A. and Evelyn J. Ferris chair and is a Professor of Management and Organization at Boston College. She is a past President of the Academy of Management, from which she won the career distinguished service award. She is also a past Dean of the Fellows of the Academy of management, as well as a Fellow of the British Academy of Management and the Center for Evidence-Based Management. She has served as an Associate Editor of the *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, and the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* as well as on the editorial boards of several journals. Her primary interests center on academic–practitioner relationships and organizational change. Her most recent edited book is entitled *Social Scientists Confronting Global Crises* (Routledge; 2022).

David Coghlan is a Professor Emeritus at the Trinity Business School, Trinity College Dublin Ireland. He is the author of numerous articles on OD and action research and of several books, including *Doing Action Research in Your Own Organization* (Sage, 5th ed, 2019) and *Conducting Action Research for Business and Management Students* (with A. B. Shani, Sage, 2018) and is the co-editor (with D. Szabla, B. Pasmore and J. Kim) of the *Handbook of Research Methods in Organizational Change* (Edward Elgar, 2023) and (with M. Brydon-Miller) of the *SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research* (2014). His most recent book is Edgar *Schein: The Artistry of an Organizational Reflexive Scholar-Practitioner* (Routledge, 2024).

Benedetta Colaiacovo is a Researcher at the Department of Psychology at the Catholic University of Milan. She holds a PhD in Economic Sociology and Labor Studies at the University of Milan. Her work focuses on the exploration of the relationship between employees' well-being and new work configurations. She is currently part of a national research program examining the quality of work life of emergency department practitioners, aiming to address the unique challenges they face and promote more sustainable working conditions.

Chiara Corvino, PhD, is a Researcher in Work and Organizational Psychology at the Faculty of Economics of the Catholic University of Milan. Her study activity is mainly focused on critical perspectives in work and organizational psychology; impact evaluation through dialogic and participatory methodologies; well-being at work and organizational change in nonprofit organizations.

Tobias Fredberg is a Professor at the Department of Technology Management and Economics at Chalmers University of Technology. He is the Head of the two collaboration platforms the Entrepreneurial Leadership Lab and the Center for Higher Ambition. His work has been published in journals such as *Long Range Planning*, *Harvard Business Review*, *R&D Management*, and the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, where also he also serves as an Associate Editor.

Yabome Gilpin-Jackson, PhD, is an Organization Development Scholar-Practitioner who is the Principal at SLD Consulting, leader within the British Columbia Public Sector, and is currently the first Vice-President, People, Equity and Inclusion and Associate Faculty member at Simon Fraser University. She was the first Organization Development Network (ODN) Emerging Practitioner recipient, an award named in her honor. Her article on practising in the gray area between diagnostic and dialogic OD is featured in OD Review Essentials. Among other publications, she was contributor to the inaugural special issue journal and textbook on Dialogic OD. She is past Chair of the ODN.

Mara Gorli, PhD, is a Professor of Work and Organizational Psychology at the Faculty of Economics, Department of Psychology, Catholic University of Milan, Italy. She is a member of the Leadership and Organizational Cultures Unit, at CERISMAS – Center for Research and Studies in Health Care Management, Milan and Director of the Executive Master in Patient Advocacy Management, Altems – Graduate School of Health Economics and Management. Mara's research interests and applications focus on the relationship between the person, the workplace, and the society, following a participative, reflexive, context-driven, and practice-based research orientation.

Mikael Hansson is a Licensed Psychologist. He works as a Management Consultant with a focus on Leadership and Management Team Development in the private and the public sector. A main feature in his assignments is to support the integration of personal characteristics with the current work role in the organizational context. Apart from his consultancy work, he collaborates with Chalmers University of Technology. Mikael has a background as a Clinical Psychologist and CEO.

Matt Minahan, EdD, is the President of the Minahan Group, specializing in long form strategic planning and organization design and development projects for major national and international organizations. He teaches in OD and leadership development programs and coaches senior executives implementing change programs. He received the Lifetime Achievement Award from the OD Network and is a former board member and chair. He is a Dean, Core Labs Co-Steward, and Emeritus member of NTL Institute. He has published more than 50 articles.

Susan Albers Mohrman, University of Southern California, USA, has spent her career as a Senior Research Scientist at the Center for Effective Organizations (CEO) in the Marshall School of Business at the University of Southern

California. She founded and directed CEO's Program in Organization Design. Dr. Mohrman's research interests include organization design and change and sustainable effectiveness. Recently, she has studied design frameworks to embed advanced digital technologies to address the needs of multiple stakeholders. She has been an editor and author in the Emerald Press series *Design for Sustainability*. With E. Lawler and J. O'Toole, she has edited *Corporate Stewardship: Organizing for Sustainable Effectiveness* (Greenleaf Press, 2015). Her most recent book, with Phil Mirvis and Chris Worley, is *How to Do Relevant Research: The Journey from the Ivory Tower to the Real World* (Edward-Elgar, 2021).

Federica Morandi, PhD, is an Associate Professor of Organization Theory at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Faculty of Economics, Department of Management Studies. She is part of the Board of Directors of Ehma (European Health Management Association). Since 2020, she is the Director of the Academic Programs in Altems (Graduate School of Economic and Management of healthcare systems), Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Her research interests span both organizational models in healthcare and human resource management and organizational behaviors.

Kisito F. Nzembayie, a scholar and practitioner in entrepreneurship, holds a PhD in Digital Entrepreneurship. As Director of the MSc in Entrepreneurship and Innovation at Trinity Business School, Dublin, he leads a premier program fostering entrepreneurial mindsets through active learning. His research spans entrepreneurship, digital technology, and action research, with contributions that include a book on *Digital Entrepreneurship* (Edward Elgar, 2022) and several journal publications. Previously a serial digital entrepreneur, he developed and scaled three EdTech ventures to reach millions of users globally, equipping him with a unique ability to blend theory and practice in his scholarly work.

Jill W. Paine is an Assistant Professor of Organizational Behavior at IE Business School. Madrid, Spain. Her research lies at the intersection of organizational change, leadership, and motivation. Her research has been published in leading management and psychology journals, including the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Leadership Quarterly*, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, and *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. She also edited a book titled *Organization Change: A Comprehensive Reader* (with W. Warner Burke & Dale Lake). In addition, Jill is the Representative-at-Large for the Organization Development and Change Division of the Academy of Management and has served/is serving on the editorial boards of *The Leadership Quarterly* and the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* respectively.

William A. Pasmore, PhD, is a founding co-editor of Research in Organizational Change and Development along with Richard Woodman. He is currently a Professor of Practice at Columbia University and a former SVP at the Center for Creative Leadership. As a thought leader in the field of Organization Development, he has published 30 books and numerous articles, including *Advanced Consulting*, *Leading Continuous Change*, *Braided Organizations, Designing*

Effective Organizations, and *Creating Strategic Change*. He is a winner of the Organization Development Network's lifetime achievement award. He holds a BS in Aeronautical Engineering/Industrial Management and a PhD in Administrative Sciences, both from Purdue University.

Johanna E. Pregmark has a PhD from Chalmers University of Technology. Her work has been published in, for instance, *Long Range Planning, ROCD*, and *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. She is also part of the core team that drives the Center for Higher Ambition and a Corporate Entrepreneurship initiative at Chalmers School of Entrepreneurship. In parallel to her research, she works as an advisor and keynote speaker. Johanna has a background as a CEO, executive, and consultant.

Abraham B. (Rami) Shani is a Professor Emeritus at the Orfalea College of Business, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, California. He is a past Chair of the Organization Development and Change Division of the Academy of Management. He also served as a Research Professor at the School of Management, Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy; Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm Sweden, and Graduate School of Business, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv Israel. He is the author of numerous articles on OD, action research, collaborative management research, and of several books. Recent books include *Storymaking and Organizational Transformation* (Routledge, 2023 with Buganza et al.), *IDeaLs – Innovation and Design as Leadership: Transformation in the Digital Era* (Emerald, 2021 with Press et al.), and *Collaborative Inquiry for Organization Development and Change* (Edgar, 2021 with David Coghlan). He is the co-editor of the annual research series *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Volumes 16–31 (Emerald Publications, 2008-present), and co-editor of *The Handbook of Collaborative Management Research* (SAGE, 2008).

Baruch Shimoni is an Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Bar-Ilan University, Israel. In his most recent research project, Professor Shimoni links the Bourdieuan concept of habitus to the field of ODC to incorporate the individual and the social in the field. Professor Shimoni published his theoretical and practical ideas in leading journals such as the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *Organizational Dynamics* (2018) and *Academy of Management Perspectives* (2019), the book *Organization Development and Society: Theory and Practice of Organization Development Consulting* (Routledge, 2019), and *Organization Development (OD) Review* (2024).

Ilene C. Wasserman has over 30 years' experience in organizational consulting, leadership development, and executive coaching. She has been on the cutting edge of research and practice in strength-based methodologies, capacity building, and relational leadership, particularly related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. As Founder and President of ICW Consulting Group, Ilene is deeply committed to providing the foundation and motivation that sustain learnings with senior leaders, teams, and staff long after the consulting relationship has ended. She is

the author of several publications including two books: *Communicating Possibilities: A Brief Introduction to the Coordinated Management of Meaning* and *Peer Coaching at Work: Principles and Practices*.

Christopher G. Worley, Rennes School of Business (France) and Pepperdine University (USA), publishes and consults in the fields of organization agility, organization development, and organization design. He is a Clinical Professor of Strategy at the Rennes School of Business and a Research Professor Emeritus at Pepperdine's Graziadio School of Business. He was the founding Strategy Director at the Center for Leadership and Effective Organizations at the NEOMA Business School in France, a Senior Research Scientist at USC's Center for Effective Organizations, Chair of the Academy of Management's Organization Development and Change division, and Director of the Master of Science in Organization (MSOD) program at Pepperdine University. Dr. Worley is the co-author of *How to do Relevant Research, The Agility Factor, Becoming Agile, Management Reset, Built to Change*, and *Integrated Strategic Change* and the co-author of eight editions of *Organization Development and Change*.

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

The ever-evolving nature of the global competitive environment suggests that organizations and systems that do not engage in continuous change and development are likely to have difficulty surviving. Given the rapid pace of change within industries and beyond, human systems are challenged to adapt to remain viable and reorient themselves to tackle the new challenges head on. However, achieving successful transformations remains elusive. One aspect of improving an organization's chances for implementing successful change and enhancing its chances for improving performance would be to integrate some of the past and emerging practices that evolved in the field of organization development and change (ODC).

Volume 31 of *Research in Organizational Change and Development* (ROCD) provides powerful new insights about emerging practices, perspectives, and theoretical development. For this volume, David Coghlan from Trinity College, Dublin, has joined us. David's addition to the editorial team represents a commitment to enhancing our community of inquiry and at the same time maintaining the high quality of work that many of you have come to expect from this publication platform.

Garrison and Akyol (2013) describe a community of inquiry as a collaborative environment where individuals engage in critical discourse and reflection, thus fostering both personal and collective meaning-making. The field of ODC and within it this annual research series form such communities of inquiry as its members research and intervene in human systems (mostly organizational) and generate usable knowledge.

The activities of the field of ODC build on the past, inquire, and intervene in the present in order to create the future. Accordingly, it is both a community of inquiry and an engaged community of practice. As Schein (2010) has argued, the tap root of ODC lies in the practical social science that Lewin practiced which meant "a new inquiry approach based on a willingness to gather data in the field by non-traditional methods, with the vivid concerns of a set of practitioners who wanted to improve organizations" (p. 93). He concluded that OD was a "quiet revolution." In the present universal environment, there are calls for ODC to use its knowledge and skills to address the phenomenon of global challenges (Bartunek, 2022; Pasmore, 2025), particularly through collaborative research and action research orientations (Buganza et al., 2023; Zandee & Coghlan, 2025) to ensure our planet's future.

Through successive generations, ODC has developed and exercised an eclectic approach to research and organizational intervention (Coghlan et al., 2019). Three interwoven themes of phenomenon-driven orientation (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016),

relevance (Cummings & Cummings, 2020), and collaborative orientation (Shani & Coghlan, 2021) seem to continuously guide practice and theoretical development. Since 1987, the *Research in Organizational Change and Development* series has been an integral part of the community whereby research is presented and knowledge is shared. In parallel, the series has contributed reflections on approaches to research and on the development of the field itself (Coghlan, 2017). The phenomenon-driven, relevance, and collaborative dynamics of the past, present, and future of the field of ODC are captured in this, the 31st volume of the series. The authors of chapters in this volume have addressed emerging issues, challenges, and opportunities while advancing new insights to practice and theoretical development.

One major global development that ODC must embrace is the rapid rise and undeniable influence of digital technology (DT) on how we work and live. The emerging role of artificial intelligence (AI) and its impact presents new challenges to organizations and an opportunity to the ODC field. Recent issues in many leading journals such as *JABS* (*The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*), (volume 60 number 4) are devoted to exploring the emerging technological development and its impact on organizations as they navigate change (Fredberg & Schwarz, 2024). Hence, we are delighted that this volume includes three chapters that are devoted to the role that OD plays and can play in helping organizations integrate AI and DT. In this chapter, issues of design, planned change road maps, collaboration and change methodologies, and relevance are explored and advanced. Two of these chapters magnify the role that action research methodology plays in the infusion of AI literacy in a business school and in the enhancement of interorganizational collaboration in the public health sector.

The ROCD series continuously advances our understanding of key elements of the field. In this category, Volume 31 includes four chapters: The first focuses on group dynamics and advances a sociological perspective that is embedded in a habitus change orientation. Another chapter addresses the role that OD can play in the development of new skills such as ambidextrous capability. Yet, another chapter addresses a scholar-practitioner system-based integrated organization development consulting model. The volume concludes with a contribution that builds on the legacy of Ed Schein where the authors identify trajectories of broad areas for future exploration and development of the field.

The first chapter in this volume by *Bill Pasmore* traces the development of the field in terms of the socio-technical perspective. It addresses the phenomenon of the interaction between people and technology and assesses the phenomenon of contemporary technological challenges, particularly from AI. It then discusses the relevance of AI to researchers and practitioners in our present world and proposes how the field may engage fruitfully with AI in the future. The argument that is advanced suggests that as we learn more about the promises and risks of AI, we can explore how the application of this new technology and the continued evolution of OD methods could merge to produce a more complex and intelligent form of OD to deal with the most important challenges of our times. Guiding principles for more effective solutions to the emerging complex challenges are advanced.

Kisito Nzembayie, in a phenomenon-driven study, building on a rich case about the integration of AI in a business school, brings to the forefront the challenges and opportunities for the ODC field in leading the way of AI integration into the workplace. The utilization of insider action research and the creation of learning mechanisms formed the foundation for the intervention. The author provides an interiority-infused action research framework as a conceptual tool and a road map to guide the development of an AI transformation initiative leading to critical AI literacy.

Sue Mohrman and Chris Worley focus on the DT promise in a study that coupled a phenomenon-driven study with relevance and claim that DT provides broad benefits, including customization, agility, transparency, efficiency, and empowerment. The authors argue that the implementation and integration of DT present organizations with a complex adaptive challenge. Namely that if the emerging social system is not guided by a future vision where technical rationality and human purpose are considered together, traditional assumptions of hierarchical control and technological determinism will overwhelm human agency. Building on the mechanism of design labs (Thompson & Schulte, 2022), the authors convened a collaborative ten-company design lab convened to increase the shared understanding of practical impacts and implications of digitalization on the design of their organizations. They describe and discuss the co-generated actionable knowledge to address the challenges inherent in this transition. Participants came to recognize the need to design digitally enabled organizations based on a new set of assumptions consistent with both technological possibilities and human aspirations. Their collaborative work generated preliminary design specifications and implications for the process of redesign and change for each of the companies that were involved.

Chiara Covino, *Federica Morandi*, *Benedetta Colaiacovo*, and *Mara Gorli*, while focusing on the phenomenon-driven study of interorganizational collaboration, leveraged action research methodology to facilitate collaboration between patient advocacy associations (PAAs) in Italy. The study explores the phenomenon of interorganizational collaboration within the third-sector voluntary organization field, specifically Italian PAAs, emphasizing the transition from competitive to collaborative dynamics. Through a yearlong action research process, the authors examine and discuss how psychosocial and organizational dynamics enable innovative collective responses and effective collaboration. Specifically, the paper focuses on forming identity awareness, managing diversities and conflict, managing boundaries, and structuring and managing shared projects. The study provides new insights about interorganizational processes, offering relevant and practical insights to enhance collaboration in third-sector organizations.

Baruch Shimoni, while focusing on one of the oldest interventions in the field of OD – group dynamics – advances a sociological perspective that rests on Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of habitus (social dispositions) and the relational. The argument is made that by using therapeutic discourse and practices aimed at developing personal skills and abilities and shaping behavior, the T-group very often hardly represents the role of social and structural aspects in generating

participants' behavior. The claim is made that integrating habitus and the relational perspective enable a group facilitator to expose the relationship between the group's social and structural context and personal behavior.

Mikael Hansson, *Johanna E. Pregmark*, *and Tobias Fredberg*, in their chapter that focuses on the phenomenon of ambidexterity and change, argue that at the core of the capability to develop and change beyond incremental improvements lie a large number of decisions, where support of the established organizational modus operandi is weighed against investments in something new or different. While many studies demonstrated that a top management team is regularly charged with the most important of these decisions, and hence needs mastery of this capability, commonly called contextual ambidexterity, few explore the roots of this capability. In this exploratory multilevel case study, the authors research the micro-foundations of ambidexterity and study how subjective, individual values can affect the team efficiency in engaging in exploitative and explorative issues as well as their ability to manage both. The authors discuss how the value palette in a management team can be influenced to enact such ambidextrous capability and by doing so are likely to trigger change and development.

Matt Minahan and *Yabome Gilpin-Jackson* bring the scholar-practitioners perspective to advance an alternative integrated organization development consulting model. The model was developed based on input of over 300 participants that attempted to trigger dialogue about building OD for tomorrow's world meetings and the outcome of a dialogue about the OD network strategic vision. The outcome informed the development of an integrated model of OD consulting practice. The proposed model was built on the integration of responses to three foundational questions, namely what OD practitioners do (consulting action steps), how do they do it (the philosophical, psychodynamic orientation and mindset of the practitioner), and who are they in the world and in their work (underlying values).

This volume concludes with a contribution from *David Coghlan, Jean Bartunek, Jill Paine, Rami Shani, Baruch Shimoni*, and *Ilene Wasserman* that explores some of Edgar Schein's insights and impact. Schein was a scholar-practitioner whose extensive contribution to the scholarship of practice typically emerged from his encounter with relevant issues facing managers. In this reflective chapter, the authors testify to elements of that contribution in how they evolved as scholar-practitioners and shows in their present work, and offer these elements as his legacy into the future. More specifically, they explore the impact of his work on the scholar-practitioner as artist, process consultation and Bourdieu's notion of habitus, the role of context and collaborative design dimensions in relationships, psychological safety and organizational culture, humble inquiry, and the role that social scientists play in confronting global crises. Last, the authors advance trajectories of broad areas for future explorations.

The ODC field is facing increasing challenges in the ever-evolving nature of the global competitive environment. The contributions of the 8 chapters and 20 authors from 6 different countries provide deeper-level insights, theoretical perspectives, methodological know how, planned change road maps, and practical implications for meaningful ODC contributions. All authors of this volume show

how, in their own ways, they adhere to the values of collaboration, relevance, and phenomenon-driven research when and where it matters most. From our editorial perspective, our collaboration with the authors always generates new learning and appreciation of what the field has to offer in addressing the emerging global challenges in the increasingly turbulent world.

This volume marks a transition in the editorial team. ROCD 31 will be the final one that we – the four of us – edit in the series. We thank the many authors who made their insightful contributions to the ROCD series for almost four decades. Acknowledging the contribution of Dick Woodman and Bill Pasmore as founders of the series and editors for Volumes 1–21, Rami Shani for Volumes 17–31, Debra Noumair for Volumes 21–31, Danielle Zandee for Volumes 30–31, and David Coghlan for Volume 31 is a task beyond the setting of this Preface. We intend this will be for a future occasion.

In a series focused on organizational change and development, it is fitting to usher in change and development of the ROCD series. We are honored to welcome Tobias Fredberg and Johanna E. Pregmark, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden, as the new series editors. Tobias Fredberg, a professor at the Department of Technology Management and Economics and Johanna E. Pregmark of the core team at the Corporate Entrepreneurship initiative at Chalmers School of Entrepreneurship have in the last decade built up alongside colleagues, two industry-academy collaboration platforms – the Center for Higher Ambition (an European sister organization to the US-based Higher Ambition Alliance) and the Entrepreneurial Leadership Lab. Both have contributed chapters to ROCD, including a chapter in this volume, and published their work in leading journals. Together, they bring to the series an appreciation and commitment to high-quality collaborative work with scholars and scholar-practitioners. *We encourage* ROCD contributors and readers to dialogue with Tobias and Johanna about potential contributions to future ROCD volumes.

Abraham B. (Rami) Shani
Debra A. Noumair
Danielle P. Zandee
David Coghlan

REFERENCES

Bartunek, J. M. (Ed.). (2022). *Social scientists confronting global crises*. Routledge.

Buganza, T., Bellis, P., Magnanini, S., Press, J., Shani, A. B. (Rami), Trabucchi, D., Verganti, R., & Zasa, F. (2023). *Storymaking and organizational transformation*. Routledge.

Coghlan, D. (2017). How might we learn about the philosophy of ODC research from 24 volumes of ROCD? An invitation to interiority. In A. B. (Rami) Shani & D. A. Noumair (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 25, pp. 335–361). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Coghlan, D., Shani, A. B. (Rami), & Hay, G. W. (2019). Toward a social science philosophy of organization development and change. In D. A. Noumair & A. B. (Rami) Shani (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 27, pp. 1–29). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Cummings, T. G., & Cummings, C. (2020). The relevance challenge in management and organization studies: Bringing organization development back in. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *56*(4), 521–546. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886320961855

Fredberg, T., & Schwarz, G. M. (2024). What AI knows: Shaping work and pushing ideas on changing organizations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *60*(4), 581–588.

Garrison, D., & Akyol, Z. (2013). The community of inquiry theoretical framework. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (Vol. 7, pp. 104–119). Routledge.

Pasmore, W. A. (2025). Intelligent OD: Organization development in the age of AI. In A. B. (Rami) Shani, D. A. Noumair, D. P. Zandee, & D. Coghlan (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 31). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Schein, E. H. (2010). Organization development: Science, technology or philosophy? In D. Coghlan & A. B. (Rami) Shani (Eds.), *Fundamentals of organization development* (Vol. 1, pp. 91–100). Sage.

Schwarz, G. M., & Stensaker, I. G. (2016). Showcasing phenomenon-driven research on organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, *16*(4), 245–264. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2016.1230931

Shani, A. B. (Rami), & Coghlan, D. (2021). *Collaborative inquiry for organization development and change*. Edward Elgar.

Thompson, M., & Schulte, M. (2022). The laboratization of change: What is it with labs and change these days? In A. B. (Rami) Shani & D. A. Noumair (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 29, pp. 33–62). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Zandee, D. P., & Coghlan, D. (2025). Action research for impact in addressing the grand challenges. *Strategic Organization*, *43*(1), 147–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270241270913

INTELLIGENT OD: ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE AGE OF AI

William A. Pasmore

Columbia University, USA

ABSTRACT

Despite decades of evolution, organization development (OD) is still severely challenged when it comes to dealing with some of the most vexing organizational and societal issues we currently face. In part, this is because the issues we face are sociotechnical in nature, requiring closer collaboration between social scientists and those possessing the technical expertise required to achieve breakthroughs. As we learn more about the promises and risks of Artificial Intelligence (AI), we explore how the application of this new technology and the continued evolution of OD methods could merge to produce a more complex and intelligent form of OD to deal with the most important challenges of our times.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; intelligent OD; incorporated knowledge; collaborative action research; diagnostic vs dialogic OD

It is easy to forget that we are less than 100 years into the grand experiment called organization development (OD). In that period of time, a great deal of progress has been made to better understand how individuals and organizations change and how those changes can be facilitated. Through theorizing and active experimentation, we have continued to evolve our approaches as we have learned more about what works and the world around us has metamorphized. We are far from proclaiming victory, as the success rate of traditional diagnostic OD hovers around 33% and even our most advanced methods based on dialogic engagement, though far more successful (in the neighborhood of 80%), need further improvement to produce real progress with the most important challenges before us (Bushe & Marshak, 2015; Hastings & Schwarz, 2022). Magnifying this concern is the reality that organizations today are facing constant multiple changes, and

Research in Organizational Change and Development, Volume 31, 1–29

ISSN: 0897-3016/doi:10.1108/S0897-301620250000031002

these changes, dealing with such things as partnered innovation, rapid shifts in the competitive landscape, and interrelated global events that disrupt supply chains, are increasingly complex (Pasmore, 2015; Stacey, 2015).

While advancing, our knowledge and related methods of approaching change are falling farther behind what will be required. In fact, what is needed is a better way to prosecute the change demands we face today. On a societal level, as we untangle what have been called wicked problems, complex messes, and adaptive challenges, we need a revolution in change methodologies. Climate change, geopolitical conflicts, economic upheaval, and pandemics are but a few of the headliners among the many threats to our continued existence that must be addressed.

In the tradition of the field, from the earliest work by Kurt Lewin to the current day, the idea that people can solve whatever problems are brought to them has been a part of our belief and value system in OD. Those who have reflected deeply upon these issues have offered methods that are designed to engage participants rather than direct them. Participative design (Emery, 1989); appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987); search conferences (Emery & Purser, 1996; Weisbord, 1992); world café (Brown, 2002); and open space technology (Owen, 2008) are among a list of 40 such methods noted by Bushe and Marshak in their book on dialogic OD (Bushe & Marshak, 2015).

The "technology" of these OD methods, deriving from their strong history in human relations and the behavioral sciences, relies on largely unaided conversation to supply solutions to complex, ambiguous issues. The same could be said about management in general; leaders are more likely to rely on unaided conversation than to bring to bear the technical expertise that more sophisticated, technical and human, systemic, interrelated, and emergent challenges demand. Despite its proven utility in growing commitment to solutions, participation *alone* is not a guarantee of success when dealing with complex sociotechnical issues. Participants can become highly committed to ineffective solutions. With awareness and appropriate precautions, introducing expertise and factual evidence of various kinds into deliberations taking place during certain change efforts may be beneficial.

In this paper, the extent to which expertise should be allowed to influence participants in organization change efforts is discussed. The case will be made that expertise should be shared in instances when change involves highly technical innovations requiring knowledge that few or none of the participants possess or in instances when the education of participants might enhance the quality of solutions they generate.

While it might seem obvious that such information could be helpful to participants as they seek to stretch beyond the limits of their known worlds in search of novel answers to particularly complex, vexing or pernicious challenges, introducing expert knowledge goes against current trends and deeply held values in the field of OD that favor continuous dialogic engagement and the empowerment of members of systems in determining their destiny (Bushe & Marshak, 2015; Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987). We are therefore challenging the popular belief that "If we just put our heads together, we can accomplish anything."

We then address how Artificial Intelligence (AI) and other tools might assist participants in fashioning action and research that bring us closer to the solutions we seek.

We begin by briefly reviewing how the field of OD has evolved and how the paths it took led us to where we are today. We then examine the strengths and weaknesses of the dominant orientations that exist and how their bifurcation hinders our progress toward conceiving the more powerful sociotechnical approaches that current and future challenges require. Next, we examine efforts to manage knowledge creation and application in organizational settings, with a particular view on how AI may supercharge those efforts. Then, we offer new principles to guide next generation OD theorizing and practice and from there, derive implications for practice and research.

HOW OD CAME TO BE

For a more complete, authoritative account of the history of OD, I refer the reader to the excellent papers by Phil Mirvis in Volumes 2 and 3 of this series (Mirvis, 1988, 1990) and the two-volume handbook on great thinkers in OD by Szabla et al. (2017). Here, I provide a shortened account, tainted by my own limited exposure, challenged memory, and picked over to accent the things that I want to say that I think are important.

Decades before there was a thing called OD, there were already forces at work that continue to influence the tensions in the field that we feel today. On the one hand, there were practitioners and theorists who viewed work and organizations as machines to be studied scientifically and made more efficient. Taylor's Scientific Management (Taylor, 1911) and Weber's Bureaucracy (Weber, 1922) were the bellwethers of this way of thinking. In their quest to set out a right way, or at least better way to do things, they didn't so much view participants as an impediment but rather as lacking knowledge, needing instructions or organizational structures and processes to guide them into more effective ways of working. Without the application of scientific methods, how could people discover the best way to perform a task? Without awareness of their own capriciousness, how could people design an organization that could operate free of their self-interests? Taylor and Weber might not have taken a purely "theory X″ view of people that casts people as inherently lazy and actively trying to avoid being held accountable (McGregor, 1960) but neither was it their view that people were resources who could and should be involved in the design of their work and the organizations in which that work took place. Rather, they felt that the design of work and organizations should be guided by experts like themselves. The proof that they were correct in their view was everywhere they looked as work was horribly inefficient and organizations hopelessly politicized and corrupt. Taylor and Weber were out to solve organizational problems and believed they had discovered solutions that should be embraced by leaders and universally adopted.

The other school of thought was led by Mary Parker Follett (1924) who, among other things, was a champion for human potential. She was inspired by

what people could accomplish when they were committed to a cause and set out to understand how conditions could be created by leaders that would allow their people to contribute to their fullest capability. Even before Lewin, who gets the lion's share of credit for breaking from Freud to propose that contextual influences could shape behavior more strongly than one's personality, Parker Follet sought to help leaders understand how their own behavior echoed through behaviors of their followers. Maximum motivation, performance, and creativity were the products of respect for the worker's inherent intelligence rather than efforts to dictate how work should be done. Whenever there were questions to be answered about something that wasn't working as well as it should, the first step, in Parker Follet's view, should be to seek input from the people involved rather than to look outside for expert guidance.

The Hawthorne Studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) were offered as further proof that human will outweighed the importance of scientific methods of work design in determining productivity. The original intent of the studies was to explore the effects of different intensities of lighting on productivity; but as the experimenters varied the lighting, they found that productivity increased regardless of the level of lighting, leading them to investigate what was actually going on. They found that employees enjoyed the attention they were receiving from the researchers and wanted to help the scientists' experiments succeed and so continued to increase their effort with each new condition imposed. The "Hawthorne effect," as it came to be known, held that when authority figures paid attention to people, people would, in return, try their best to fulfill the implied demands being placed upon them.

In the same period, Chester Barnard, President of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, wrote an influential book that addressed the psychological contract between employees and their organization, reinforcing the importance of maintaining positive relations with workers in order to increase their loyalty (Barnard, 1938). These streams of thought led to a shift from people being treated as disposable parts by the "Personnel Department" to family members being cared for by the "Human Relations" function.

These currents set the stage for Lewin whose early work addressed the power of people participating in decisions that affected them and experimentation with approaches to reduce the negative effects of racism (Lewin, 1946). It was in the latter efforts to reduce racism that the "T-group" or training group methodology was invented (Lippitt, 1949). The T-group was explicitly designed to help participants inquire for themselves into the dynamics of their relationships. The facilitator was instructed not to share expertise but rather to create a space in which conversation among the participants concerning what was happening in the "here and now," without a set agenda, could take place. Presumably, whatever took place was what the participants created themselves rather than it being imposed on them in the form of a structured exercise or intervention. As the participants reflected on why what happened took place and how they felt about it, they learned how the choices they were making were influencing the dynamics they were experiencing. In this way, they learned about group dynamics by teaching themselves. The revelations produced by this methodology were

powerful, leading to reports of greater self-awareness, understanding of others, and improved relationships.

As the T-group approach was taken into organizations, it was adapted by practitioners to address challenges associated with teams and organizational effectiveness. We mark this as the birth of OD. Blake and Mouton (1964), for example, were among the earliest to coin the phrase "Organization Development" and created the "managerial grid," which instructed leaders on how to engage employees in ways that emphasized both task completion and social concerns. Beckhard (1969) defined OD as follows:

> Organizational development is an effort (1) planned, (2) organization wide, (3) managed from the top, (4) to increase organization effectiveness and health and (5) through planned intervention in the organization's processes using behavioral science knowledge. (p. 3)

The human potential movement, which flourished in the 1960s and 1970s alongside OD, focused attention on people finding meaning in their lives and more specifically, the search for meaning at work. The more potential people discovered in themselves, according to this line of thought, the more capability they could bring to the job. OD, embracing the human potential movement, began to acquire a reputation as being concerned about things that were "warm and fuzzy" rather than being concerned with dealing directly with performance issues and the bottom line.

Today, we continue to feel reverberations from OD's early attention to human feelings at work in employee engagement programs (Sorenson, 2013), positive organization psychology (Cameron, 2013), appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987), dialogic OD (Bushe & Marshak, 2015), and organizational flourishing (Dutton et al., 2008).

As the humanistic school of OD was evolving in the United States, researchers at the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations were exploring ways to apply an understanding of social systems to making organizations more productive (Trist et al.,1963). Working in coal mines in the United Kingdom and weaving mills in India after the Second World War, researchers at first studied how various social configurations influenced different aspects of performance and then experimented with involving workers in the design of their own work systems. The Tavistock researchers rediscovered, in a sense, what the Hawthorne studies had demonstrated: that workers were eager to participate in improving the ways in which their work was performed. What was new, however, was that the researchers were able to demonstrate that workers could contribute significantly to technical as well as social decisions about the design of their work systems. This led to the invention of participatory methods which were used to redesign existing operations and completely new "greenfield" sites (Emery, 1989).

In the Scandinavian countries, and in Germany, values concerning the dignity of work led to what became known as the industrial democracy movement (Poole, 2017) and work councils becoming part of national law. Researchers in Norway collaborated with those from the Tavistock Institute to bring what was being called the sociotechnical systems approach to businesses there (Hill, 1971).

Eventually, the sociotechnical approach spread to the United States where extensive experimentation followed (Pasmore et al., 1982).

In the late 1970s, the quality movement took root in Japan and then was re-imported to the United States and elsewhere (Aguayo, 1991; Juran, 1994). Lean Six sigma followed (Atmaca & Girenes, 2013), which emphasized the importance of employee involvement in continuous improvement. Another stream of work focused on process improvement (Davenport, 1993; Hammer & Champy, 2009) also emphasized the importance of tapping into the knowledge that workers possessed to eliminate wasted effort, reduce inventory and speed time to completion. Because both the quality school and the process improvement school incorporated scientific methods and imposed solutions reminiscent of Taylor and Weber, leaders embraced them as practical (not warm and fuzzy) approaches to improving performance which they could manage without the need to engage workers in participatory design activities that impinged on leadership authority.

Meanwhile, in the world at large, technology in its various forms was rapidly transforming the workplace. Information technology provided the foundation for enterprise resource systems (ERPs) which simplified record keeping, provided information to drive the automation of decision-making and promised greater control over operations. Robots started to replace workers on the assembly line and various software programs brought access to relevant data to scientists and knowledge workers. Visions of "dark factories" in which no lighting would be required because machines would do all the work raised the anxieties of workers who wondered how long their jobs would last.

Knowledge management systems became in vogue in organizations that relied on expertise from internal and external sources to design products and services. Then, it was discovered that AI could not only access large quantities of knowledge but do the work that humans used to do to connect the dots across vast data sources to generate innovations. As we will discuss, the implications of AI for the future of work and organizations are only just emerging.

The evolution of technology and its impact on organizations has for the most part been beyond the ken of OD. OD's role has been to help organizations manage the resistance to change that often accompanies the adoption of new forms of technology rather than being intimately involved in either the invention of new technologies or decisions about how technologies should be deployed. That needs to change going forward, given that harnessing both human will and technological know-how are vital in addressing our most meaningful challenges.

The historical stage was thus set for the schism between the two approaches to OD mentioned earlier: normative-re-educative which was advocated by Mary Parker Follett and Lewin, contrasted with the more rational-empirical approach taken by the Tavistock researchers, quality gurus and process redesign champions.

Benne (1961) described the rational-empirical strategy for bringing about change as relying upon the rational self-interests of the person, group or community to adopt changes that make objective sense. In contrast, Benne described normative-re-educative change as requiring that people adopt new values,

attitudes or orientations, not just changes in knowledge or intellectual explanations of the benefits of change.

Of interest to the argument to be made here, Chin and Benne noted Lewin's contributions to normative-re-educative change strategies:

> Lewin's contributions to normative-re-educative strategies of changing stemmed from his vision of required interactions between research, training, and action (and, for him, this meant collaborative relationships, often now lacking, between researchers, educators, and activists) in the solution of human problems, in the identification of needs for change, and in the working out of improved knowledge, technology, and patterns of action in meeting these needs. (p. 31)

We will return to a discussion of the need for greater collaboration between technologists and social scientists in the section to follow.

The contrast between rational-empirical approaches to change and normative-re-educative approaches was echoed in a piece by Friedlander and Brown (1974). They spoke to the impracticality of focusing exclusively on either structural change or human process change alone:

> Since processes and structures are embedded in each other, it is almost impossible to create lasting change in one without modification of the other. Yet there are those who focus on changing organizational structures with no involvement in the behavioral processes in which these structures are embedded, and those who are totally concerned with changing processes, oblivious of the ongoing structures which underlie these processes. (p. 315)

They go on to describe technostructural approaches, which are like the rational-empirical side of OD, as follows:

> Technostructural approaches to OD refer to theories of and interventions into the technology (e.g. task methods and processes) and the structure (e.g. the relationships, roles, arrangements) of the organization. Technostructural approaches are rooted in the fields of engineering, sociology, psychology, economics, and open systems theory. Change interventions are intended to affect the work content and method and to affect the sets of relationships among workers. Within the broad heading of technostructural development are included sociotechnical systems perspectives, job design and enlargement, and job enrichment. (p. 320)

They describe human processual (more like normative-re-educative change) approaches as follows:

> Human process intervention focuses on human participants and the organization processes (e.g. communication, problem solving, decision making) through which they accomplish their own and the organization's goals. This orientation to OD is rooted in the academic fields of psychology, social psychology, and anthropology and in the applied disciplines of group dynamics and the human relations movement. Human process-orientation change agents tend to value human fulfillment highly and to expect improved organization performance to follow on improved human functioning and process. (p. 325)

Action research (Lewin, 1946) and collaborative inquiry (Shani & Coghlan, 2021) are mainstays of OD used to bring about change in systems and better understand how they operate at the same time. They are in part driven by the fusion of rational-empirical and normative-re-educative approaches to change. Action research is any attempt to experiment with changing a system so as to learn how it responds and from that, to develop a deeper understanding of the

variables that govern how the system operates. Collaborative inquiry, which includes collaborative management research (Reason & Bradbury, 2008; Shani & Coghlan, 2021; Shani et al., 2008), adds to general action research the involvement of social scientists who partner with organizational representatives to bring theory to practice and thereby refine the power of investigations undertaken. Shani and Coghlan (2021) define collaborative inquiry as follows:

> We define collaborative inquiry (CI) as a dialogical emergent inquiry process between two or more parties, at least one of whom is a member of the system/organization/network and at least one of whom is an external consultant/researcher, for the dual purpose of taking actions and creating new and shared meaning in order to improve and/or develop a system and of generating new understanding of an issue or phenomenon. (p. 3)

As in the normative-re-educative/human process school, underlying the process of collaborative inquiry is a recognition that only those who inhabit a system fully experience its influences and as a result of their experiences, develop tacit knowledge of how the system operates, some of which is conscious but some of which exists beyond sentient access. Collaborative inquiry, based on dialogic emergent processes, exposes patterns of behavior that may not have been obvious as causes of inefficiencies or sources of inspiration for innovation.

At the same time, scientists involved in collaborative inquiry bring a rigor to the process that is the characteristic of the rational-empirical/technostructural approach to change. The partnership created in collaborative inquiry between researchers and members of the system is intended to answer basic questions about how a system operates and also to build commitment on the part of those who live in the system to the possibility of its transformation. Therefore, knowledge of the system, inaccessible to either party alone prior to the inquiry, is made available for application to practical concerns. Shani and Coghlan (2021) refer to the collaborative inquiry approach as "Mode 2 research."

In contrast, they refer to traditional research, in which the scientist stands apart from the system and observes it objectively and dispassionately, as "Mode 1 research." The rational-empirical/technostructural leanings of some OD practitioners, like Mode 1 research, privileged the knowledge of scientists over that of members of the system. Like Taylor or Weber, these practitioners found value in conducting a diagnosis of the system from a scientific perspective, using tools and frameworks based on behavioral science research. Nadler and Tushman's congruence model (Nadler & Tushman, 1977), the Burke-Litwin model (Burke & Litwin, 1989), Galbraith's star model for organization design (Galbraith, 1977), and Marshak's examination of covert processes (Marshak, 2006) are but a few prominent examples of this school. These scholarly practitioners held that research in the behavioral sciences could be applied to assist system members in understanding something about how organizational systems work that is not obvious to the casual observer. This knowledge, when properly applied, could be used to enhance the functioning of systems in ways that members of the system would not be likely to discover based on their own experience. Barrett (2015) notes the tension between diagnostic and dialogic currents in our field in the following: