WHAT IS ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FROM A PROCESS WORK PERSPECTIVE?

An Interview Study Using Qualitative Methods

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

MASTER OF ARTS IN
CONFLICT FACILITATION AND ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE

from

THE PROCESS WORK INSTITUTE
Portland, Oregon

by

Heike Hamann

December 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not exist if it were not for Dawn Menken's dream about creating a Master's programme focusing on the theory and methods of Worldwork – the Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change (MACFOC). I am enormously grateful to her for this dream, and to the many people, including Julie Diamond, who made this dream become a reality. You have changed my life. Thank you. My thankfulness flows onto Arny Mindell, for creating Process Work and Worldwork, and with it this amazing community of teachers and students.

A huge thank you to Caroline Spark, for being there with me along the whole journey as my thesis supervisor – I cannot find the words to describe the breadth, depth and constancy of support and love I felt from you. Thank you for guiding me, challenging me, helping me clarify my thoughts and nursing me through the frustrations and tiredness.

I am indebted to the four study participants – Lesli Mones, Max Schupbach, Julie Diamond and Stephen Schuitevoerder – for generously sharing some of their experiences, thoughts, ideas and discoveries about the topic.

To Katje Wagner, my friend and fellow researcher, who inspired me to do academic research in the first place, and who could relate to my experiences, and share her learnings. Thank you for your support and for being there when I first experienced the pain of having abandoned my 'inner authority', and handling the complicated juggling act required to embrace its first return.

I am grateful to Dawn, who worked and continues the not-always-the-most pleasant work with me as my inner authority finds a place in me and the world. And I am thankful for her critical mind in reading and engaging with this thesis, and knack of unearthing the incongruencies.

To Lesli, whose excitement for the topic meets my own, and whose openness to learning blows me away. And for her never ending support of me in so many facets of my life. Thank you.

To my study committee – Caroline, Lesli and Dawn – I am grateful to you for all the things I've already mentioned and for helping me crystallise and sharpen my ideas.

Brett Hardin, my partner, thank you for being with me on this journey, as a bouncing board for ideas and for keeping up the constant message in the final phases of "get that &*^% thing done"!

And last, but not least, to the first MACFOC Cohort, with whom I learned and grew, and for being excited by this topic and its early findings.

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study explores the question of what organisational development is from a Process Work perspective. It does so by interviewing four Process Workers who identify as working with organisations, and based on their responses to a set of open ended questions, reports on findings in three areas: (1) 'Ideas Behind pOD' (process-oriented organisational development) describes how pOD is the application of Worldwork to organisations, with Worldwork providing the concepts and tools practitioners use; (2) 'Applications of pOD' lists the wide range of organisations participants have worked with, and the types of problems they encounter; and (3) 'pOD in Practice' presents the phases that practitioners go through when working with organisations. Based on these findings a pOD Model is proposed, which suggests that pOD = Worldwork (background philosophy) + pOD Practice (phases of working with an organisation).

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

Process Work is a body of theory and practice with many applications, including working with individuals in various states of consciousness, couples and small and large groups in group processes. These applications, whilst still evolving, are mostly well developed. There are many practitioners practicing Process Work in these fields and they are generally well documented (Diamond & Jones, 2004; Mindell, 1999; Mindell, 2002a).

Problem Statement

The application of Process Work in organisations and the field of organisational development is an exciting, powerful and largely new area of work. While there are some people working in this field, they are in many ways pioneers and working out how to apply Process Work in this setting as they go. There is relatively little literature available about the application of Process Work to organisational development, as is discussed in the Literature Review.

The Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change (MACFOC) was established in 2004, and includes teaching in the area of organisational change and development, which is conducted mostly through case presentation and discussion. Rather than presenting a theory of how to apply Worldwork in this setting, teaching in this program adopts "an experimental approach in looking at new ways to integrate Worldwork theory and methods into organisational life", recognising that "Worldwork concepts and tools are just beginning to be used in a systematic way to organisations" (Process Work Institute, 2006, p.15).

This study seeks to further the process of developing process-oriented Organisational Development (pOD), by contributing to the emergence of theories and formal documentation of this field and to provide a snapshot of the stage of development that pOD is in now, in 2007. The lens through which this snapshot is taken is constructed from interviews that I conducted with four Process Work faculty members who identify as working with organisations. The interviews were conducted in late 2006 and early 2007.

The research question this study seeks to answer is: "What is organisational development from a Process Work perspective?"

As this is a question of meaning, understanding and process, rather than a question of facts and figures, the problem is appropriate for qualitative research (Merriam, 2002, p. 19). More specifically, I adopted a qualitative approach to each phase of this interview study – research design, data collection and data analysis – within the philosophical framework of interpretive inquiry. My generic approach to thematic analysis was based on Merriam (2002) and Tesch (1990).

Overview of Chapters

This study is described in the seven subsequent chapters. Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature. Chapter 3 discusses the research method. Chapters 4 to 6 present and discuss study findings. Chapter 4 focuses on conceptual findings, Chapter 5 on the applications of pOD and Chapter 6 presents findings that relate to the practice of pOD. Chapter 7 reviews the findings, and proposes a pOD model. Chapter 8 concludes with a review of

the study, its implication for future research and its contribution to the field of process-oriented organisational development.

Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the knowledge relevant to this area of inquiry. It explores existing information about the topic of the study – process-oriented organisational development – and highlights the relative lack of literature available in this area. It then looks briefly at the literature available in the general field of organisational development, of which there is plenty.

Additional review of literature is interspersed throughout the thesis, in the Methodology and the Findings sections. This placement is one of a variety of options recognised by qualitative research methodologists, as outlined by Jones (2005, p. 43).

Process-oriented Organisational Development

The findings of this study are organised into three areas – 'Ideas Behind pOD', 'Applications of pOD' and 'pOD in Practice'. My review of the literature suggests that there is some writing on the first area – both in books about Worldwork (Mindell, 1995) and on various websites (see Schupbach, 2006b and Diamond, n.d.b). Some applications of pOD are mentioned briefly in the books, and increasingly frequently so in the websites. The amount of information on the practice of pOD is mixed – both the books and the websites contain information about some interventions, for example, group process methods. There is less information about other interventions, such as coaching techniques. Information about the actual process of consulting to an organisation in the area of pOD – from the moment contact is made with the organisation, until the final

evaluation is complete, and all the phases in-between – is very limited, in both books and websites.

As this study focuses on such a recent and developing field, the focus of this literature review is mostly on the availability of literature on pOD, with a review of some key writing this area (Mindell, 1992; Schupbach, 2006b).

As is shown in this study, Worldwork theory forms the framework for process-oriented organisational development. However, while Worldwork theory is well developed and documented, there is almost no literature available in books or journals regarding its application to the area of organisational development – either in terms of where and when it is applied, or how it looks in practice.

As is shown in this study, Process Work and Worldwork theory form the philosophical framework for process-oriented organisational development. However, while both Process Work and Worldwork theory are well developed and documented, there is almost no literature available in books or journals regarding their application in the area of organisational development – either in terms of where and when they are applied, or how that looks in practice.

A number of books and manuscripts have been written about Process Work, and its derivative application, Worldwork, which is a "process-oriented approach to group work" (Diamond & Jones, 2004, p. 9). Mindell's books *The Year One* (1989), *The Leader as Martial Artist* (1992), *Sitting in the Fire* (1995) and *The Deep Democracy of Open Forums* (2002a) all focus on the theory and applications of Worldwork. These include theories about viewing groups as living organisms, on the process structure of a group,

roles and ghost roles, deep democracy, eldership, rank and power and the levels of a group. Overviews of these theories are included in the pOD Concept section.

References to working with organisations are harder to find in the existing Process Work literature. A scan for 'organisational development' or 'organisational change' in the indexes of the above books draws a blank. 'Organisation' is listed in *The Deep Democracy of Open Forums* with about 10 entries. *The Leader as Martial Artist* refers the reader seeking references to 'organisation' to 'groups'. *Sitting in the Fire* makes no reference to organisations in its index.

However, when reading these books, reference to organisations and organisational development are quite frequent, particularly in Mindell's later writing. The words 'organisation' and 'group' are used interchangeably, suggesting that the theories related to groups, are also relevant to organisations. Businesses are a subset of groups, as are a couple, a family, a group of friends or a nation (1992, p. 14). Worldwork theories apply to them all.

In *The Leader as Martial Artist*, both terms – groups and organisations – are used interchangeably, with groups being used as the more generic word. In his next book, *Sitting in the Fire*, Mindell refers mostly to groups. In The *Deep Democracy of Open Forums* the terms are generally used interchangeably again, with the reference to organisations becoming much more frequent. I say 'generally' though, in that Mindell does at one point differentiate between groups and organisations (2002a, p. viiii). Likewise, on his and Amy Mindell's website, he defines Worldwork as "a small and large group processwork method that uses Deep Democracy to address the issues of groups and

organisations of all kinds" (Mindell, 2006). This suggests the definition of an organisation is in flux in his writing, and moving from the more generic use of the word, as defined as "a group of people identified by a shared interest or purpose, e.g. a business" by Encarta Dictionary (Encarta, 2007) to specifically talking about businesses or corporations.

The important point here is that the Worldwork theories apply to organisations, however they are defined. Much has been written about these theories by Mindell, his associates and students of Process Work.

The detailed steps of how to apply Worldwork to conducting an open forum is the subject of the book, *The Deep Democracy of Open Forums* (Mindell, 2002a). Similar details, about how to apply Worldwork in consulting to an organisation, or process-oriented organisational development, have not yet been documented.

A search of the internet shows a growing quantity of information available about Worldwork and its application to working with organisations. The websites of Arnold and Amy Mindell, the Deep Democracy Institute (DDI), Julie Diamond, Max Schupbach, Wikipedia, the Worldwork Australia website, and others all describe the main theories of Worldwork, to various levels of detail, with some giving glossaries of the main terms. Thus, once again, the 'Ideas Behind pOD' are quite well documented. Many make reference to areas in which Worldwork is applied, often listing organisational development as one of the applications. Some websites give examples of the types of organisations and types of issues to which Worldwork has been applied. Details about how Worldwork is applied in practice is available via a limited number of case studies.

While the information that gives an overview of Worldwork as applied to organisations (Schupbach, 2006c; Wikipedia, 2006) has been available for at least the last year, there has recently been a proliferation of web pages giving more detailed explanations of both Worldwork and its application in the area of organisations. This recent, positive development shows how rapidly the field is developing and is largely thanks to the work of Max Schupbach. Schupbach has also recently had an article called "A Multi-dimensional Change Management Model" published in a German organisational development journal. A summary of the information available on several websites follows.

Arnold and Amy Mindell's website (2006) gives an overview of Worldwork terms, concepts and skills. The Deep Democracy Institute website gives an explanation of deep democracy, describing it as the "philosophical basis of the Worldwork paradigm" (DDI, 2007).

Julie Diamond (Diamond, n.d.b) describes the theories of Worldwork elegantly and concisely, also suggesting that Worldwork is based on the concept of deep democracy. She discusses concepts of rank and power, openness to different communication styles, and the group as a self organising system. She describes Worldwork as a "method for conflict resolution and mediation, organisational change and development, community development, leadership training, and facilitation of group processes and public forums". To become a Worldwork facilitator, she says, requires an "experiential and self-reflective training" (Diamond, n.d.b).

Wikipedia (2006), in its entry on Process Work, gives a description of Process Work applications – among them is "Worldwork with businesses, non-profit organisations and government groups", going on to describe Worldwork as a "global theory, that has universal categories, that can describe and analyse all organisational processes. Many organisations are using this method beyond conflict resolution or dealing with disturbances for leadership development, strategy development, merger-acquisition negotiations, etc." This entry into Wikipedia was added on 21 August, 2006.

Max Schupbach's website is the most comprehensive in the area of pOD. As well as providing a great deal of Worldwork theory and a glossary of terms (Schupbach, 2006a), his website is laid out in such a way that it differentiates between 'The Paradigm', 'The Practice' and 'The Application' of Worldwork. Schupbach's home page (Schupbach, 2006b), links to an informative article called "Transformation in Organisations, Communities, Business, and the Public Space – An introduction into the perspective, methodology and attitudes in Worldwork" (Schupbach, 2006c) in which he gives an overview of Worldwork and lists many examples of its application in organisations and some of the innovations it brings. The home page also links to two organisational case descriptions – one working with a Fortune 500 company, the other with a large correctional facility.

Under 'The Paradigm' menu on Schupbach's website are the sub-menus of perspective, methodology, attitudes and personal development, each with an essay describing different aspects of Worldwork. 'The Practice' menu lists change management, leadership, facilitation, strategy, teamwork, conflict resolution, diversity, inner work and exercises as sub-menus. 'The Application' has been organised into the following sub-menus:

organisational development, business, public space, government, NGO, political, social activisim, grassroot, mediation and urban and regional development. The website is still under construction for the 'The Practice' and 'The Application', with no information being available yet in each of the sub-menus, showing again the cutting edge nature of this field.

Schupbach's most recent article, "A Multi-dimensional Change Management Model", is published in the most recent edition of the German quarterly magazine "OrganisationsEntwicklung" (2007), and available on his website (Schupbach, 2007). The article's synopsis is loosely translated as follows:

> WorldWork, also known as Process Work, is based on one of Arnold Mindell's developing, comprehensive models about collective transformation. The universal character of the model permits its application within the entire range of the change management field. This introductory article highlights the key points of the method and illustrates these by means of one of the interventions – the group process.

Organisational Development

Much literature exists about organisational development. Since the focus of this study is on organisational development from a Process Work perspective, I chose not to extend this literature review to the field of organisational development literature as a whole. However, in analysing and discussing my findings in relation to the practice of pOD, two titles were particularly helpful in outlining a basic OD process: *Organisation*

Development and Change (Waddell, Cummings &Worley, 2004) and *Flawless Consulting* (Block, 2000). Waddell, Cummings and Worley (2004, p. 37) propose a "general model of planned change" which describes the practice of OD and is comprised of four major activities – entering and contracting, diagnosing, planning and implementing change, evaluating and institutionalising change. Block's (2000) model echoes that of Waddell et al (2004), although he does not speak about their fourth activity, evaluating and institutionalising change. Waddell et al's model in relation to the practice of OD will now be described in further detail.

OD Process

Waddell et al. (2004) describe three theories of planned change – Lewin's change model, the action research model and contemporary adaptations to the action research model. Based on these, they propose a "general model of planned change", which I refer to as the 'OD Process', which is made up of the "four basic activities" already noted (p. 37):

1. entering and contracting
2. diagnosing
3. planning and implementing change
4. evaluating and institutionalising change

Waddell et al. (2004) suggest that while these activities typically occur in the sequence listed, there is considerable overlap and feedback between them (p. 37). Each of the activities are summarised below.

Entering and contracting. According to Waddell et al. (2004), this first step of the 'planned change' process occurs when one or more key managers or administrators sense there is either a need for improvement or a problem needs to be addressed in their organisation, department or group (p. 76).

Entering is made up of three steps – clarifying the problem or opportunities, identifying who the relevant client is and choosing an OD practitioner (p. 77).

The organisation may be specific about what the 'presenting problem' is, such as absenteeism or a change in market conditions, or it may be more general such as a need to be more effective. Sometimes the presenting problem is stated in the form of a solution, such as needing team building. The presenting problem may just be a symptom of underlying issues. Clarifying the issue may involve preliminary data collection, in the form of interviewing key members and examining company records (p. 77).

Identifying the relevant client – normally those who can directly impact the change – is important at this stage of the process. This ensures there is buy in from them to enter into an OD process (p. 78).

Choosing an OD practitioner requires the organisation to find out about the practitioner's experience and competence – both technical and interpersonal. It needs to check whether the practitioner approaches the organisation with openness and requires a diagnosis phase, or whether the practitioner has a program that he or she applies to all organisations. The practitioner is also responsible for ensuring there is a match between themselves and the organisation and its problems (p. 79).

Contracting may be formal or informal, and includes three areas – clarifying what each party expects to gain from the OD process, committing resources to the process and establishing the ground rules for working together, such as confidentiality (p. 82). The decision about whether to proceed or not with the OD process occurs here (p. 85).

Diagnosing. Diagnosing is described by Waddell et al. (2004, p. 87) as the "process of assessing the functioning of the organisation, department, group or job to discover the sources of problems and areas for improvement". If this step is done well, it points towards the interventions required to improve the organisation's effectiveness. It involves collecting and analysing data about the current operations and feeding information about problems and opportunities back to managers and organisation.

Planning and implementing change. According to Waddell et al. (2004) this stage of the OD Process is a joint activity conducted between the OD practitioner and the organisation. They design interventions that suit the organisation and the change agent's skills and make plans to implement these interventions (p. 38). Waddell et al. (2004) suggest interventions fall into four major categories (p. 39):

1. Interpersonal interventions, which describe interventions associated with human processes (p. 160);

2. Technostructural interventions, which focus on the organisation's structure and 'technology', meaning job design (p. 162);

3. Human resource management interventions, which are designed to integrate people into organisations to "improve member performance and wellness" (p. 39); and

4. Strategic interventions, which focus on linking the "the internal functioning of the organisation to the larger environment and transform the organisation to keep pace with changing conditions" (p. 163).

This stage of the OD process includes "managing the change process" (p. 39) which requires the OD practitioner to work with the resistance to change, create a vision of the desired future state, gain political support for these changes and manage "the transition of the organisation towards them" (p. 168).

Evaluating and institutionalising change. Evaluation of the OD interventions implemented is a two-fold process: the first is evaluating and feeding back to the organisation, the effectiveness of the implementation of the intervention – is the intervention being implemented as intended? The second checks to see whether the expected results are being achieved or not. With this information, decisions about whether the changes should continue, be modified or stopped can be made (Waddell et al., 2004, p209). Change is institutionalised by reinforcing successful changes through feedback, rewards and training (Waddell et al., 2004, p39).

Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study was to further the process of developing process-oriented Organisational Development (pOD), by contributing to the emergence of theories and formal documentation of this field. This chapter introduces qualitative inquiry as the methodological framework of this study. It begins with an overview of the research method, explaining the philosophical framework and research strategy in practical and theoretical terms. It then describes the details of the method, including the data collection and data analysis processes. The chapter concludes with a review of the quality criteria applied to the evaluation of the soundness of this study, including making explicit the role of the researcher, ethical considerations and limitations of the study.

Method Overview

Finding one's way through the maze of research methods and terminology is quite a challenge for the first-time qualitative researcher, or for anyone reading about qualitative research for the first time. Hence, a brief methodological overview follows.

A research method encompasses the philosophical framework, research strategy and the related methods used to conduct a research study. The philosophical framework defines the philosophy about knowledge that underlies the study – does knowledge equal objective facts, or is it about meaning? This is sometimes referred to as the epistemological underpinnings. The research strategy is also known as the theoretical orientation and the related methods are the details about how one generates and analyses data. The present study is a qualitative interview study (Merriam, 2002), within the

philosophical framework of interpretive inquiry. It adopts a generic qualitative approach to research design, data generation (interviewing) and data analysis (thematic analysis) based on Merriam (2002), and Tesch (1990).

Philosophical Framework

In academic research, it is not possible to choose a research method or design any research before first asking yourself what your perspective on knowledge is. Is knowledge something you can effectively count and measure, always? Or is it something that is affected by context, time and the subjectivity of the researcher? The answer to these philosophical questions impact the type of research you do.

If you believe the former, that is that the world, or reality is a "fixed, single, agreed upon, or measurable phenomenon" (Merriam, p. 3) and "independent of the mind that seeks to know it" (Jones, 2005, p. 25) then you have a positivist viewpoint and your research is likely to be quantitative in nature.

If you believe that the latter is closer to 'the truth', and that "there are multiple constructions and interpretations of reality that are in flux and that change over time" (Merriam, p. 4), then you have a relativist viewpoint and your research strategy is likely to be qualitative in orientation.

A clear way of differentiating quantitative and qualitative research is via the following table, based on the work of Sanghera (n.d.) and Merriam (2002).

Quantitative Research	**Qualitative Research**
Positivist philosophical framework	Relativist philosophical framework
See reality as static	Sees reality as dynamic
Is objective	Is subjective
Counts and measures things	Searches for meaning
Uses a large sample size	Uses a small sample size
Uses instruments	Researcher is instrument
Statistical analysis	Inductive analysis
Attempts to find universal laws	Attempts to understand something in depth

In my case, my philosophical position depends on what I am researching – I believe some knowledge lends itself to being counted and quantified – and much of my work as an engineer has fallen into this category. To obtain other knowledge, particularly knowledge pertaining to subjective human experience, I believe a less black and white, more meaning-based analysis is more useful. This puts me in the category of the 'pragmatists' (Patton, 2002, p. 72), with my "choice of philosophical perspective … determined by the degree to which that perspective is useful in a specific knowledge context" (Jones, 2005, p. 26).

In the present exploration of process-oriented organisational development from the viewpoint of several key Process Work practitioners in the field of organisational development, I have taken a relativist philosophy philosophical framework and have chosen to do qualitative research.

Research Strategy

Qualitative research has many different strategies and procedures, born of the different disciplines that conduct qualitative studies (Merriam, 2002, p. 6). These have been organised in many different ways, and sometimes go by different names depending on the writer of the qualitative texts. I have chosen to use Merriam (2002) as a guide, and following her categorising system have chosen the 'basic interpretive qualitative study' (p. 6) as my research strategy. This is one of eight approaches she describes. While all of the approaches have the common attributes of qualitative research, each has a somewhat different focus, resulting in "variations in how the research question might be asked, sample selection, data collection and analysis" (Merriam, 2002, p. 6).

According to Merriam (2002, p. 4-5), there are four common attributes that are true for all eight approaches. The first is that the researcher is seeking to understand the meaning that people have made about their world and experiences. Secondly, the primary instrument for data collection and analysis is the researcher. Thirdly, the process is inductive. This means the researcher immerses themselves in the details of the data, looking for important patterns and themes and interrelationships (Patton, 2002, p. 41), from which they can build concepts, hypotheses and theories. The last common attribute

is that words and pictures are used to convey what the researcher has learned about the topic of study – the product of the qualitative research is 'richly descriptive'.

All of these attributes are true for this study. What gives this study its own focus are the related methods – the way the samples were selected and the data generated and analysed. In this study, data generation is via qualitative interviewing – the data are elicited through open-ended questions asked during interviews, and "capture direct quotations about people's personal perspectives and experiences" (Patton, 2002, p. 40). Purposeful sampling is used in this research, with a small group of people "purposefully selected for the quality of insights they are likely to reveal about the phenomenon of interest" (Jones, 2006, p. 10). The data is analysed using the generic approach to thematic analysis suggested by Tesch (1990).

Method Details

Qualitative researchers have been criticised for not applying their research skills in the presentation of their own methods (Chenail, 1995). Given qualitative researchers make a lot of decisions about their research methods, says Chenail (1995), it is important that they talk openly about their decisions and the rational behind them. He goes onto say that "it is in this spirit of openness that trust is built between the researcher and the reader. It is not a matter of the researcher simply telling the reader that a study is valid or reliable for that qualitative research study to be valid or reliable". In this next section I talk in detail about my data collection and analysis strategies, and my rational for choosing them.

Data Collection

Data in qualitative research can come from interviews, observations or document analysis (Jones, 2005, p. 47). The data for this study came from interviews with four Process Work faculty members that identified as working with organisations. The interviews were between 60-90 minutes long, and conducted from September 2006 to March 2007.

Sample selection. Working out who to interview about pOD, when pOD had not yet been defined was an interesting conundrum. If I didn't yet know what pOD was, how could I identify who was doing pOD work?

In the end I applied fuzzy logic type thinking to the problem – I started by brainstorming a list of Process Work faculty members who I believed worked in organisations, without clearly defining what sort of 'organisations' I was referring to (all organisations or just large corporations), or what I meant by 'working with' organisations. I then invited each of these 7 people to an interview.

Of the 7 people I invited, 4 accepted, these being Lesli Mones, Max Schupbach, Julie Diamond and Stephen Schuitevoerder. Of the 3 people who declined, Arnold Mindell, the founder of Process Work, was not available to be interviewed during the research period. The other two potential interviewees declined because they did not identify as working with organisations – in one case because most of the work they had done had occurred too long ago, and in the other, because they felt they didn't work with 'organisations' at all.

The interviews with these four people and subsequent analysis of what they said, has enabled me to get clearer about what pOD is, what type of 'organisations' I am referring to and what 'working with' organisations means. Therefore future research in this area can build on this study, with a more precise sample selection method as a result. Any subsequent research sample selection would build on that research and so on – hence the fuzzy logic parallel!

Study participants. The four participants in the study are all faculty members of the Process Work Institute.

A brief description of each of them and their involvement in organisational work follows. This information is drawn from the biography pages from their own or affiliated websites. Further background information is included in Appendix A.

Lesli Mones, MA, Dipl.PW, is a process-oriented therapist in private practice and an organisational consultant and executive coach (Mones, n.d.).

Max Schupbach, Ph.D., Dipl.PW, CPF, is a co-founder of Process Work. He is the founder and president of Maxfxx, a consulting and coaching firm that is active on all continents (Schupbach, 2006d).

Julie Diamond, Ph.D., Dipl.PW, is a member of the original group who helped develop Process-oriented Psychology. She co-authored its international training program and its Master of Arts degree programs in Portland (Diamond, n.d.a).

Stephen Schuitevoerder, Ph.D., Dipl.PW, is an international consultant, lecturer and facilitator. Stephen is the President of the Process Work Institute (Schuitevoerder, n.d.).

Data collection method. Open ended questions were asked during semi-structured interviews. With the exception of the first 10 minutes of the interview with Diamond, all interviews were audio taped, and transcribed. Notes were taken during the first 10 minutes of the interview with Diamond.

Interviews with Mones and Schupbach were face-to-face, and those with Schuitevoerder and Diamond were conducted over the phone. The interviews with Mones and Schupbach occurred in September 2007, with Diamond in December 2006, and the interview with Schuitevoerder was conducted in March 2007.

The questions listed below were used to structure the interview, with all participants being asked all of the questions. Various follow up questions were asked, as needed, to help the participant respond more fully or to clarify their responses. These probe questions varied from participant to participant.

Interview questions. The following questions were asked in all of the interviews:

1. What sort of work do you do with organisations?
    a. What kind of organisations do you work with?
    b. What kind of problems do you work with?
    c. What's your role? (How is it defined from the client organisation's side, how do you define yourself? How would you describe the work you do?)
    d. How long does your work normally go for?

2. How would you define process-oriented OD? (If I read about it on a flyer, what would it say?)
    a. Is coming in for 1-2 days to work on a problem, organisational development?
3. What are the steps of process-oriented OD? What does it look like from the moment contact is made between you and the organisation and when you leave the project?

When it came to the actual interviews, I suggested to all participants that they answer the third question by picking a case study and taking me through the steps they followed.

I made the decision to ask the questions as though I had no background in Process Work. I did this because I wanted to be able to convert this study into an article for publication in a non-Process Work journal, and wanted to hear from the participants how they would describe Process Work and pOD to a non-Process Work audience.

Data Analysis

The first step of the data analysis process was to transcribe the interviews – I decided to do this myself to enable me to get close to and familiar with the data. This was followed by working through a generic approach to inductive analysis, suggested by Tesch (1990). I used Microsoft Excel to manage my data.

Transcribing interviews. I transcribed each of the interviews word for word from the audio recordings, as soon as possible after each interview was conducted. This

transcription process brought me close to the data and enabled me to record the insights I remembered having during the interviews alongside the insights I was having during the transcription process. These insights made it possible for me to identify areas to focus on during subsequent interviews. It is quite typical of qualitative research for initial insights about the data to emerge during the data collection and the early stages of data analysis phases, with subsequent data collection influenced by these insights (Patton, 2002, p. 436). Time stamps were included in the transcripts (as measured by time since the beginning of the interview), to enable easy cross-referencing back to the original recordings when needed.

I have included the 'tidied up' and edited versions of these transcripts in Appendix B, to enable readers to read for themselves what was said. By tidied up, I mean that I removed the 'thinking words' and 'uhms and ahhs'. For example, the following verbatim transcript, "…and I worked on the phone with my direct …with the consultant who brought me in … my direct … the partner on the project" would become, "…and I worked on the phone with the consultant who brought me in, my partner on the project". I sent these 'tidied up' transcripts to each participant, and then worked with them to edit the transcripts to ensure I represented the participants accurately, thereby enhancing the quality of the raw data I was working with.

Data management. The data was managed during the analysis process using Microsoft Excel (Excel). Initially the transcripts were written in Microsoft Word (MSWord), and converted to tables which enabled the transcripts to be broken into 'chunks of information' (Tesch, 1990) by creating a row for each chunk. At this point in time, the 'chunks' were very loosely created, with more precise 'chunking' occurring as part of the

analysis process. The tables were then copied into Excel, and each chunk, which I later refer to as text segment, given its own unique number. Excel performed well as a tool to work with the data.

Saving the files under new filenames at the various stages of the analysis enabled me to leave a clear history of the analysis process. This contributes the audit trail, which "in a qualitative study describes in detail how data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the inquiry" (Merriam, 1992, p. 27).

The naming convention used during the analysis process is as follows:

- Date that file was created (year, month, date)
- Analysis Phase number
- Description, initially of interview number and later of section name.

An example of this is "070415 Analysis 4 – pOD Definition.xls".

Analysis process. This basic interpretive qualitative study uses a generic approach to analysis suggested by Tesch (1990) (included in Appendix C). This is made up of three main steps:

1. coding data, finding patterns, labeling themes and developing a category system;
2. convergence and divergence in coding and classifying; and
3. interpreting findings (Tesch, 1990).

Simply explained, the process of analysis involves breaking the data into ‘chunks’, almost as if the transcripts were printed out, read in their entirety and then cut into hundreds of slips of paper (text segments) – generally a number of sentences to a paragraph long. Each of these slips of paper are read again, and placed into piles, with all ‘like’ chunks/slips of paper put together. Each pile of paper slips is then read and themes generated for each pile. As these themes become clearer paper slips might be moved from one pile to another, or copied and placed in multiple piles. These themes become the findings of the study.

The beauty of using Excel for the analysis process, rather than using paper and scissors, was that at every point in the analysis and writing stage it was easy to find where each text segment fit in the context of the overall interview. This was done using the unique number assigned to that particular text segment.

My analysis process was ‘based’ upon Tesch (1990), in that I used her analysis process as a guideline, rather than as a set of ‘rules’ that I needed to strictly follow (Patton, 2002, p. 57). There were six phases of analysis:

1. Getting an Overview
2. Defining the Categories and Sub-Categories
3. Assigning Categories and Sub-Categories to Text Segments
4. Assembling Categories into ‘Sections’
5. Generation of Themes

6. Preparing MACFOC Presentation

7. Write-up

These analysis phases, including Tesch's corresponding analysis steps, are detailed in Appendix D. The biggest difference between the analysis process I performed and the one suggested by Tesch (1990) relates to the quantity of data I had collected before starting the formal process of analysis. I had interviewed three of the four participants, and so completed most of my data collection, before beginning the process outlined above. All the interviews were complete before beginning phase 3 of the analysis. Tesch (1990) suggests beginning the data analysis process earlier in the data collection process, and follows a more iterative process, where the results of the data analysis inform the next round of data collection as late as phase 5 of the analysis.

Quality Evaluation

Anyone reading this research report needs to evaluate the quality of the research before being able to trust and rely on its findings, or to determine its applicability in the wider world. How sound was the method employed? What impact do I, the researcher, have on the findings? How ethically did I conduct the study? What are its limitations?

Ultimately the decision is yours, the readers, and here I present some information to assist with that evaluation.

The Method Details section describes with as much transparency as possible, the research process I followed and the thoroughness with which I analysed the data. My liberal use

of quotes from the interviews in the chapters on my findings, and the decision to include the interview transcripts in the appendix, gives readers the opportunity to see for themselves what participants said, and then decide whether the findings seem plausible or not and to determine the applicability of these findings to a broader setting. It is important to note that when I answer the research question about pOD, I am not writing about what the participants think pOD is, but what I understand pOD to be, based on what participants said in their interviews. Further, none of the findings are generalisable to a wider group of people than those interviewed in this study, since no random sampling procedures were used.

My openness about what I, as the 'research instrument', bring to the study helps one understand the lens through which I see the world, and through which these findings are recorded. I also paid close attention to the ethics involved in this study, which further contributes to the soundness of my research (Merriam, 2002, p. 18). Finally, my discussion about the limitations of this study shows the areas where this study could have been improved.

Role of the Researcher

In quantitative research, 'instruments' are used to measure whatever is being studied. A thermometer is used to measure temperature, and scales to measure weight. In qualitative research, the 'instrument' is the researcher. I bring with me the ability to observe and be aware of a lot more factors than a thermometer or scales can … and yet I don't have the objectivity of such instruments. Therefore anyone reading this study needs to get to know me a little – my training, my background, my experience as a researcher and my

relationship to the research topic – as these will inevitably influence my research process (Jones, 2005, p. 68).

As an ex-'corporate-person' who got excited by the desperate need for and the potential power of Process Work in the corporate setting, I bring a lot of passion to this research. My background in engineering and my experience of working in corporations means I also bring a certain level of pragmatism to my role as researcher. In embarking on this study, I wanted this work to be as 'practical and useful as possible', and to be highly structured in the way it is presented.

I started my professional working life as a mechanical engineer, working with some of the largest corporations in the world – Mars, who were and possibly still are the largest privately owned company on this planet, and Rio Tinto, a huge Australian mining corporation. I became indoctrinated by their values and principles, and learned to fit into their 'culture'. Fifty to sixty plus hour weeks were the order of the day, and much as I enjoyed my work, I struggled to find meaning in what I was doing … and so I left … to become an Australian paragliding champion and to think about where my life was taking me.

I had by then encountered Process Work, and recognised that its methods and philosophy had a lot to offer the corporate world … but didn't have the understanding required to bring this into my work. So I became a Diploma student, and then, realising my particular passion for working with groups, enrolled in the Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change (MACFOC) programme, which in my mind promised to show me how to bring this work into organisations and how to apply

Worldwork in a setting which knows nothing about Process Work. It was the OC in the programme that most excited me, and when I realised that the concentration on and content of this component was not what I had imagined, I decided to find that out for myself. And thus, this study was born.

By then I was back in the corporate world, working as a consultant, experiencing more corporations and their particular cultures, and doing so from a role that moves between being an 'outsider' and an 'insider'. It is generally my engineering, and in particular my Process Improvement background, that gets me involved in the various projects, and of late I have been incorporating as much OD work as I am able.

Process Improvement work focuses on making systems, in my case generally manufacturing systems, more efficient – by reducing the waste they generate, increasing their efficiency and uptime (times the machines are running) and improving the systems that interface between humans and machines. Many of the interventions I employed to do this are quality management tools, based on the work of Deming (1986). More recently I've been focusing on the organisational reasons why the manufacturing processes were not performing as expected. What was the root cause for the gradual downturn in their performance? What needed to change in the organisation in order to maintain the technical improvements coming out of the process improvement work, so that if I came back 2 years later, things would be running as I left them, or better? The root cause generally has something to do with people and the culture of the organisation – how things are done, how people communicate and work together, how they are supported. So here then was the opportunity to bring in other OD interventions into my

work – generally interpersonal interventions. With the completion of this study I hope to be able to bring in my OD work more overtly in how I market and 'sell' myself.

This engineering/corporate background comes with some biases, assumptions and expectations. I have a bias for receiving and presenting information in a highly structured and logical manner, and made the assumption that the steps of pOD follow a linear process, at least at a high level. I have struggled at times as a student of Process Work to understand what I've been taught – this is partly because of my need for more linearity in the way the theory is presented and my desire to have the context or use of the theory outlined before being given the details of that theory. I have an expectation that the information in this study can be presented in a practical and useful way. However, as a student of Process Work, I bring some balancing tendencies to this. I have a love of following the process and being curious about the unknown, and an understanding that processes are rarely ever just linear.

My experience as an academic researcher is limited, and this is my first experience in qualitative research. While my work as an engineer has involved some large scale research projects, these have always been quantitative in nature. So whilst I was researching the topic of pOD, I was also learning how to conduct a qualitative enquiry, and struggling with my quantitative bias.

Lastly, my love of Process Work also brings with it a bias, of wanting to put it in the best possible light. Balancing this is my emerging relationship with my critical nature – the one who can critically analyse things and clearly and dispassionately present the findings, whatever they are. I have tried to be aware of these biases in conducting this study, and

knowing that they cannot be removed altogether, have tried to make them explicit in the interest of the overall trustworthiness of my research.

Soundness of Study

There are different philosophical viewpoints about how to check for the soundness of a qualitative inquiry (Jones, 2005, p. 65). Traditional criteria, originating from quantitative studies have been modified to suit qualitative studies – although there is still considerable debate about how best to do this (Merriam, 2002, p. 24).

The three traditional criteria are reliability, internal validity, and external validity. Reliability basically asks the question about how reliably the data has been interpreted – if someone else were to take this data, would they come up with the same results? Internal validity relates to whether you are measuring or observing what you think you are measuring or observing – this is relatively easy to check for if the measuring device is a tool – such as a thermometer. As long as the thermometer is in good working order and is being used correctly, it is a valid way of measuring temperature. As discussed above, it is somewhat more complicated in qualitative inquiry, where the researcher is the instrument. Finally, external validity is interested in how valid the information from this study is to other people and other situations.

Reliability. So, how reliable is this study? Would someone else, using the same four interviews, come up with the same findings? This is hard to answer. However, there are a number of ways to make a qualitative study more reliable. Peer examination, being

clear about my position as researcher, and the audit trail are three such strategies (Merriam, 2002, p. 27).

Having my research advisor and study committee review this thesis, constitutes a form of peer examination. As seen in the previous section, I have made my position in relation to this study explicit, providing detail of my background, and exploring my biases and assumptions, and my experience as a researcher. Throughout the study I also kept a thorough audit trail. While "we cannot expect others to replicate our account, the best we can do is explain how we arrived at our results", writes Dey (1993, p. 251). Every decision I made, and every question, insight and problem I had, was recorded in a method journal, which is almost as long as this thesis itself! My detailed description of my data collection and data analysis methods (see Appendix D) are drawn from this record. Finally, as a supplement to all of this, the entire interview transcripts are provided in Appendix B, and so readers can decide for themselves how reliable my findings are.

Internal validity. Internal validity assesses whether you are observing what you think you are observing (Jones, 2005, p. 64). Or as Merriam (2002, p. 25) puts it, how congruent are the findings with reality? This opens up a can of worms, because the question of what is reality immediately comes up. However, this has already been addressed by choosing a relativist viewpoint as the philosophical framework – in which there is an assumption of multiple changing realities. In qualitative research "the understanding of reality that is presented in the research findings is understood to be the researcher's interpretation of the participants' understanding (not the participants' actual understandings)" (Jones, 2005, p. 64).

So, what I have written in this study are my thoughts about the answer to the research question. This is based on the participant's views of the topics via their answers to the questions, which I have represented as accurately as I can. The synthesis of their answers into themes, is my synthesis and the findings based on these themes, my findings.

Peer examination and the audit trail, which have already discussed, increase a study's internal validity. The interview transcripts were sent to each of the participants, with some changes being made by them, which enhanced the quality of the raw data I was working with, making it easier for me to interpret.

External validity. How applicable are the findings of this study, based on interviews with four participants, to other people and other situations? Are the findings in this study an accurate reflection of the wider pOD field? The answer to the latter question is maybe, but it is not something that can be stated definitively in this study due to its lack of random sampling procedures. Qualitative research, by design, often has a small number of participants in order to study a phenomenon in-depth. It does not aim to ascertain what is generally true (Merriam, 2002, p. 28), as is the case with research based on large, randomly obtained samples.

In qualitative inquiry "it is the reader who has to ask, what is there in this study that I can apply to my own situation, and what clearly does not apply?" (Walker, 1980, p. 34), thus assessing the external validity, or generalisability of the study. I have given as much detailed information (called rich, or thick description by qualitative researchers) as possible in the Findings, in order to enable each reader to decide for themselves whether findings from this study can be applied to their particular situation or not.

Ethical Considerations

According to Merriam (2002), "A "good" qualitative study is one that has been conducted in an ethical manner" (p. 29). This includes ensuring participants give informed consent to the research, that confidentiality is kept and the data is protected, and any dual role aspects between the interviewer and interviewees are considered.

Informed Consent. Part of my inexperience as a qualitative researcher shows up here, in the way I handled gaining consent. I was not totally clear about my research strategy before conducting the interviews. So when I asked and received verbal consent related to this study, it was not 'informed consent', as I was not able to inform the participants about the details of what they were consenting to. I remedied this by following up the verbal consent with a written consent form, which is attached in Appendix E.

Confidentiality and anonymity. It is quite common for research participants to require confidentiality of information and to want to remain anonymous. Confidentiality about the organisations that participants worked with, and any other specified material, is maintained throughout this study. However, this study, being one of the first in this application of Process Work, made the issue of participant anonymity an interesting one. I wanted to credit participants with the knowledge they were sharing, and so had a mindset that I would be naming who I interviewed, and quoting them as part of the report. This was in fact the preference of some participants from the outset, and ultimately all participants chose to be identified. However I hadn't considered the flip side of the relative newness of this application – that because it was a developing area it was "not a conclusive, definitive arena". Therefore, it might be difficult for participants

to stand behind the things they said, as they were learning as they went, and therefore choose to be anonymous, at least initially.

Data Protection. The data collected during the interviews was and is protected – I transcribed all of the interviews and am the only person who has access to any of the data or the interview recordings. Permission was received from each of the participants to include the transcripts attached in the Appendix B of this report.

Duality of roles. Multiple roles were present between myself and the interview participants, with each of the participants being my teacher and/or therapist and/or supervisor at some point in time. Normally the dual role considerations are important in qualitative research when the interviewer has the higher rank, as in the case of any therapeutic relationships where the study participants may be patients or clients. In this case I had less structural rank than the participants, so the impact was not so much an ethical one, but rather a limitation of the study. This is discussed in the Limitations section below.

Intellectual property. Intellectual property (IP) is an ethical consideration in this study. The application of Worldwork to organisations is relatively new, and so practices are being developed at a rapid rate, and credit needs to be given to the creators of that work. This poses a dilemma – how to credit individuals for their IP, whilst also synthesising all their ideas into my own findings?

By including much of the original data in the Findings, and including the interview transcripts in the Appendix, I hope I have been successful in my intention to credit individuals for their ideas. I believe I have attributed all quotes, whether they are

verbatim or paraphrased, to the particular participant. The process of working with the participants on the transcripts and giving them the opportunity to make changes to ensure I am representing them accurately, is also an attempt to take care of their intellectual property.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this study – the most significant is that there were only four participants in the study. Others include the way the participants were selected, the limited amount of time available to devote to this study and the age of the data used in this study. My lack of experience as a qualitative researcher and the complications of interviewing people more senior to me in terms of Process Work knowledge and expertise are further limitations.

Number of participants. While having a small sample size is common in qualitative inquiry, having only four participants may still be seen as a limitation of this study. It is an issue because it means that it was rare for me to get the sense that there was a 'saturation' of data (Patton, 2002) – meaning that I was coming across the same information repeatedly and could get a sense of the agreement or otherwise between the participants about a certain topic. While there was certainly saturation in some areas, there were numerous times when I felt uncomfortable making a 'finding', because it was only based on one person's account.

I am left with an image of a large circle, drawn in the sand, that represents existing knowledge about pOD in the areas covered by this thesis – the ideas behind pOD, where

is it used and how is it practiced. Handfuls of sand are placed in this circle to symbolise the amount of data relevant to that aspect of pOD. When I stand back from this circle, I see about three quarters of it has piles of sand on it – the other quarter is left uncovered. And of that three quarters, most of the piles are quite small, often coming only from the data of one participant. Every now and again there is a larger pile of sand, when concepts or ideas were mentioned by multiple participants.

Number of case examples. Case examples were analysed to see if pOD phases exist when working with organisations. However, each participant gave only one case example, and only two of the case examples described completed projects. Therefore the validity of the results of the analysis are questionable.

Participant selection method. As discussed in Sample Selection in the Methodology section of this thesis, my participant selection process was far from scientific – I asked 7 people to participate in this study, based on whether they identified with working with organisations or not, without defining what working with an organisation meant.

If I was to repeat this study, with the knowledge of the topic that I have now, I would define what I mean by working with an organisation, and extend a general invitation to the worldwide Process Work faculty for people interested in being involved in this study. I would also plan the interviews far enough in advance to enable me to interview Arnold Mindell, the founder of Process Work. He was willing to be interviewed for this study, but was not available in the time I had left myself to get the interviews.

Time limitations. Having limited time to devote to this study meant I was not able to present all the themes coming out of the data analysis, nor do more thorough member

checks by sending each of the participants the findings to see if they concurred with what I was suggesting.

Age of data. The currency of the data is another limitation – the first interview was conducted with Mones in September 2006, more that 12 months before the findings of the study were written. pOD is going through such a rapid time of growth that some information was no longer 'contemporary'. This was addressed in part by sending the participants the interview transcripts in September 2007, enabling obsolete sections to be removed. However, short of repeating the interviewing process, this could only remedy things to a certain point.

My lack of experience as a qualitative researcher was largely responsible for this – I was not aware of how long it would take to complete this study. Another learning I have around this is that when researching any field that is in a rapid stage of growth, particular priority needs to be given to having time to analyse and write about the data as soon as it is gathered.

Lack of researcher experience. As previously discussed, I have no prior experience with qualitative research. The main impact of this that I am aware of has already been considered – in gaining informed consent and in underestimating how much time would be needed to complete this work, hence making the findings less current.

My experience as an interviewer, was also limited. This, and the multiple relationships with participants that I discuss below, at times made it difficult for me to probe for more edgy information and to bring interviewees back 'on track'. That being said, knowing what 'on track' was only become clear as the data was analysed – during the interview

stage it was not possible to know what information would end up being relevant to the study.

Multiple relationships. I am a student of Process Work and all the participants of this study are all Process Work faculty members. This means they are all more senior to me, and as previously noted, have been or are my teachers, therapists and/or supervisors. The experience of me being in the higher contextual rank position with them was unusual for me – I was the one facilitating the interaction, asking the questions and asking for clarification. I needed to work on myself to overcome my edges to be in that role, to decide when I had enough information and when I needed more. This was particularly an issue in the earlier interviews when I was less clear about what I was doing.

Chapter 4 FINDINGS – Ideas Behind pOD

What is pOD? How is it defined? What are the ideas behind it? Are there theories and philosophies in the background, and if so, what are they? How are they used? Where and when are they used? Chapters 4, 5 and 6 begin the process of answering these and other questions by reporting the findings of the interviews, centred around the research question which guides this study: What is organisational development from a Process Work perspective?

This chapter, which focuses on the ideas behind pOD, begins by defining pOD in a nutshell. It then describes some of the concepts on which pOD is built, and the tools resulting from these concepts. Chapter 5 gives an account of some applications of these ideas – the organisations where pOD has been practiced, and the types of problems and issues present in those organisations. Chapter 6 presents findings in relation to the practice of pOD.

In all the Findings chapters I report the findings by conveying my interpretation of what participants said during the interviews as accurately as I can. I follow Chenail's (1995) suggestion in his chapter "Data As Star" of presenting "as much of the data you collected as is physically possible". He suggests this is important for two reasons – firstly, as discussed in the Soundness of Study section, to enable readers to judge the validity of the results for themselves. And secondly, to "share the wealth" – to enable readers to "see what they can see", thereby inviting them to continue the exploration and conversation (Chenail, 1994).

Defining pOD

When participants were asked how they would define process-oriented OD, no one definition was given. For the most part, participants were still arriving at a definition, in some cases through talking about it in the interview. Some commonalities between their definitions exist, one being that pOD has to do with unfolding an organisation's process, with most participants referring in some way to working with the primary and secondary process of the organisation. Another commonality was the link to Worldwork, the application of Process Work to groups (Diamond & Jones, 2004, p. 9), with two of the participants making this link more overtly than the others. One participant referred to interventions in their response to the question and another to the theories on which it is built. The isomorphic aspect between personal development and organisational development was also noted.

pOD in a Nutshell

After boiling down the various responses from the four participants to the definition of process-oriented organisational development, here is my attempt at a definition in a nutshell: "pOD is the application of Process Work and more specifically Worldwork, to the field of organisational development. It identifies and brings awareness to the process of the organisation and facilitates the unfolding of that process".

Schuitevoeder and Diamond, respectively, define pOD simply as "…following the process of the organisation, and helping it unfold into its next place" and "…using process-oriented methods to further the development of an organisation."

Similarly, Mones speaks about facilitating the unfolding of an organisation's process. Without using Process Work terminology she speaks about unfolding the organisation's secondary process in a way that paces their primary process:

> I would say that it's the process of working with an organisation where you look at their strengths and what they do well, and that you also look at the things that disturb them, and take them away from their intention. And based on their culture and what they are willing to go along with, you find ways to help them integrate the things that disturb them, so they can be a more resilient organisation.

Diamond makes the link to Worldwork, describing it as a "framework for understanding the development of an organisation" with "a set of interventions we use that are designed for working with an organisation":

> The framework that we typically use is the Worldwork framework, where we look in terms of roles and ghost roles and we look in terms of the long term dynamics and pressures and influences that are part of the organisation's wholeness, and we work to give back the sense of wholeness to the organisation, so they feel more empowered, so they have a deeper connection to their different parts. Including all stakeholders – clients, customers, shareholders.

Schupbach first describes the relationship of Worldwork to Process Work, and the concept of collective development. He then goes on to state that pOD is Worldwork, for specific types of groups:

> Process Work is the overall umbrella – that has the whole thing in it – but in return Worldwork also has the whole Process Work paradigm in it. And then Worldwork deals with areas that, to begin with, look like they are … focusing especially on collective transformation. So if you think of things in terms of personal development, you think of the development of one person, one human being. Then there is collective development, which is anything larger than the human being. … What I call process-oriented organisational development, is Worldwork with for-profit and non-profit groups – either organised or networks – that are interested in becoming conscious about or working with who they are and where they want to go.

Isomorphicness

Thinking about the isomorphic aspects between organisational development and personal development gives a framework for those who are familiar with working in the area of personal development to apply to their thinking about work with organisations. Merriam-Webster defines isomorphic as "being of identical or similar form, shape, or structure" (Merriam-Webster, 2007).

Mones, Schupbach and Diamond all draw the parallel between working with an individual client and working with an organisation. Diamond and Schupbach respectively, address this directly: "There are a lot of parallels that are useful between individual therapy and organisation therapy, or organisation development," and "I think that whole idea of personal development and organisational development, as symmetric

aspects, or isomorphic aspects is really helpful. It's contained in our processwork understanding of non-locality in psychology".

This leads nicely onto two questions. The first asks whether pOD is a new application of Process Work or a new field? The isomorphic aspect of organisational development to personal development implies there is nothing particularly new about organisational development, therefore suggesting it is a new application. The second asks what constitutes organisational development? When is working with an organisation pOD, and when is it something else? This parallels the question of what constitutes personal development?

New Application, Not a New Field

Diamond ponders the question about whether pOD is a new application of Process Work or a new field. She leans in the direction of seeing it as another application of Process Work, with the same set of process work skills transferable to pOD:

> It's also uncertain, whether it is a new field, or is it just a new application? I feel like, for me, I know that Process Work has branched into new applications about once every five years. A major new application that starts to emerge – it deepens the theory, but it never changes it. It's never like, oh, okay, process-oriented coma work is this, and it's completely different and you need to learn a new set of theories or a new set of skills. It's the same transferable set of skills, so I'm guided by that thought when I'm doing this work. When I try to think about what I'm doing with organisations, I go back to, okay, it's an application and what does

> that mean and how is that an application? Because it just looks different… the landscape looks different. Maybe the landscape looks more different, and the landscape makes us think that it's a much more different thing, but I don't think it's all that different. So, we'll see though.

While this question was not specifically discussed with other participants, seeing pOD as another application of Process Work aligns with the definitions given by the others.

To pOD or not to pOD? – The Development Process

When is working with an organisation pOD, and when is it something else? For example, is Mones's following account pOD? "…I've gone in there for a weekend, or a few days, or even one day, and kind of made a splash, gave a hand, did a group process and did a bit of relationship work, and that was kind of it."

Mones, Diamond and Schuitevoerder all pondered the question of what is and isn't pOD. All agreed that the key was whether there was any development occurring. As Mones put it:

> … if you talk about development, organisational development, it's nice to be able to talk about what is developing, what's the process? What are you supporting to unfold, and actually interact, you know, with that.

She draws the parallel to working with an individual:

> I do a session with somebody that makes a big impact on them, but what does it really do? What does it really do over time? Maybe you've touched something in

> somebody. I don't really know. Does it change how they deal with conflict, does it change how they orient themselves around relationships, how effective they can be in the world? I would doubt it.

All three agreed that time is not a factor when considering this question. As Schuitevoerder put it: "I think changes can happen really quickly, I don't think they are time based." He spoke about tracking change or development through client feedback and also through observing the organisation having gone over an edge – this is discussed later in this study, in pOD Practice.

Diamond summarises her thoughts about the matter by saying:

> Organisational development is basically assessing and designing interventions towards a particular goal. … So it's not time, it's what you do. It's the degree to which your work is imbedded in a larger goal that you are somehow a part of.

One Paradigm in the Background – Worldwork

As noted above, there is a strong link between pOD and Worldwork, a point that Schupbach repeatedly makes on his website. "The basis of our work", he says, referring to his work as an organisational consultant, "is Worldwork, the sociological daughter of Processwork, which is the overarching paradigm that the researchers Drs. Amy and Arny Mindell developed" (Schupbach, 2006b).

This realisation, obvious as it may seem to some, needs to be stated clearly. Worldwork is the main paradigm in the background of process-oriented organisational development.

The importance of having such a well developed and all-encompassing theory behind pOD can not be understated. It gives the practitioner a road map to follow in their work with organisations, and a set of tools to employ in the process.

Schupbach makes this point in the interview, and we go on to discuss how important this is to both of us:

> MS: Worldwork is the overarching paradigm, that allows us to focus on long-term processes spanning the whole range of OD interventions, as well as to focus on a specific local issue, using the same perspective and interventions for both. One of the situations that I am working with involves a large international corporation, and includes teams and departments on all continents over the period of several years. Another situation focuses for example on a family issue of the local corner store. In both cases, the same paradigm and perspective can be used. And paradoxically, we cannot judge which of the processes will eventually have a larger impact on changing the world, because of sensitivity to initial conditions, also known as the butterfly effect.
>
> HH: That's wonderful, having the same paradigm in the background. I've worked in some places where that has been missing, where they've pulled bits and pieces from all over, and there's nothing in the background holding it together.
>
> MS: Wow. So therefore, so you can never say this went wrong.
>
> HH: And I can never stand fully behind it, because there's something missing. It's like empty.

I say Worldwork is the 'main' paradigm in the background of pOD, because as this study will show, pOD also includes working with individuals on their reactions, issues and edges away from the physical presence of a group, on their issues and edges. The question then arises of whether or not this is considered Worldwork.

A definition of Worldwork is required to answer this question. As previously noted, Mindell defines Worldwork as "a small and large group processwork method that uses Deep Democracy to address the issues of groups and organisations of all kinds" on his website (2006a). Diamond et al. define Worldwork as "process-oriented approach to group work" (2004, p. 9). Both definitions refer to Worldwork being related to groups – so the question then becomes, does individual work constitute group work?

In her handout on *Levels of Interaction or Communication*, Menken states five levels of group life exist – systemic, group/field level, subgroups, relationship level and individual level (2004, p.1). Goodbread (2004b) describes how "processes often change levels":

> What starts out as a group process may trigger a relationship process between two participants. Similarly, a single individual may react strongly to a group process and may need focus. … When the facilitator can focus on this individual, his or her experience makes the group process concrete for many other participants (p. 2).

So individual work is part of group work, when it takes part in a group setting. What if the individual work is taking place in private? Does this constitute group work and therefore Worldwork? Or is this closer to another application of Process Work – therapeutic work with individuals?

None of the participants specifically mentioned the application of Process Work to therapeutic work with individuals when defining pOD, and two of them – Schupbach and Diamond – specifically make the link between pOD and Worldwork, as described in pOD in a Nutshell. However, Diamond also refers to pOD as an application of Process Work in the discussion on whether pOD is a new field or a new application, and in a private email, Mones says:

> I actually think it is PW theory [as applied to working with individuals] as much as Worldwork theory, in that so much work is the one on one interactions you have with people in different contexts. It is all about being aware of what is closer and what is further away from a person's awareness at any given moment – and finding ways to help them broaden what they are aware of, in themselves and around them. Basic Process Work theory (personal communication, November 24, 2007).

Whether working with individuals away from the physical presence of a group constitutes Worldwork or not is not clear from this study. However, for the purposes of this report, I include all individual work as part of Worldwork. As a result, this study focuses on Worldwork as the paradigm in the background of pOD.

pOD Concepts

The philosophies behind pOD are essentially Worldwork concepts. Worldwork theory forms the framework for process-oriented organisational development. As was stated in the Literature Review, there is much literature available about Worldwork, and the

intention of this study is not to repeat or summarise all of its underlying concepts. However, the aspects of Worldwork theory that were mentioned by participants during the interviews are presented here, along with a brief definition of each. These included the concept of an organisation as being an organism, with its own process structure, roles and ghost roles, the ideas of deep democracy and eldership, rank and power, and the holographic principle regarding levels of work.

Organisations as Living Organisms

Mindell (2002a) views organisations as being 'living systems', rather than just mechanical entities. "Organisations are partially mechanical beings needing behaviour change. However … organisations are also living organisms whose lifeblood is composed of feelings, beliefs, and dreams" (p. 4).

Diamond makes reference to this when she says, "we are always looking at groups as organism, organisations as organism". Mones also mentions this different way of thinking: "… that's totally a change in thinking, to a more systemic kind of thinking, for people, rather than just this, 'if we push hard enough …'."

Process Structure of Organisations

Understanding the process structure of an organisation is central to many of the ideas and techniques participants spoke about during the interviews.

Primary process, secondary process and edges. An organisation has a primary process, a secondary process and edges, just as an individual has. This means that the organisation

has aspects with which it identifies, which are more known (primary process), and aspects which it marginalises, which are less known (secondary process). The edge forms the boundary between the two, and often shows up as an inability to say something about the things which have been marginalised by the organisation.

The primary process of the organisation is described by Diamond and Mones, respectively as "a role that needs to be satisfied, it's got goals and agendas and those have to be satisfied" and "their strengths and what they do well". Mones describes the secondary process as "the things that disturb them, and take them away from their intention". Schuitevoerder refers to the secondary process as "what is wanting to evolve and emerge in the organisation".

Field, roles and ghost roles. The concept of fields, roles and ghost roles are important in Worldwork, and mentioned a number of times throughout the interviews. A field is described as "the atmosphere or climate of any community, including its physical, environmental and emotional surroundings" (Mindell, 1995, p. 42).

Roles form part of this field – they are the "momentary players" (Mindell, 2002a, p. 179) such as the boss, the sub-ordinate, the outspoken person or the quiet person. In consensus reality (the reality most people agree is 'real'), people are assigned roles in organisations, such as the boss or the sub-ordinate. Role theory suggest that in dreamland (the world of dreams, emotions, fantasies), we all have aspects of all roles within us – for example we all have aspects of a boss-like figure in us, although we may not identify with that role.

Ghost roles are those roles which are present in the field, but no-one is identifying as being in that role. Schuitevoerder gives an example in organisations, where the role of

someone who is incompetent is a ghost role in an organisation where competency is valued. Another example is the role of the 'boss', if he or she is being talked about but not present in the room. Ghost roles are linked to the secondary process of an organisation, as described by Schuitevoerder: "frequently, things that aren't expressed get marginalised, and they get hidden and they manifest in terms of ghosts".

In Worldwork theory, roles and ghost roles are best expressed and filled out by many people. Often more than one person is needed to fully represent a role. And conversely, any individual is more than one role – no one role represents all of who we are. Role switching occurs naturally when different roles interact, meaning a person who is in one role might, after expressing something from that role, notice themselves move into another role.

Schuitevoerder gives some examples about how role theory shows up in organisations. Firstly, how the role of 'leader' is a fluid one, and can move between members of an organisation at different times:

> The model also ascribes leadership as a fluid process which is role based rather than individually based. And that frequently leaders and wisdom in the group does not necessarily come from the ostensible leader, but can easily come from someone, who might not appear to have so much overt rank in the organisation, or overt authority in the organisation.

Secondly, he makes the point that roles will stay with the organisation, even if the individual leaves. This might be true of the role of a 'troublemaker':

> Even if you get rid of the individual, you've still got to work through that process with the organisation.

Deep Democracy and Eldership

Deep democracy is the philosophy and metaskill (feeling attitude) that everyone, all sides, and all states of consciousness are important and need space to express themselves and be heard (Mindell, 2006b).

Schuitevoerder speaks about deep democracy as applied to organisations, and the value of this philosophy in organisations:

> I have the belief that the wisdom of change lies within the group itself, and it lies in the ability … of the group to embrace the diversity of the voices, in the group as meaningful. So process-oriented facilitation, process-oriented OD would be the method of awakening organisation systems and groups within those organisation, towards a deeper recognition of the value of the differences within the organisation and begin to work with those differences in a way that actually enriches and enhances the organisation.

Eldership is the place within us that is deeply democratic – that can hold and hear all the parts, all the levels, both in the world and within ourselves.

Rank and Power

The amount of power we have relative to each other in relationships, groups, community and the world is referred to as rank (Dworkin & Menken, 2006). This power or ability

can be personal or social, and arise from either external factors, such as the culture or community support, or from internal factors, such as one's personal psychology or spiritual power. Rank "organises much of our communication behaviour, especially at edges and in hotspots" (Mindell, 1995, p. 42). Some rank is inherited and some rank is earned (Dworkin et al., 2006), and we are generally conscious of some and unconscious of other forms of rank (Mindell, 1995, p. 42). Schuitevoerder makes the theoretical point that "those who have power frequently, are not as conscious of the ways they use it as those who have less power". In other words, we tend to be aware of the areas where we have low rank and less aware of the areas where we have high rank (Dworkin et al,. 2006), and conversely, we tend to be aware of the areas where other people have high rank.

Process Work normally differentiates between four types of rank – social, contextual, psychological and spiritual rank. The following description of each rank is loosely based on the work of Dworkin et al. (2006). Social rank refers to such things as age, gender, physical abilities, education, sexual orientation, race and class. People tend to take this social rank for granted, and have little awareness of it. Contextual rank relates to the group you are currently in. In an organisation, the higher you are in the organisational hierarchy, the higher your rank. Contextual rank changes as we move between groups – we are seen or valued differently, and so will generally be aware of it.

Psychological rank comes from how well we know ourselves, and how well we can stay close to ourselves when things get difficult. It is acquired through life experiences such as how we were treated as a child, surviving traumas, working through abuses and the love and support we get from friends, family and community. Spiritual rank comes from

having a connection to something bigger than ourselves or having clarity about what our life's purpose is (Dworkin et al., 2006).

Holographic Principle and Levels of Work

Worldwork draws on the holographic viewpoint in its theories – the concept of a hologram is borrowed from physics, suggesting that each part of a whole carries the same patterns as the original whole (Mindell, 1988). So "any group will mirror the same kinds of processes that any little bit of the group will have" (Goodbread, 2004a), whether this 'little bit' be a sub-group, a relationship or an individual.

"The idea of Worldwork came from the idea that groups work like individuals", and so the methods used for working with groups can be based on the methods used to work with individuals and relationships (Goodbread, 2004a). This is aligned with point discussed earlier about the parallels between personal development and organisational development.

The holographic principle has a number of applications, including the concept that work at any level of a group (including organisations) will impact the whole group. This is exciting in that it suggests working with an individual to help them develop, will develop the organisation. So for example, an individual in an organisation learning to communicate more directly will in some way impact the organisation's communication culture. Making a change at any of the following levels will impact the whole organisation:

1. Systemic – making changes to policies, statutes, laws

2. Group – a group working on it's issues, conflicts
3. Sub-group – a group within a group working on themselves
4. Relationship – two people working on their relationship
5. Personal – an individual getting insights or making changes in themselves – their behaviours, beliefs etc.

(Differentiation of levels based loosely on the theory described by Menken, 2006).

Similarly, the process structure at any of these levels can be used to gain an insight into the process structure of an organisation. So for example, an individual's edges in an organisation will point to an organisation's edges. Or a conflict between individuals can reflect a dynamic present in the larger organisation. Both of these applications of the holographic principle are part of Diamond's case example, which is included in the section on pOD in Practice and are good examples of pOD Tools, which will be discussed shortly.

Myths

The concept of myths and organisational myths are mentioned by all of the participants. Organisational myth, according to Schupbach, is "the individual and timeless character of an organisation, which is its biggest potential and source of power" (Schupbach, 2006c). In his class on "Myth, Vision, Strategy" (2006) he said "organisational myth is a hyperspace, meaning it is an un-nameable thing that organises a group, that will appear in as many forms as there are participants mindsets looking into it".

Participants in this study emphasised different aspects of myths. Diamond referred to "mythic issues" as "meaning long term, chronic" and goes on to say "we look at the myth and the deeper symbols, and the persistent ghost roles or allies of the organisation, and help it connect with its myth". Schuitevoerder speaks about the organisation's myth as often being "connected to the primary identity of the organisation".

Schupbach describes an organisation's myth and speaks about the power of working with it.

> MS: ... How do I define myself? I define myself as a facilitator whose task it is to help the group or the person connect to their myth. Their myth is not something like, 'that's my myth, and now I know my myth'. But the myth has a movement to it, a story line. It has a sentient characteristic, which means, it's also a particular groove, it's experienced as flow. It can be experienced as "the zone", which we know from sports. That's also the myth. And if someone finds that, everything will go better, or flow more easily. They'll work better, they'll flourish better, they'll sleep better, they'll develop new relationships with their competitors, and they'll have a new view on the market. Groups that are able to connect with that do as a whole much better. They have done much better financially and in terms of a general feeling about what they are doing. And it's all connected. You know that from yourself. If you are in the groove, it happens.
>
> HH: So all the things that you say you do – large and small group process, coaching etc – somewhere in the background there's myth work?

> MS: Yes, that it is a big part of it. … I see my task is to help them find the key purpose, and then notice it, and then celebrate it and then use it.

pOD Tools

pOD tools are specific and tangible methods and techniques that pOD practitioners can use that are based on Worldwork concepts. The concepts of rank theory, deep democracy, levels of work and that an organisation has a structure, can all be directly applied when working in an organisation. Many tools exist in Process Work – here I present the tools discussed by the participants, including how to elucidate an organisation's process structure, taking a structural viewpoint on issues and unfolding techniques.

In many instances, having an awareness of Worldwork concepts is in itself a powerful tool. Schuitevoerder describes elements of his 'toolkit' when working in organisations:

> The toolkit, that I use, in terms of process work, that I find really important is: One, awareness of rank. Two, awareness of roles and ghost roles – frequently, things that aren't expressed get marginalised, and they get hidden and they manifest in terms of ghosts. The third one, that is super important, is edges. And edges are constellated around issues, but there are also personal edges.

What's the Process?

Understanding that an organisation has a process structure, with a primary and secondary process, edges, roles and ghost roles is central to process-oriented organisational

development, as described by participants in this study. It provides the structural map or framework within which many of the tools and interventions mentioned by the participants are used. Participants describe a number of methods that can be used to map the structure of an organisation's process.

Using client understanding of issue as diagnostic. The first of these uses the client's understanding of the issue as indicative of the organisation's process. Diamond explains:

> The client comes, the client has a presenting issue, the client understanding of the issue itself is diagnostic – in the sense that it's not so much a description of what is, but a description of the edges and the structures and the roles and ghost roles of the client organisation or individual.

Client as reflection of organisation. In the same direction, but subtly different, is seeing the person who is speaking about the organisation – and their problems, edges and relationship with the organisation – as a reflection of the organisation itself. This is an application of the holographic principle discussed earlier. Both Mones and Diamond mention this, and here Diamond describes what she tracks in her early meetings with her client to gather this information:

> So yes, you come in, you have an initial conversation. One of the things I do, and how I think, is that I ask myself, who's bringing me in and what's their relationship with the organisation? And what are the edges they have and what are the problems they have? How is that related to the organisation? How are the issues that they are having or the problems that they have, exactly what the organisation has?

Consultant as missing role in organisation. Diamond explains how she looks out for the roles and ghost roles in the organisation by seeing herself as a missing or needed role in the organisation. She stresses the importance of doing this as one of her strategies as a consultant:

> What are the different roles? Who's happy I'm in, who's upset that I'm in? This person is having trouble with some part of the organisation, and who am I meant to solve, by my presence? So I think about it that way – that's part of my initial entry into an organisation – to think about myself as part of what the person is attempting to do. And that for me is a big piece of my strategy.

Consultant being dreamt up by organisation. Mones highlights the importance of understanding the organisation's process structure in ones work with an organisation. It gives the crucial overview of what's going on in the organisation and guides the consultant in their work. Here she discusses the problem of one's personal psychology or getting 'dreamt up' as getting in the way of being able to see the process structure:

> I think one of my biggest learnings was about not taking things personally. When I was taking things personally, I felt like I really didn't know what to do, because I felt really rejected, and was just swimming around in my own stuff. Therefore I couldn't see the bigger structure of what was going on, and couldn't use my reactions for the sake of the client. I was positively hypnotised. Looking at the bigger structure, it was easier to know what to do.

Being 'dreamt up' is "the experience when a therapist [or OD practitioner] unwittingly begins to act like an aspect of the client's process that is not yet directly represented"

(Mindell, 2002b, p. 130). This points to another diagnostic – when the OD practitioner notices they are being dreamt up, they can look to see how the organisation's process is found in themselves.

Interviews to sense the field. Another method for gaining an understanding of an organisation's process is by conducting interviews with organisation members to 'sense the field'. Three of the participants mentioned this method. Mones explains the process she followed when conducting interviews with one of the organisations she has worked with:

> I did all these one-on-one interviews, and small group interviews and just tried to sense the field, and talk to many people, basically about the same things around how relationships work, how things get done, how people deal with conflict. … When it gets boring that's good because you understand the structure through the redundance. … It's an indication that you've been able to figure out what the process was about.

Structural Viewpoint on Issues

The issues and problems participants have worked with in organisations are presented later in this study, in Applications of pOD, where they are categorised according to their content. pOD also looks at issues from the point of view of the organisation's structure.

Schuitevoerder and Mones both spoke about taking a structural viewpoint on an organisation's problems, suggesting respectively, that issues are "constellated around primary and secondary processes" and "the thing that is marginalised becomes

problematic in whatever way, whether that's the power or whatever." Disturbances and conflicts, from this point of view, come in order to awaken the primary process of the organisation about aspects that it has no awareness of.

Marginalised aspects becoming problematic. Schuitevoerder gives an example of how something that is marginalised causes the organisation to get stuck around that place and have problems:

> If you look at many organisations … if there's a lack of recognition of that which wants to emerge in the organisation, the organisation gets stuck. For example, many, many cultures, in the United States at least, and probably everywhere in the world, believe that in order for people to stay in organisations they have to be highly competent. So there's a huge amount of pressure of competence in many organisations. The result is that when you don't feel competent in an area, you are unable to express that in the organisation, which means all that sense of incompetence goes underground, and the whole organisation, instead of being a learning organisation, where people grow and develop and learn new things, has to be a competency based organisation.
>
> So the organisations then get stuck in competency, and when people don't know, they don't admit it. And then, typically when you don't know and are stuck in having to know, there is only one way out, and that is to leave at some point in time – or to hide your mistakes. Then you get huge attrition in organisations. On the front they are highly competent, but in the background, all of the places that

> they are failing or weak aren't addressed. Because of the inability to deal with anything but competency.
>
> So you can see an organisation actually thrives and develops, through beginning to unfold that, which is not accepted within the primary culture of the organisation. In that situation, competency, is primary. That which is not accepted would be places we don't know, we are exploring, we are uncertain about, and yet those are the very things that are exciting about organisations, in terms of their growth.

Disturber as awakener. The role of the disturber in waking up the primary identity is outlined by Schuitevoerder:

> The essence of the idea of the disturber in Process Work is that the disturber comes in order to awaken us to information that we are not yet present to. And it's disturbing that, which needs to be disturbed, which is frequently the primary identity of the organisation. The disturbers come as an awakener of the primary identity, and encourages an emerging secondary process within an organisation.

Personal edges leading to organisational edges. Both Schuitevoerder and Mones suggest personal edges also lead to organisational edges. Mones adds that most problems get constructed around relationship edges:

> You know, it always seems to come down to difficult relationships between people, regardless of the context. The problems get constructed around relationship edges. Perhaps people have a hard time being direct with each other

> – it comes out in all sorts of complicated intricate ways. I think that's always true – that all the issues get constructed around people's edges and then become organisational edges.

Unfolding the Process

Participants discussed a number of tools to unfold an organisation's process.

Framing from the viewpoint of the primary process. The first is framing things from the viewpoint of the primary process. Mones gives the example of a company who identifies with being cutting edge but whose market position is slipping to being number two. They identify as being innovators:

> So framing, for instance, the idea of deep democracy, or everybody's voice being included, as the most innovative thing you can do, is the direction that you need to go with, them. I'm going to say it a little simply – I would do it like this: "The numbers are showing that people are nipping at your heels, and to be really innovative, you need to draw on the wisdom of everybody in this group. Sometimes that's not such an easy thing to do, cos people are a pain in the ass, you don't want to hear from people." It's somehow modelling for them, that by listening to all the different voices – this is just an example – they will be able to capture something innovative that they weren't able to get to before. Or maybe didn't need to even get to before, when they were just number one. Using the primary process to really motivate them around secondary stuff.

Process pointing to the intervention. Letting the process point to the intervention is another tool available to pOD consultants. Diamond explains:

> Depending on how they talk about the problem, I might need to see him or her work with the team. It sounds like they keep talking about relationship things, and difficulties they are having, so it may be that I need them to bring in the whole team, or it maybe that I can just do this one to one and then help them with their edges.

Consultant going over organisational edges. Going over the edge for an organisation is yet another pOD tool. Here Mones speaks about going over the edge in an organisation where no-one was being direct and makes the point that it is easy to get dreamed up, or caught up in the culture of an organisation:

> So I then crossed the edge, and I realised I wasn't being direct, I was being like a real schmuck, you know, so when I could be direct and say what needed to be said, my client was sort of able to meet me more. So when I went over my … cos you get caught in the culture of the field. Dreamt up. If you take yourself out of the way, which sometimes is really hard to do, and you don't take it personally, you can be more effective. You can use your reactions as diagnostic.

Representing ghost roles and addressing edge figures. Representing the ghost role in a group is another method used to unfold the organisation's process. Diamond explains:

> You think the person talking, you think these are roles, and there's a primary process, a role that needs to be satisfied, it's got goals and agendas and those have

> to be satisfied. And you look at what's troubling it, what's the secondary process, what are the roles that are ghost roles and how can we help facilitate a better connection between those roles?

Schuitevoerder gives examples about addressing edge figures and bringing in ghosts. He suggests that you need to address edge figures first, to make it safe to bring in the ghosts:

> Frequently, the whole organisational scene constellates around primary and secondary identities, and that's why picking up the disturbers in a way, is really helpful, because it presses the group to edges. But the first step frequently is to be able to bring out the ghost roles. And those things that are felt but not said within the organisation. And check whether those things are safe to come out. If they are not safe to come out, then you have to address the safety issues first. Otherwise, after a day in the organisation, a whole lot of people are fired, which you don't want. Frequently, as I approach an organisational system, the first things I have to determine is, what are the various edge figures, that will stop people from actually coming out and expressing what ghosts are present? And often I will, as the facilitator, talk to those edge figures.

I ask whether the setting for bringing in the edge figures is a group process, which he affirms, and goes on to give an example:

> In a group process, absolutely I'd say, because I have rank as a facilitator, and I have to hold the group. So if there's a whole lot of tension in the group, and I know from talking to individuals that there's an edge to be direct, but they are afraid because of an edge figure that says they are going to get fired if they talk

> directly, then I would talk to that. And I'd say, "you know, one of the reasons I imagine folks won't talk, is because you might get fired if you do talk. Is that correct?" You see, because that won't get you fired. The next level, with what you say, will get you fired. So that discussion needs to be had, before you can go to the next level.

He goes on to give an example of bringing in a ghost:

> So frequently I'll begin to address those concerns. Whether the concerns, by the way, are of the members in the group or myself. I've had groups that have said, "hey, you're in the president's pocket, they are paying you, I don't trust you." And I've actually stood up in front of a group of 100 people, and said, "I heard this gossip", and then opened it out as a ghost. And then answered the ghost. I've said to the group, "I hear that folks, some folks might feel that I'm not fully trustworthy, because I have a friendship with the president. I want to tell you that's true. I also want to let you know, that my job here, is to support the facilitation and the development of the whole community. And, please check me out around that. If I don't support the diversity of the roles in the group, and I don't encourage that to happen, I'm no good for you. Please let me know, I want to grow and develop if that's the case, and if I can't support you, please fire me." And that was the end of the issue.

Chapter 5 FINDINGS – Applications of pOD

Where and when is pOD applied? This chapter looks at the organisations where participants have practiced pOD, and the types of problems and issues they were working with.

Organisations Where pOD is Practiced

The four participants have worked as practitioners of pOD in a wide range of organisations, including governmental, non-governmental, for-profit and not-for-profit organisations. The table below summarises these organisations. Whilst this is not a comprehensive list of all the organisations the participants have worked in, it gives an overview of those mentioned during the interview.

Type of Organisation	**Mones**	**Schupbach**	**Diamond**	**Schuitevoerder**
Intentional communities	x		x	
Non profit organisations		x		x
NGOs		x	x	x
Labour unions			x	
Hospitals and health Care org's	x			

Type of Organisation	**Mones**	**Schupbach**	**Diamond**	**Schuitevoerder**
Government organisation	x		x	
Educational institutions	x		x	x
Small businesses		x	x	x
Fortune 500	x	x	x	x
Fortune 50		x		

The table shows all participants have worked with a Fortune 500 company and most participants have worked with NGO's, educational institutions (schools, colleges and universities) and small businesses.

The table does not show the number of times each participant mentioned individual types of organisations, therefore it does not give any indication about where pOD is practiced most often. Nor does it indicate whether there was a change over time in the type of organisations the participants engaged with. Neither of these questions were directly addressed in the interviews, however Mones indicated that the types of organisations she has worked with is changing. She said she has worked with:

> … a wide range of organisations – it has changed a lot over time. I started working with intentional communities, schools, healthcare and government organisations, and currently am working with a couple of Fortune 500 companies.

Organisational Problems and Issues

Communication issues, issues around power and rank and conflict were the most common examples of problems participants named when talking about the kinds of problems they work with in organisations. Other problems included dealing with diversity issues, work/life balance, changing organisational vision and issues related to the organisational structure.

These issues can be viewed from a structural viewpoint, as discussed in pOD tools, or categorised by content. Here I categorise them by content, into three categories – personal, interpersonal and organisational. These categories align with the three levels in an organisation, which are a synthesis of the five levels that have been described by Menken as "levels of focus on a group" (2006) – personal, interpersonal, sub-group, group and organisation – and the three aspects of an organisation described by Mindell (2002a):

> Sometimes aspects of an organisation can be understood in terms of groupings. There are always at least three such groupings under the umbrella: (a) the entire organisation, (b) interpersonal relationships among members, and (c) the psychology of individual members. All levels need focus for the organisation to work well (p. 78).

Organisational Levels

I define the three levels of an organisation as follows:

- Personal – This is the level of inner experiences, reflections (Menken, 2004) and issues related to the individual.

- Interpersonal – This is the level of interactions between people, and can occur either between two people (relationship level), a sub-group or a group.

- Organisational – This is the level of the entire organisation. It includes group process and systemic change, "the level of how a business or organisation operates, social action issues and changes that needs to happen, laws, policies, 'the way you do business'" (Menken, 2004).

Interpersonal issues made up a large proportion of the organisational problems mentioned by the four participants. Issues in the other two categories were less common.

Personal Issues

The only personal issue discussed during the interviews was related to work-life balance. Schuitevoerder identifies it as "a huge issue in organisations".

Interpersonal Issues

Many of the issues and problems cited by participants can be described as interpersonal issues – these include communication issues (and in particular being direct), difficulties in collaborating, rank problems, sub-group marginalisation, diversity issues and dealing with conflict. Schuitevoerder reflects this finding – he identifies that most of problems he is called in to help with tend to be interpersonal:

> Mostly it seems that I'm pulled in when there's either, individual, relationship, team or systems challenges, and mostly they are of an inter-personal nature. So when it's seen that what is required is a focus on an interpersonal or communication level.

Issues that could loosely be called communication issues were mentioned by all of the participants. Diamond, in talking about leadership teams, speaks about the fear they seem to have when relating to each other as peers. Each leader has their own team – for example an IT team or an Operations team – and come together to form the leadership team:

> Leadership teams each have their own silos, and are used to being leaders of their teams. When they get with other vice-presidents or leaders, they become … almost afraid. They have a fear of speaking out and they seem afraid to interact. And there seems to be a fear around disagreeing – people basically go along with things. They don't know how to disagree.

Earlier she makes the link between not being able to speak out and with their difficulties in collaborating, another issue in organisations.

Mones mentions the difficulty in being direct, in reference to a Fortune 500 company she is consulting to:

> They say one thing and do another, they are not accountable – because they have a hard time being direct.

Schuitevoerder speaks about how people have difficulties being direct with people in a higher rank position, and how this is related to rank unconsciousness on the part of the managers:

> One of the frequent edges I come across is people being able to communicate directly to their managers. That's just one of the edges that's really very common.… Many people who go into management positions often don't identify with their power or with the ability to communicate effectively that power.

He identifies rank problems as a typical issue in organisations:

> One of the things that typically comes up in organisation, is rank problems. And it comes when there's a very strong, frequently authoritarian style, or a style that doesn't like expression of people that are direct reports to the manager. So, sometimes unconsciousness of relative power that is held within the organisation becomes problematic.

Diamond spoke about the difficulties people have engaging with those with different hierarchal rank:

> Staff and managers have conflict … people have trouble managing upwards. They don't know how to engage and interact and manage bosses, and bosses don't know how to empower people.

Mones also identified rank and power as common issues in organisations:

> All organisations grapple with how to deal with power. It is an issue around community living – where there is no sort of designated leader. Also in corporations with a matrix structure, where hierarchy is marginalised. Hierarchy really isn't popular today even in the most mainstream of organisations. People act as if there is no real boss – and thus all the power is marginalised. I think the essence of that really, is power, people are so edged out. They are afraid to congruently step in or out of their power. When power or rank does surface it is usually in ways that make it difficult for everyone to deal with—less tractable.

Schuitevoerder identified a sub-group issue he's worked with in his work with organisations, when one group feels marginalised:

> One group in the organisation feels marginalised, whether it's because they have lower rank – they have this role which is less recognised, and they feel under-appreciated, because they come from a marginalised group – or because they might have a different nationality.

He also describes the types of diversity issues he's encountered:

> There are frequently diversity issues, not necessarily only around race. Sexual orientation, of course gender, as I just mentioned. You'll get issues of homophobia – I've worked with organisations around homophobia.

Dealing with conflict, whatever its source, is another issue participants discussed. In Mones's case example included later in this study, she speaks about how people shy away from conflict, rather than using it as a way to grow. Here Schuitevoerder describes

how conflict is frequently marginalised in organisations, and how the organisation knows it has issues, but doesn't know how to access them:

> Frequently in organisations, conflict is underground. So when I go into an organisation, often there's a tension, there's symptoms. For example, you get this huge attrition in organisations, or you get tensions or problems or gossip in the office. Those are some of the symptoms that are indicative of troubles. Or you get unhappiness, people not showing up for meetings, that kind of representation. It's the kind of thing where the organisation knows it's in trouble, but it doesn't know how to access it. And that's frequently when I get called in.

Organisational Issues

A number of issues at an organisational level were identified by participants, including issues related to the way the organisation was structured, the different functions in an organisation and a number of problems related to making strategic changes in an organisation.

Schuitevoerder speaks about what he calls a 'classic OD issue', related to an organisation's structure:

> Sometimes I'll go in, the executive is overwhelmed. I'll ask them why they are overwhelmed, and they'll say they are not sure. Then I find that they have thirteen or fourteen direct reports. I say, "Well, I understand, your organisational chart needs changing". In other words, it's on a systemic level that the change needs to occur.

He gives another example of an organisational issue, of the tension caused when an organisation that has two different functions:

> For example if you look at many educational institutions, they have two functions, they have an administrative function and they have a programs or educational function, and those two often have a huge amount of tension. So if you have an organisation which doesn't have a combining body of someone who is able to hold the diversity of both of those, it becomes problematic.

Schupbach gives the example of working with internal resistance caused by strategic changes in an organisation. He was invited in to work with a European organisation that needed to change their marketing strategies to cope with the changes in European Union policies. The strategic changes to the organisation caused interpersonal issues:

> You can say that's a facilitation, coaching thing. And it's quite complex, because as you know, any group of this size, has a lot of internal political things. You convince one guy – you have a good discussion with one guy – one guy buys into your model. Now the moment Mr So-and-So has bought in, Mrs So-and-So won't buy in anymore.

Schuitevoerder also identified issues related to organisations making strategic changes. He described what happened when an organisation tried to change its 'myth' – which Schuitevoerder uses here in the context of vision and strategy of the organisation:

> What happens is they create a myth, and the organisation is supported and it's unfolded according to that myth. Then the organisation begins to change and the

> myth still is the background figure that is followed. And the question is then how to change that, how to change the vision and strategy of the organisation? Then tensions occur when that myth begins to change. That frequently occurs in founding organisation, when there is an original founder of an organisation.

Issues arising from mergers were also mentioned. Schupbach gave the example of NGOs who are merging to become more competitive, and the status battles that happen as a result:

> The smaller NGO is trying to hook up with the bigger NGOs. There's an unspoken rule in OD that says, the lower the financial stake, the more vicious the status battle in the background.

Presenting Issues

After outlining the types of problems she's worked on with organisations, Diamond makes the point that all these issues are the presenting issues. Consultants initially get invited in to organisations to help with these issues – these then lead to other areas of focus:

> These are the presenting issues. I don't want to make a diagnostic … I don't want to make too much of a big deal out of it, do you know what I mean? This is why Process Workers work with an organisation. These are like presenting issues that people struggle with, it doesn't mean to say it's the sum total of what we do in organisations, they are like issues that bring people to therapy, so to speak.

Chapter 6 FINDINGS – pOD in Practice

How is pOD done? How are the Worldwork theories and pOD tools applied to organisations? How does one consult to an organisation? Is there a process that is followed – from the moment contact is made until the work is complete?

This chapter presents findings in relation to the practice of pOD. It commences with a discussion about whether pOD steps exist, and goes on to address the questions posed above by looking at four case examples described by the participants. The major elements in each case are summarised, and categorised to see if there is any alignment with the "general model of planned change" proposed by Waddell et al. (2004). pOD phases are proposed, and these phases are described. One of these phases includes the implementation of interventions – as interventions form such a large part of the practice of pOD, the chapter concludes with a section that is devoted to these interventions.

Steps – Do they Exist?

In order to get a sense of how pOD is 'done', or the practice of pOD, I asked participants the question, "What are the steps of process-oriented OD? What does it look like from the moment contact is made between you and the organisation and when you leave the project?" The way I formulated this interview question suggests that I assume that steps of pOD exist – a fact that both Schupbach and Diamond brought to my attention.

Schupbach does so by asking me about the paradigm in the background behind my questions. The following discussion took place after I list the questions I will be asking him during the interview:

> MS: Let me ask you something. Do you mind? Why these questions? What's the rational behind the questions?
>
> HH: I came up with a whole list of questions, things I'd like to find out about, and had to narrow it down to something I thought would take an hour, for the interview.
>
> MS: I understand, but why, I mean in addition to the things you say? If I would make a study on intimate relationships, my first question would be, "what is your first experience when you relate to someone, thinking about an intimate relationship?" Behind that would still be the paradigm, that first moments count, and that's what I am researching. Do you know what I mean?

It was only after the interview that I understood what Schupbach was referring too, and so my response – "That seemed like a fairly linear sort of a question and also maybe an easier one to get people warmed up into the interview" – misses his point.

Diamond makes the point that there are no 'steps' in Process Work. Here Diamond and I discuss this:

> HH: The next question goes into the specific details again. What are the steps of process-oriented OD? What does it look like from the moment contact is made between you and the organisation and when you leave the project? I'm thinking,

as a suggestion here, that you think of one particular organisation you've worked with, and we work from the beginning to the end with that one, as a possible way of doing that.

JD: I just want to say as an interview meta-comment, there really is no … like with an individual, you can't say every client comes in and here's how it goes. That's not how we talk about Process Work, so we wouldn't talk about organisation development work that way either. And organisation development itself depends on what the basic problem is. If we do talk about one case, which I think is a better way to do it, it's important that it's not formulated as though this is how it's done in every situation. Are you with me there?

HH: Totally. And I think the levels are important here. I'm sure there's still a beginning phase, a middle phase and an end phase, which are going to be similar. At a high enough level, there is making the initial contact, getting some understanding around what the identified problem is, coming up with interventions. There'll be something like that at a very high level, I think?

JD: Beyond what you just said, I don't think so.

Case Examples

Abbreviated versions of the case examples provided by each of the participants follow. For the full versions, please see the transcripts of the interviews in Appendix B. I have a dual purpose in including the case examples – to enable readers to track the analysis I

carry out and to 'tell the story' of some of the pOD work that's been performed. The intent is to begin to give readers a sense of the practice of pOD – how contact is made, what happens during the first meeting, etc., and the sort of things the participants are thinking and feeling during this process. Examples of the pOD tools discussed earlier are also revealed in these case examples.

I then summarise the key elements in each of the cases, and being mindful of Diamond's statement about not suggesting "this is how it's done in every situation", look for recurring patterns in the case examples. My aim is to explore and identify discernible characteristics of the practice of pOD, and see if they bear any relationship to the main activities or phases of organisational development described by Waddell et al. (2004).

Mones's Case Example – Fortune 500 Company

Mones's introduction to her client, the head of HR for a Fortune 500 company, came via an ex-client, who was on the company's executive team:

> Basically he just said, "you know I have a coach who has always done with me in business, what you did with me personally. Why don't you … you'd be great." So he introduced me to the guy who was head of HR, who he'd been working with for many years. The primary team he was working with was having a lot of relationship issues.

During the first meeting Mones established rapport with her client and then gave a short introductory presentation, in which she spoke about "a process-oriented viewpoint of conflict and the value of disturbances":

> Then I gave a very short presentation about how I work with problems … my viewpoint about problems, as an opportunity for learning. And conflict – how most people tend to sort of move away from conflict, because they are scared of it. Or explode and make more trouble. That most people don't know how to use it, as a way to evolve and grow. And I introduced the idea that you really can't keep out trouble. That people try to keep it out and it ends up coming back in a more disturbing way…. It's a huge paradigm shift for most people and it can be communicated very simply.

He asked her to come back for a longer meeting the following week, where they continued talking:

> So I went back the next week, and I was all excited and freaked out, and prepared another presentation … but we basically just continued our chat. Pretty casual actually. … He was kind of freaked out with his new position, the tensions on his team – being in the USA, which is the headquarters, and his new responsibilities.

Then followed a period of constantly changing plans about how to proceed:

> Then this whole process began where, for a year now, of let's do this, let's do that, let's do this. I would prepare major presentations and be ready to travel across the world… then they would fall through. Change of plans … change of organisational structure … change of leadership.

Some of the constant changes were due to resistance, the need to build relationships and the client's personal edges:

> The man who is the boss of this team, is not into this work … he's scared. So everything is about politicking. It's crucial how you frame things. Central. So [my] client has really had to make relationships with a lot of people, and get really comfortable with [me]. At one point, he was trying to make one more plan. I said, "I can't make one more plan with you. The bottom keeps falling out constantly, like, what the hell?" Finally he was able to say, "I really don't know how to talk about it with other people". So it was great to be able to go back into that, and help him. You know, you really have to work with the person who you are facing, because they will reflect the edges of the organisation. He would get really excited in the moment, but then he couldn't really turn around and formulate it and talk about it with people.
>
> I think after that happened things started moving. In my own excitement and ambition I didn't really realise all of his edges. One part of him was really wanting to do this, but another part was really scared. He didn't know he was scared, he didn't know that he didn't know how to talk about it. So, you can only look at 'what happens' – what people's feet do. He keeps dropping the ball – okay, but he's not dropping us, but he keeps dropping the ball. So what's going on? To be able to be really direct in an environment where people aren't, is tough. In my last conversation, I thought that's the end, he's going to be done with me, cos I was sooo pushy. But it was fine.

Finally the decision was made to interview everyone on the leadership team and one tier below them. Mones had a standard set of questions about relationships, conflicts and how things get done that she asked each of the 30 or so people she interviewed. After conducting the interviews, she synthesised the information and wrote a report outlining what was working well and what the challenges were. These findings and some basic learning points about "conflict and teams and collaboration" were pulled together into a Powerpoint presentation, which Mones's client presented to the leadership team:

> He presented some of the findings to the leadership team. As kind of a taste as to what would come when we met with them next time they got together. He was a bridge of sorts.

A package was put together suggesting a programme that would address the findings, including facilitation, coaching, on-line learning and a learning lab:

> So my high dream about where that goes is that it's a slow culture change over time, in terms of how people relate to each other. How teams work together. We have offered them a package: facilitated meetings (so that we would be there to facilitate) on-line learning, coaching and a learning lab.

Schupbach's Case Example – Combination of Organisations

Whilst Schupbach didn't present a complete case example during the interview, he spoke about various aspects of his pOD work, which are collated here. He spoke about the two ways he enters an organisation – he differentiates change management projects from

consulting, and speaks about how the first contact occurs for both of these. In change management projects, he gets short-listed and is asked to send in a proposal:

> One classical scenario in change management for an independent consultant, who is competing with a group of other consultants, is to be shortlisted. She might get a telephone call from someone that says, "we've heard you do this and this, we've looked at various groups and you are short-listed. You ended up on our shortlist of 5 different people or groups. Are you interested in that? If so, would you send us a proposal?"

This compares to the more "standard consulting approach" where the invitation is to check for 'fit', with a specific consulting problem in mind:

> For consulting usually, you have a specific problem. They'll say something like, "we don't know yet if there's a fit, would you come over for a morning and say a little bit about what you do and who you are, so we can see if you are a fit?"

In this scenario Schupbach will often work on the problem with the organisation, to test if there is a fit, instead of discussing the fit. He explains that this can avoid the set-up of debating an issue with an internal evaluator of the group who wants to hire the consultant:

> So they'll say, "would you come and talk with us so we can see who you are and see if you fit, if we want to use you as a consultant for a particular problem?" And I prefer now to say: "better would be that I come over and work with you on the problem." It's like if someone would say to me, "I'm looking for a therapist,

> how about meeting for a coffee to feel each other out, to see if we like each other, if we are a fit." I don't think it's as useful as saying "why don't I give you a session and we can see how that works out for you". So I prefer that to only going and explaining what Process Work is and all of that.
>
> If you have someone who is asking for a proposal, you have an evaluator. This process is important for the organisation, as evaluation serves to help the group to understand itself better, become more aware of who they are. Finding out who you fit with is like finding out who you are. Working together on an issue will bring that process up also, but with a framework of making it more conscious. So maybe a good way to work with this would be to say "let's work on it. Bring your worst problem, we'll work on it for an hour. And if you're not happy with it afterwards, you don't want me to be a part of it anyhow."

In the case of the organisation mentioned previously where Schupbach was invited in to help them with internal resistance they were experiencing to a strategy change, the first step was one of facilitation and coaching:

> The first phase – I'm a year and a half into the whole process now – is to convince those guys that the reason they are meeting with internal resistance, is because they are approaching the whole thing with an incomplete mindset. You can say that's a facilitation, coaching thing. A process might look like resistance to one side, as long as they don't understand the diversity issue behind it. What looks like resistance to the one with more rank, looks like liberation to the one with less rank.

Having succeeded with that, the next step was a combination of interventions, including large group process, small group process, coaching, peer coaching, a newsletter and a bulletin board:

> About a month ago we got the buy-in from everyone – great, we're going to go for it. Now we're developing this whole thing – it has large group process in it, it has small group process in it and it has coaching and peer coaching things in it. It has a newsletter in it. It has a bulletin board with the whole feedback system.

Schupbach goes on to explain the bulletin board concept, a large group process method over time:

> The basic idea is – how do you create a group process, over a year and a half with 1400 people, that work in different areas all over Germany? … One part is going to be an online thing, people write if they have different opinions – we don't like this, we like this, we don't like this, we want a different salary, this doesn't work, the union people […recording inaudible]. Then we cluster those as roles. So, with other words, that's a quite a big operation, with lots of facets to it.

Diamond's Case Example – Small Company

Diamond chose a small company she had worked with as her case example:

> There was a small company and I worked with a conflict in the leadership team. The conflict reflected problems they had in the structure of their company, so I helped them make a link between the conflict and then changes in the

> organisation itself. It was a small process, a small project. … It took all of a couple of weeks from start to finish.

She was invited to do the work by the director of the company, with whom she met a number of times to discuss the issue:

> I met with that person several times, and discussed the issue. Then, after hearing the issue and discussing it with him in detail, I proposed a method for how to work with it, based on what he told me about the company, the people involved, and everything.

She sent her client a written proposal about how to work with the issue – conflict facilitation at two levels – personal and organisational. Her client agreed to the proposal:

> I proposed that we sit together with the management staff and that we look at the conflict that emerged. It was one particular conflict that came up, a pretty heavy conflict that came up between two people in the management team – and we actually try to mediate or facilitate that conflict.
>
> But also, we did two other things with that. We looked at the conditions that led to that conflict, and how they were part of a problem in the organisation itself, that the individuals were in a way on a collision course based on a lack of clarity in the organisation, and so their conflict wasn't just personal. We looked at different ways we could solve that, organisationally. Through certain types of training and also through certain organisational changes, like structural changes in

> the organisation. So, I proposed that to him, and sent it as a proposal, and he said yes.

Diamond met with the management team and started by working with the conflict at an interpersonal level, with the two people in the conflict. She describes how this process needed to be quick:

> JD: …briefly and rapidly – it wasn't like a long drawn out relationship conflict. It was short, and factual. There's not a lot of tolerance, you know you can't really spend a lot of time going deep into people's emotions, feelings and issues. It's very counter-productive in a team, in a business.
>
> HH: How long was it, when you say 'very short'?
>
> JD: Well we talked about the conflict, and finishing up the actual conflict between the people, I don't know, took like between 20, 30, 40 minutes.

She then shifted her focus to working on the conflict at an organisational level with the whole team, on the conditions that led to the conflict and possible solutions:

> It then more rapidly went into a discussion about the whole team, and what the conflict meant for the whole team. And how it was a reflection of certain larger organisational dynamics, and how we could resolve that and what people thought about that.

Diamond wrote up a second proposal, recommending training for the team and organisational structural changes, which were subsequently implemented:

> We met with the team, and … followed up with the training aspect as I recommended. … And then there was a follow up on organisational structures – that was a meeting … and a written report and a couple of individual sessions with the director.

Schuitevoerder's Case Example – Non-profit Educational Organisation

Schuitevoerder chose a non-profit "educationally based organisation" that employs about 150 people for his case example.

He speaks briefly about how he was invited into the organisation to "do a residential retreat with all the staff members":

> My initial contact was through someone in the organisation who had seen me teach, and they thought I'd be fantastic at facilitating this meeting, and therefore invited me to come into the meeting.

During the first meeting with the organisation Schuitevoerder got clarity about the format of the meeting and who would be present:

> I then wanted to know a number of key members who'd be at that meeting, at all levels of the organisation. … This was going to be a large group meeting of about 100 people for about 3 or 4 hours for a number of days. So I want to know exactly what was present, so I came totally prepared.

He conducted interviews with about 15 people to see what "was present in the system" and to "cultivate relationships". Schuitevoerder did not use a specific set of questions during this process:

> My tendency, when I interview, is not to ask specific questions. I'm looking for what are the background tensions, conflicts and processes, that I think are going to be present when I go and facilitate. I want to know about the organisation.

Part of this process is checking for 'fit', "to see whether myself and the organisation can work well together".

Schuitevoerder then cultivated a sense of preparedness, which helped him to hold the group:

> In the first case, I want to know what are the issues. And so I can anticipate the types of tensions and conflict that are in the room by virtue of the issues. Then, if I find that there's a particular challenge that I'm stuck with, I'll go into the roles around it. And I find out what ghost roles I can anticipate. …But once I am prepared, I drop the whole lot. I go in empty. You can't go in with a pretence, because that might not be the case of what emerges. And I have found, I've prepared and then other things come up, but I feel like I've got so much knowledge about the group already, that the group feels me holding it by virtue of my awareness of it.

The group process followed, which Schuitevoerder describes:

> We had a number of hot moments. One of the edges which came up is one I've mentioned earlier, where the executive director at that time, had been quite authoritarian, and people were afraid to speak out. The executive director, by the way, was absent from that meeting. The president was there, and some of his direct reports were there, but the executive director wasn't there. And he'd chosen not to be there. And that was fine with me. We used his role as a ghost. And someone else picked up his role at different times, and the meeting was remarkable. One person, who had been asked to leave the organisation, stood up and confronted this role. [In this organisation people stay on for a set time after they have been asked to leave.] The role was taken by a direct report who had been involved in the firing, and a profoundly deep and touching discussion occurred. With the actual manager apologising – it was quite remarkable – and recognising where they'd made a mistake. It was quite remarkable. And the whole organisation changed from that.

After this first contact with the organisation, Schuitevoerder's role was expanded to include coaching and facilitating meetings (small and large groups):

> After that, I was pulled into meetings with the president – the president liked what I was doing – so I began to work directly with the president. I began to work directly with the executive director, and went to a number of team meetings, small meetings, 4, 6, 10 people, and worked ongoing with the organisation, both on a coaching and a team level. And then I was also asked to come back for a number of meetings with the larger group of people – not quite 100 or 150, but maybe 40 or 50 people.

Summary of Case Examples

To organise the ideas around the practice of pOD, and to see if phases might be discernible when working with organisations, I summarise the key elements of each case example. I then look to see whether each element can be categorised into one of the four activities or phases of organisational development proposed by Waddell et al. (2004) in their "general model of planned change", as described in the Literature Review.

The codes used for each of the four activities are:

- E&C – entering and contracting;
- D – diagnosing;
- P&I – planning and implementing change; and
- E&I – evaluating and institutionalising change.

Case Example Elements	**Code**
Mones's Case Example – Fortune 500 Company	
1. Introduction to business	E&C
2. Meeting – short introductory presentation - about change process, conflict/problems, rank	E&C
3. Meeting – follow up conversation	E&C

Case Example Elements	**Code**
4. Constant change of plans re how to proceed.	E&C
5. Interviews to sense the field	D
6. Report – synthesis of interview findings	D
7. Presentation of findings and some basic learning points	D
8. Proposal – interventions package to address findings	P&I
Schupbach's Case Example– Combination of Organisations	
1. Entry into organisation via change management projects – short-listed, asked to send in a proposal	E&C
2. Entry into organisation via standard consulting approach – invited to check for 'fit' with specific consulting problem in mind	E&C
3. Works on the problem for an hour or so, for free	E&C
4. Interventions – facilitation and coaching	P&I
5. Interventions – interventions package including large and small group process, coaching and bulletin board.	P&I
Diamond's Case Example – Small Company	
1. Invitation	E&C

Case Example Elements	**Code**
2. Several meetings	E&C/D
3. Proposal 1 – recommended strategy – working with conflict at two levels: personal and organisational	E&C
4. Client's agreement	E&C
5. Intervention – conflict facilitation at interpersonal level – working with two people	P&I
6. Intervention – conflict facilitation at organisational level – working with team on conditions that led to it and possible solutions	P&I/D
7. Proposal 2 – recommendations re changes – training and structural changes	E&C
8. Intervention: training for team	P&I
9. Organisational structural changes intervention – meeting, sessions, written report	P&I
Schuitevoerder's Case Example – Non-profit Educational Organisation	
1. Invitation	E&C
2. First meeting	E&C

Case Example Elements	**Code**
3. Interviews, to sense the field and cultivate relationships	D
4. Checks for fit between organisation and self	E&C
5. Strategy – as specified by organisation – large group process	P&I
6. Cultivate sense of preparedness	D/P&I
7. Intervention – group process facilitation	P&I
8. Interventions – coaching and facilitating meetings (small and large groups)	P&I

Case Example/OD Process Comparison

The table above shows that the case examples essentially follow the first three phases of the 'OD Process' proposed by Waddell et al. (2004) – entering and contracting, diagnosing and planning and implementing change. While the activities above generally occur in sequence, there is considerable overlap and feedback between them, as suggested is the case by Waddell et al. (2004, p. 37). The overlap between the activities can be seen in a number of the elements presented in the table above – for example Diamond's case element 6. As in that example, diagnosis is often occurring in parallel with the other activities, and it could be argued it is present in all activities. The feedback

between the activities, or the iterative nature of this process is most clearly shown in Diamond's case example, where she essentially goes through the complete process twice.

Evaluating and institutionalising was the only activity not present in the case examples. This is partly because only two of the case examples describe completed projects – this limitation of the study is discussed in the Limitations section.

Based on the relatively strong alignment between the case example elements and the OD Process, I propose that iterative steps or phases of work exist when working with organisations, which I call pOD Phases, and give an overview of these phases.

pOD Phases

While the case examples suggest that the practice of pOD is largely comprised of three of the activities named by Waddell (2004), there was also some reference to the fourth activity, evaluation and institutionalising, during other parts of the interviews. As a result I propose that the pOD Phases reflect the "general model of planned change" described by Waddell et al. (2004), in which the following four activities are discernible:

1. entering and contracting;
2. diagnosing;
3. planning and implementing change; and
4. evaluating and institutionalising change.

In the next section I give an overview of each of these four phases, noting the multi-step, iterative nature of each. While most of the information about each phase is drawn from the case examples, information and corresponding data exemplars from other parts of the interview are included where relevant. Each overview is compared with the activities described by Waddell et al. (2004).

Entering and Contracting

Invitations to work for organisations came via a number of different channels – Mones's contact came via an ex-client, Schuitevoerder's contact had seen him teach, and Schupbach spoke about being short-listed for change management programs by organisations that had heard about his work.

Examples of the types of problems the participants have worked with in organisations are covered in the section on Problems and Issue. The problems or opportunities focused on in the case examples were varied. In Mones's case example, her client needed support – "He was kind of freaked out with his new position, the tensions on his team". Schupbach spoke about being asked to help an organisation with internal resistance they were experiencing to a strategy change. Diamond worked with a conflict in a leadership team, while Schuitevoerder was asked to facilitate a meeting of about 100 people.

In all case examples, the first step was to meet with the client. During this first meeting, Mones gave a short presentation on the "process-oriented viewpoint of conflict and the value of disturbances". Diamond discussed the issue in detail, while Schuitevoerder got clarity about the format of the meeting and who would be present. Schupbach generally

doesn't explain what Process Work is and will work on the problem with the client for free, if they are interested in checking for 'fit' between himself and the organisation.

Schuitevoerder also mentioned the importance of checking for 'fit':

> So I need to know what I'm going into, so I can see whether I can actually facilitate that kind of scene, and whether facilitation is the thing that is needed from that organisation. Do you know what I mean? So I need to check what my usefulness will be.

Diamond describes the different ways clients present the OD work required. Sometimes it will begin with a discussion about the problems. Other times clients jump straight to the intervention they think will address the problems:

> We talk and think about what the problem is, and what wants to happen? But sometimes people come in and they don't want to talk about the problem. They have a very specific something that they want you to do. And sometimes they just need help to figure that out, as well. And maybe what you are doing for a while, is just coaching, or you are just working with them on brainstorming what the problems are.

At another point in the interview she elaborates about clients jumping straight to the intervention required:

> A lot of times people don't know what they need and they don't know what they are asking for – they just know they have a problem, and typically they interrupt ... they mess themselves up by trying to diagnose the issue and then they call you

> in to actually do an intervention. They say "could you come in and do x, could you come in and work with the team or could you come in and do this?" Then you have to back up and say, "what is the problem you are hoping the solution will address?" Sometimes you can and sometimes you can't get to that with them.

Waddell et al. (2004, p. 77) speak about the three steps of the 'entering' phase as being:

1. clarifying the problem or opportunities;
2. identifying who the relevant client is; and
3. choosing an OD practitioner, which is both the organisation's and the practitioner's responsibility.

The first step was discussed in detail by the participants. The second step of identifying the relevant client was not mentioned. The third step was discussed, in relationship to the practitioner's responsibility in helping the organisation choose the correct OD practitioner.

Contracting is the second part of this phase or activity. Diamond and Mones both spoke about the process of clarifying what is required from the OD process. Diamond sent her client a written proposal about how to work with the issue – conflict facilitation at two levels, personal and organisational – which he agreed to. Later she writes up a second proposal, recommending training for the team and organisational structural changes. Mones and her client, after many changes in plans, agreed that she would interview

everyone on the leadership team and one tier below them. Later she presented her client with a written proposal suggesting a programme that would address the findings.

Schuitevoerder speaks about elements of this outside the case example discussion. He makes the point that it is important to get really clear on what your role with the organisation is, and what they are wanting you to do. He also mentions the need to check to see how much buy-in there is for that:

> Before I go into an organisation, I want to know what my role is. And I also want to know who has bought in and whose hasn't bought in. So my role is actually fluid, and it's dictated – it'd be nice if I could dictate it all the time, but even if I were to dictate it, it doesn't necessarily mean that it's accepted as that. So it's very, very important, in going into an organisation, to really identify what your clear intent is. Else you can easily get set-up – to really fulfill a role which is not what you anticipated. So, before I go into an organisation, I often talk to the people that are employing me and I want to find out exactly what they are wanting me to do. And then get a sense of how I would operate within that, and then I have to find out how much buy-in they have for it.

Contracting, according to Waddell et al. (2004, p. 81), can be formal or informal, and includes three areas:

1. clarifying what each party expects to gain from the OD process;
2. committing resources to the process; and
3. establishing the ground rules for working together, such as confidentiality.

Participants spoke about directly about the first step, and whilst it was not specifically discussed, implied the second step occurred in getting agreement to their proposals. The third step was not discussed during the interviews.

Diagnosing

Process Work has some tools that are very powerful in 'diagnosing' an organisation, as discussed in pOD Tools. Some of these tools are used to elucidate the structure of an organisation's process – viewing the organisation as having a structural process and understanding what this is, is key in process-oriented organisational development. It gives the consultant an overview of the organisation that goes far deeper than the organisation's presenting problems, and points to what type of intervention or interventions will be most effective. To summarise from pOD Tools, the tools used to illuminate the organisation's structure include:

- taking the client's understanding of the presenting issue as diagnostic;
- seeing the client as a reflection of the organisation itself – for example the client's edges as reflecting the organisation's edges;
- seeing the OD consultant as a part of what the person is attempting to do in the organisation;
- using the consultant's dreamt up reactions as an indication of an organisation's process that is not yet directly represented; and
- conducting interviews with organisation members to 'sense the field'.

Also discussed in the pOD Tools section is how pOD looks at the presenting issues as an indication of the organisation's structure – for example, the concept that whatever is marginalised as becoming problematic. So the focus is not just on the content of the issues, and this forms part of the activity of diagnosing.

As a result of this, diagnosis is taking place with the organisation during every interaction with the client, and particularly in the earlier steps of the process including the initial meeting(s).

Both Mones and Schuitevoerder conducted interviews "to sense the field" in their case examples, with Mones synthesising her findings into a report, which she then presented back to the organisation. Schuitevoerder used this understanding to prepare himself for what to expect when he was facilitating the meeting with the large group.

In Diamond's case example part of the diagnosis took place in working with the management team – she worked with the team to identify the conditions, at an organisational level, that led to the conflict between two people on the team.

Diagnosing is described by Waddell et al. (2004) as the "process of assessing the functioning of the organisation, department, group or job to discover the sources of problems and areas for improvement". If this step is done well, it points towards the interventions required to improve the organisation's effectiveness (p. 87). It involves:

1. collecting and analysing data about the current operations; and

2. feeding information about problems and opportunities back to managers and the organisation.

Both of the elements of diagnosis described above are discussed during the case examples. The diagnosis performed by pOD practitioners goes far beyond understanding the organisation's consensus reality problems and opportunities.

Planning and Implementing Change

According to Waddell et al. (2004, p. 38) this stage of the OD Process is a joint activity conducted between the OD practitioner and the organisation. They design interventions that suit the organisation and the change agent's skills and make plans to implement these interventions.

In the case examples the degrees to which this activity was a 'joint activity' between the practitioner and organisation, differed. Mones worked very closely with her client, to the point of describing herself as being "led around by the nose", rather than being "more directive", which she would be now. Diamond was more directive and initially proposed a method for working with the issues presented to her, which the client then agreed to. In a later proposal she incorporated ideas from working with the management group. Schuitevoerder was directed by the organisation to first facilitate a large group meeting, and later coach and facilitate smaller group meetings. These differing levels of involvement by the practitioner in the activity of planning interventions may be a reflection of the field the practitioner is working in – their momentary facilitation style may be dreamed up by the organisation. This points to another possible diagnostic – how the process is found in the facilitator.

Implementing the interventions forms a large part of this third phase. As this makes up such a large part of the practice of pOD, interventions are studied separately in the next section "pOD Interventions".

Waddell et al. (2004) go on to suggest that this stage of the OD process includes "managing the change process" (p. 39) which requires the OD practitioner to work with the resistance to change, creating a vision of the desired future state, gaining political support for these changes and "managing the transition of the organisation towards them" (p. 168).

Schupbach was brought in precisely to work with resistance to change and speaks about gaining political support for changes. Mones spoke about working with the resistant of her client to introduce the change, based on his edges, and that the need for "politicking" was part of this process. Diamond helped the organisation manage the transition towards the change by working closely with the director at both a systems level and a personal level.

Creating a vision of the desired future state was not mentioned by any of the participants.

Evaluating and Institutionalising Change

Evaluating and institutionalising change does not appear to have much focus in pOD yet, although participants indicated this might be changing. Any references participants made to evaluation came as a result of my probe questions.

Diamond performed an evaluation when she connected with the client in her case example many years later, and sent him a case example of the work she had done with his organisation:

> So in a way I had a bit of a follow up. He was very appreciative of the case example, he was very appreciative of the work, and so I got some feedback from him. I wished I got it earlier – I didn't feel I should have waited six years. I would do it now.

Mones speaks about that not being a goal in her OD work until more recently:

> I think I was happy, to go in and make a little splash. I don't think I really thought, in terms of what's going to be most effective.

Schuitevoerder spoke about two different ways to measure change, which is a way of evaluating whether the expected results are being achieved. The first is via participant feedback:

> Feedback seems to be one of the most effective ways – asking people how they found it is often an effective way of evaluating.

The second is through seeing a shift in the organisation into its secondary process.

I'm interested in edge changes. In other words, when I go into an organisation, I recognise the primary and secondary issues in the organisation, and as the organisation goes over the edge, you begin to feel palpably, the system begins to change. And so I can measure it through a recognition of transition to secondary process in the organisation.

Waddell et al. (2004, p. 209) describe evaluation as being two-fold:

1. checking for the effectiveness of the implementation of the intervention; and
2. checking whether the expected results are being achieved or not.

Institutionalising change occurs by reinforcing successful changes through feedback, rewards and training (Waddell et al., 2004, p. 39).

The first part of the evaluation process as described by Waddell et al. (2004) was not discussed by participants. However, as most of the interventions were performed by the participants themselves and with feedback forming such a large part of the Process Work model, checking for the effectiveness of the intervention implementation was probably occurring in every moment but not spoken about. The same is probably true of the second step, on a moment by moment basis. Checking over a longer term basis was discussed by Schuitevoerder. Institutionalising change was hinted at during Diamond's case example, but not discussed in any detail.

POD Phases Using Process Work Terminology

The four pOD Phases can be described using the following Process Work terminology:

1. Engaging with the organisation;
2. Mapping the organisation's process;
3. Planning and implementing the change process; and
4. Assessing and integrating the changes.

The amount of Worldwork knowledge that can directly be applied varies for each of these phases. In some instances, where there is no direct application of the Worldwork paradigm, there is a hole in the available knowledge for this activity. Often this hole is partially filled in by the relationship and communication skills a pOD practitioner has as a result of studying and practicing Process Work.

The first phase of engaging with the organisation (entering and contracting as per Waddell et al., 2004) requires the practitioner to establish the relationship and utilises the Worldwork skills of pacing the primary process, building a container etc. Worldwork knowledge can be applied directly to aspects of the second and third phases – mapping the organisation's process (diagnosing) and planning and implementing the change process (planning and implementing change). As already discussed, pOD has many methods for diagnosing linked to elucidating the organisation's process structure, that go far beyond understanding the organisation's consensus reality problems and opportunities, as described by Waddell et al. (2004). Planning the change lies outside the theory and tools of Process Work, while implementing the change is one of Process Work's strengths. Not only does it have a raft of interventions that can be implemented here, but its awareness of feedback and edges facilitates the change process. As already discussed, assessing and integrating the changes (evaluation and institutionalising change), over the long term, is an activity which hasn't been high on the agenda in pOD to date, although this may be changing. Assessing in the moment is constantly occurring, and utilises the signal and feedback awareness of Process Work. Integration makes use of the concept of edges.

pOD Interventions

The third of the pOD Phases, planning and implementing the change process, includes the implementation of a large range of interventions. Performing interventions forms such a large element of the practice of pOD that I have chosen to study and report findings about them in their own right. This section summarises the interventions performed by participants by type, and then gives an overview of these interventions. The last part of this section gives a detailed description of one intervention – the group process method.

Interventions Overview

Participants have carried out a large range of interventions in the organisations they have worked with. To get an overview of these interventions they have been itemised and sorted into the three levels of an organisation – personal, interpersonal and organisational – as defined in Problems and Issues.

The table below gives an overview of each intervention and shows how many of the participants mentioned that intervention during the interviews. Whilst this is not a record of the all the interventions practiced by participants in their work, it does begin to give a picture of which interventions are implemented more frequently than others.

Intervention	**Mones**	**Schupbach**	**Diamond**	**Schuitevoerder**
Personal				
Coaching	x	x	x	x
Peer Coaching		x		
Learning Lab	x			
Work-life balance				x
Interpersonal				
Conflict resolution		x	x	x
Communications interventions	x		x	x
Team building/development	x		x	x
Diversity work				x
Training	x		x	x
Organisational				
Group process facilitation	x	x	x	x
Organisation structure			x	x
Policies		x		

Intervention	**Mones**	**Schupbach**	**Diamond**	**Schuitevoerder**
Systems alignment			x	
Strategic visioning & development		x	x	x
Myth related work		x	x	x
Organisational assessment				x

As mentioned earlier, Mindell (2002a) writes that "all levels [of an organisation] need focus for the organisation to work well" (p. 78). This is reflected in the table, which shows a relatively even spread of interventions being executed in each of the levels of an organisation. Group process facilitation and coaching were two interventions all four participants mentioned. Other interventions that were mentioned frequently were conflict resolution, team building, communication interventions, training, strategic visioning and development and myth related work.

It is not always clear which category interventions belong to. For example, myth related work is listed under the organisation level, but could also occur at any of the other levels. Likewise, diversity work could be a organisational intervention, and training and organisational assessment could be implemented at any of the levels depending on the focus of the intervention.

Limited information about the interventions follows. With the exception of the group process method (which is included at the end of this section), only minimal details of these interventions were discussed in the interviews. Data exemplars are only included if they have not been included in the case examples.

Personal Interventions

Coaching, peer coaching, the learning lab and addressing work-life balance issues are four personal interventions discussed by participants.

Coaching was mentioned by all of the participants as an intervention they had used in their work with organisations, and Diamond briefly described this work:

> We have interventions around coaching – certainly working individually, helping leaders and managers in organisations with the issues that they have.

Mones described the learning lab:

> The learning lab is something that would really be about a stress free environment where people can practice working with double signals, practice dealing with their own edges around picking up different things, dealing with rank stuff. Really where they are there to learn.

No details about peer coaching or the work-life balance intervention were given in the interviews.

Interpersonal Interventions

Interpersonal interventions cited by participants included conflict resolution, communications interventions, team building/development, diversity work and training.

Details about how to perform conflict resolution were not given in the interviews, with the exception of Diamond making the point that her conflict facilitation between two people was purposely kept short and factual. Schuitevoerder makes the point that he prefers the term conflict facilitation rather than conflict resolution:

> Conflict resolution isn't really the right word for me – it's really beginning to facilitate conflict and unfold it.

Communications interventions include those related to working with double signals, edges and rank. Diamond gives an example:

> We also work a lot with double signals and basic rank and signals. And helping people cross edges to really say and be straight, you know, learn how to interact more. We have a lot of communication interventions around that. That's part of the group process sometimes.

She goes on to give an explanation of team building, another of the group level interventions:

> We also have a whole lot of team work interventions, which are different from group process. Team work is more about everybody identifying their strengths,

> and empowering people to bring out their own different strengths and to bring out those of others.

Three of the four interview participants mention training as an intervention. Diamond describes what she means by that: "…you train as you work with a group – you share what you are doing as a training, so people can pick it up themselves". Mones spoke about delivering on-going training to "slowly work on transforming the culture, more internally". Schuitevoerder spoke about being asked to deliver training about group facilitation, and how to integrate the Worldwork model into their organisation.

Details about diversity work were not given in the interviews.

Organisational Interventions

Organisational interventions include group process facilitation, interventions related to the organisation's structure, policies, systems alignment, strategic visioning & development, myth related work and organisational assessment.

Group process facilitation is one of the interventions mentioned by all participants. Here Diamond speaks briefly about the one aspect of the method:

> We have a group process method, where we bring in the background ghosts and represent the roles that are more marginalised as a way to unstuck a group around something.

A detailed description of facilitating a group process with a group that have no previous knowledge or experience of Process Work, is provided at the end of this section.

Schupbach spoke in the case example about an application of the group process method to gather organisational feedback from people over an extended period of time and who are geographically dispersed, via the on-line bulletin board.

Diamond gives an example of what she means by systems alignment:

> Let's say the problem is like performance, getting people to perform better. And it's not just a question of training, and it's not just a question of better management and better performance evaluation, but you have to ask yourself, are all the systems aligned? Is the pay package, is the compensation aligned with the performance goal? If you want people to work better in teams, but the compensation package is based on individual performance, that's like a lack of alignment.

Strategic visioning and development and myth related work are mentioned by many of the participants. Schupbach talks about having a strategy development model, a "three day group process", often conducted as a strategic retreat:

> For example, now I'm in the middle of these strategic, off-site retreats. The next one is for a so-called 'small business' in the United States – a for-profit organisation with a $10m turnover. They want to break into a new market and are developing a three year business plan. I'm facilitating the three days of the retreat – I've developed a process-oriented strategy development model that I am using. It also starts out with preparation for where they really want to go and who the stakeholders are. … Usually the CFO [chief financial officer] gives a report, so I'll sit with the CFO to work out what numbers to present. What will they show

> and how do we want to present those? I go through every single detail regarding the present strategy. All of this finally gets mapped out as a three day group process, with different phases where we work with different individuals, teams and the whole group. It has a group process phase and a brainstorming phase in it.

He makes the point that in large international organisation, consultants are not included in the high level strategic decisions made by an organisation – these are decided before the consultant is involved. The consultant's work such as he describes above, occurs with strategic issues at the next level down – strategic issues that come as a consequence of the high level strategic decisions.

Both Diamond and Schuitevoerder spoke about strategy development in terms of visioning and strategy. Schuitevoerder referred to it a number of times as "visioning towards a strategic plan". Diamond defines this as a process of working out "where are we going, were are we headed and how to get there". They both make the link between the vision and strategy of the organisation and myth work. Here Diamond explains:

> Let's say the organisation needs help with connecting with who it is, it's at a big crossroad, so we do mythic work. Which is exactly what we would do when an individual has big questions about their development. We look at the myth and the deeper symbols, and the persistent ghost roles or allies of the organisation, and help it connect with its myth.

Diamond mentions organisational assessment as one of the interventions she performs:

> We have an assessment – we can do interviews and assessment. We can do things like helping an organisation by looking at and analysing the data, looking at what the members say. Assessing what people in the organisation say about it and then helping someone interpret those data.

No details about interventions related to the organisational structures or policies were discussed during the interviews.

Group Process Method Details

The details of 'how to do' many of these interventions was not discussed during the interviews, with two exceptions. The first is the steps of facilitating a group process with a group that has no background in Process Work. This is described below. The second is an example of how to bring in 'the ghosts'. This has been described in the section on pOD Tools.

Schuitevoerder gives details on how to facilitate a group process with a group which has no experience in Process Work. He starts out by running through the steps of a 'traditional' Process Work group process:

> Let's think first about the traditional group process, from a Process Work perspective. Say there's no topic, okay? You go in, you check out the atmosphere, you sort towards consensus, you pick up the roles, you work with the ghost roles, you unfold them, you look for edges and hotspots, and you help unfold the process. Then you frame during that whole scene – is that correct? That's essentially the Process Work model.

He speaks about having this model mapped inside of himself when he facilitates a group with no background in Process Work: "Now when I go into a group, I have that mapped inside me – it is me." He describes the process of checking out the atmosphere and beginning the sorting process with the group:

> So I walk in and I say to them, "it's an honour, a pleasure to be here, etc, etc". I kind of share a little about myself. And I say, "what should we do with this time?" … And I give it to the group. And I already know in my pocket, six or eight issues they are going to want to look at. And that's the advantage I have. And then I stay wide awake. Someone will bring up an issue, and someone will bring up another issue, and what I might do is say to them, "you know this issue looks like it's quite intense. And we have a whole bunch of time. Should we focus on an intense issue as it comes up, or should we try and get a whole bunch of issues, before we decide where to go?" You see we are just in the sorting process, can you see that? It's just organic.

Schuitevoerder then explains the process of sorting towards consensus, showing how he constantly gives the decision making to the group and frames what is going on:

> SS: Now if they say let's focus on one as it comes up, I say "great". If they say let's get a whole bunch of ideas I say, "let me put them on the board for us".
>
> HH: And what happens if one person says let's focus on one, and others say let's get the issues up?

SS: I give it back to the group. I'm facilitating, so I say, "well, it looks like we have diversity in the group about how to proceed. Well, how should we decide friends?" Or, "how should we decide?" – and give it back to the group. And the group decides how to proceed. Frequently, an early group will just choose to go with an issue that's hot, I'll say "this looks hot, let's stay with that". But if the group chooses to sort towards a consensus, at some point in time I'll say "do you think it's time to choose an issue yet?" And they'll say yes or no. That's it. They don't know anything about Process Work. … I'll say, "how do we choose?", and people will eventually choose an issue and I'll say "great, let's go with this one". And we've got consensus. And if we don't have, I'll spend time there. And say, "you know it's really important for us to really sort which is best, let's take time here. This is part of the community getting to know itself, or the group getting to know itself. No problem, let's take time".

HH: So you are framing it.

SS: Yes, I just frame it in a way that makes it helpful. I'd say "this is very important that everyone's voice be heard".

He outlines his ideas about picking up the roles and ghost roles:

Once we get there, we get into an issue, and I hear the voices coming out. I don't require people to move necessarily. If I've been with the group for a number of times, I'll begin to introduce role play … you know role ideas, from one side to another. But frequently I'll use it as a town meeting. "There is one side, can someone talk to the other?" Sometimes I don't even say that, I just say "let's hear

> your thoughts", and I'm looking for the ghosts. Almost invariably you don't have to frame a ghost or find it, it will come up itself. And you've got to catch it as it comes up, cos it comes up subtly and disappears. So I catch the ghost, I say "hey, that's a voice that's important, can you say more about that?" And we help bring out the ghost. And there we are!

He finishes by describing the process of watching for and working with edges and hotspots:

> And then I'm watching for edges, and they'll often constellate between two people. I'll see two people in the group communicating intensely. And you'll see an edge and I'll say "let's go slowly here".

He wraps the discussion up by speaking about the profoundness of Process Work:

> Actually, you can really do effective Process Work. I think Process Work is a profound model, and the profoundness of the model is that it's not a model, it's a process. And I'm following the process. I think that's why Process Work is so profound – it's actually what's happening! And then you're creating a framework for what's happening, and we're able to track it through the model.

Chapter 7 DISCUSSION

This chapter reviews the findings of this study and then proposes a pOD model based on these findings. It concludes with a discussion about the difference between organisational development and organisational change.

Findings Overview and Discussion

The findings of this study are organised into three areas – 'Ideas Behind pOD', 'Applications of pOD' and 'pOD in Practice'.

Ideas Behind pOD

When participants were asked how they would define process-oriented OD (pOD), no one definition was given. For the most part, participants were still arriving at a definition. However a synthesis of their responses generates the following definition: It is the application of Process Work and more specifically, Worldwork, to the field of organisational development. It identifies and brings awareness to the process of the organisation and facilitates the unfolding of that process.

There is an isomorphic aspect between personal development and organisational development, or, as Diamond put it, "there are a lot of parallels that are useful between individual therapy and organisation therapy, or organisational development". Importantly, there is one paradigm in the background of pOD – Worldwork, which a "process-oriented approach to group work" (Diamond et al., 2004, p. 9). The

significance of having such a well developed and all-encompassing theory behind pOD is enormous. It gives the practitioner a road map to follow in their work with organisations, and a set of tools to employ in the process.

Worldwork concepts referred to by participants were presented and defined in pOD Concepts. These included the perspective that organisations are living organisms – "we are always looking at groups as organism, organisations as organism" (Diamond) – with a process structure. It has a primary and secondary process, described respectively as "a role that needs to be satisfied, it's got goals and agendas and those have to be satisfied" (Diamond) and "the things that disturb them, and take them away from their intention" (Mones), and edges. The concept of a field, and roles and ghost roles – "things that aren't expressed get marginalised, and they get hidden and they manifest in terms of ghosts" (Schuitevoerder) – was introduced, and that facilitating the interaction between them is a powerful intervention.

The concepts of deep democracy and the ideas of rank and power were outlined, including the concept that "those who have power frequently, are not as conscious of the ways they use it as those who have less power" (Schuitevoerder). The holographic principle and the five levels of group or organisation life were defined – systemic, group, sub-group, relationship and personal. Organisational myths, "the individual and timeless character of an organisation, which is its biggest potential and source of power" (Schupbach, 2006c) concluded the discussion about the Worldwork theories outlined in pOD Concepts.

These concepts are all powerful in their own right, and in combination, give the practitioner working with organisations an impressive and cohesive grounding from which to work. A number of these concepts deserve particular mention. The first is the concept that an organisation has a process. This process structure gives the OD practitioner a total overview of their work with an organisation, which goes much deeper than the organisation's presenting problems. It points to which interventions will be most effective and enables changes in the organisation to be tracked and comprehended in light of the overall process. The second is the idea that working to help an individual develop, will develop the organisation – so, for example, supporting an individual to communicate more directly will impact the organisation's communication culture.

pOD Tools are specific and tangible methods and techniques based on the Worldwork concepts that pOD practitioners can apply in their work with organisations. Tools outlined by study participants included how to elucidate an organisation's process structure, taking a structural viewpoint on issues and techniques for unfolding an organisation's process. Five methods that can be used to map the organisation's process were discussed – the first two use the client's understanding of the issue as indicative of the organisation's process and see the client and their edges and problems as a reflection of the organisation. Viewing the consultant as a missing role in the organisation and as being 'dreamed up' by the organisation, and conducting interviews to sense the field were three other methods that were discussed in this study.

Taking a structural viewpoint on issues was another set of tools discussed, as these also shed light on an organisation's process. These included understanding that marginalised aspects become problematic, that personal edges can lead to organisation edges and

seeing disturbers as awakeners. Techniques for unfolding an organisation's process, the third group of pOD tools, included framing interventions from the viewpoint of the primary process, letting the process point to the intervention, the consultant going over the organisation's edges and representing ghost roles and addressing edge figures.

This overview highlights the close relationship between the concepts and tools of Worldwork. Later in the study the phases of applying Worldwork in an organisation were outlined, with these tools being used at various stages during these phases.

Applications of pOD

The four participants have worked as practitioners of pOD in a wide range of organisations, including governmental, non-governmental, for-profit and not-for-profit organisations. The organisations mentioned during the interviews included intentional communities, non profit organisations, NGOs, labour unions, hospitals and health care organisations, government organisation, educational institutions, small businesses and Fortune 500 and Fortune 50 companies.

Communication issues, issues around power and rank and dealing with strategic changes were the most common examples of problems participants named when talking about the kinds of problems they worked with in organisations. All the issues were categorised by content using a condensed version of the five levels of group or organisation life listed above – the three categories used were organisational level, interpersonal level and personal level. The majority of issues were interpersonal ones – these included communication issues, particularly around being direct, difficulties in collaborating, rank

problems, dealing with conflict, sub-group marginalisation and diversity issues – each issue was generally identified by a number of the participants. Dealing with strategic changes, an organisational issue, was also mentioned a number of times. Other issues in this category were only mentioned once, and were related to how the organisation was structured, including an issue with the number of a manager's direct reports and with an organisation having two different functions. Only one personal issue mentioned by a participant and this related to an issue of work-life imbalance.

pOD in Practice

The Deep Democracy of Open Forums (Mindell, 2002a) gives an example of an application of Worldwork, Open Forums, and outlines the steps required to prepare for and run an open forum. The question of whether steps exist in the application of Worldwork to organisations was posed: do steps exist that provide the framework with which to apply the concepts and tools – from the moment contact is made with the organisation until the work is complete? This was answered by summarising the key elements of four case examples described by the participants (Fortune 500 companies, a small company and a non-profit educational organisation). These elements were categorised to see if there was any alignment with the "general model of planned change" proposed by Waddell et al. (2004) as described in the Literature Review.

This suggested that steps are discernible when applying Worldwork to working with organisations. I refer to them as phases to emphasize their multi-faceted, iterative nature, and call them pOD Phases. There are four such phases – engaging with the organisation; mapping the organisation's process; planning and implementing the change process; and

assessing and integrating the changes. While these phases generally occurred in sequence, there was considerable overlap and feedback between them.

The first phase, engaging with the organisation, broadly speaking consisted of receiving the invitation to work in an organisation, meeting up with the client to clarify the problems or opportunities, checking for 'fit' between the client and organisation, clarifying what was required from the OD process and the practitioner's role and checking to see how much buy-in there was for that.

Mapping the organisation's process, the second phase, utilised the pOD tools of elucidating an organisation's process structure and taking a structural viewpoint on issues, to understand the process structure of the organisation. This diagnostic step began during the first phase and continued into this second phase.

The third phase, planning and implementing the change process, was a joint activity between the practitioner and the organisation. It included the planning and implementation of interventions at all levels of the organisation – organisational, interpersonal and personal. Given the large body of knowledge about interventions, these were described separately in this study. Working with any edges or resistance that come up and gaining political support for the changes formed part of this phase. The tools of unfolding the organisation's process are utilised here.

Assessing and integrating the changes was the final pOD Phase. Longer term assessment of the effectiveness of the interventions appeared not to have been a big focus in the past, although this appeared to be changing. One way of evaluating the effectiveness of the interventions was by asking for feedback, and a way of observing change was through

seeing a shift of the organisation into its secondary process. Whilst immediate assessment of the interventions was not discussed, feedback forms such a large part of the Process Work model that this would be occurring naturally as part of the implementation of interventions. Integrating the changes occurs by ensuring the all edges to the changes have been worked through.

pOD Interventions

The third of the pOD Phases, planning and implementing the change process, includes the implementation of interventions. Interventions mentioned by participants were wide ranging, and were sorted into the same three categories as those used to categorise the organisation's problems and issues – personal level, interpersonal level and organisational level. Coaching, peer coaching, the learning lab and addressing work-life balance issues were four personal interventions discussed by participants. Interpersonal interventions cited by participants included conflict resolution, communications interventions, team building/development, diversity work and training. Organisation interventions include group process facilitation and interventions related to the organisation's structure, policies, systems alignment, strategic visioning & development, myth related work and organisational assessment.

pOD Model

To conclude this study I propose a definition of pOD. The model is based on the findings of this study, and takes the conversation about pOD one step further – my hope is that in providing this model a discussion will ensue and more responses and more research will take place, and the definition of pOD will be refined. It may look something like I propose – or it might take on a totally different form.

Process-oriented organisational development, or pOD is the name I've used to describe the application of Worldwork to organisations. Just as Worldwork is an application of Process Work, pOD is an application of Worldwork. Another example of an application of Worldwork is Open Forums, as described by Mindell (2002a). My proposed pOD model is as follows:

pOD =	**Worldwork**	+	**pOD Practice**

Background philosophy	**Phases of working with an organisation**

Concepts	**pOD Phases**
- Organisations as living organism - Process structure of organisations - Field, roles and ghost roles - Deep democracy and eldership - Rank and power - Levels of work - Myths	- Engaging with the organisation - Mapping the organisation's process - Planning and implementing the change process - Assessing and integrating the changes
Tools	**Interventions**
- Mapping org's process structure - Structural viewpoint on issues - Unfolding techniques - Relationship work tools - Individual work tools - Inner work tools	- Personal (eg coaching) - Interpersonal (eg conflict resolution) - Organisational (eg group process and strategic development) Interventions form part of the third phase, planning and implementing the change process.

The model I propose suggests pOD is made up of two main elements – the first is Worldwork, the concepts and tools drawn from the main body of Process Work theory and practice, which form the background of pOD. The second is what I've called pOD Practice, the phases of applying Worldwork to working with an organisation. Worldwork is well developed, with an existing body of knowledge. pOD Practice is less developed, and this thesis begins to flesh this out.

The first element of the pOD model I propose is Worldwork. Worldwork is the application of Process Work to groups (Diamond & Jones, 2004, p. 9) and this provides the background philosophy, including the concepts and tools that pOD practitioners use. This body of knowledge is well developed and taught in the MACF, the bi-annual Worldwork conference, and Worldwork seminars and classes around the world. Many books (Mindell, 1995) and papers exist about various aspects of Worldwork.

In the pOD model I differentiate between the concepts and the tools of Worldwork. The former includes the concepts of deep democracy, roles and ghost roles, rank and power. These are discussed in pOD Concepts. The tools are those methods and techniques that are based on these concepts, and include mapping an organisation's process structure, taking a structural viewpoint on issues and techniques for unfolding an organisation's process. These are outlined in pOD Tools. Other tools such as those required to do relationship work or work with an individual, including inner work tools, are included in the pOD model, but not discussed in this study.

The second element of the proposed pOD model, pOD Practice, is made up of the pOD Phases and interventions. This thesis proposes there are four phases practitioners go

through when working with organisations – from the first moment of contact with an organisation until the work is complete. These iterative phases include the implementation of interventions, the activities designed and carried out in response to an identified organisational problem or issue.

At this point in time the body of knowledge about pOD Practice is at various stages of development. The pOD Phases are less developed, consisting mainly of case studies in the various websites reviewed in the Literature Review. pOD practitioners are applying Worldwork to organisations – but the steps they follow to do this have not been spelled out or documented. Some of the interventions, on the other hand, are highly developed and documented, such as the group process method, conflict facilitation and diversity work. Others, such as coaching and organisational assessment are being developed as more practitioners work with organisations, with very little documentation available.

The pOD Phases, the phases of working with an organisation suggested in this thesis are:

1. Engaging with the organisation;
2. Mapping the organisation's process;
3. Planning and implementing the change process; and
4. Assessing and integrating the changes.

These phases are discussed in pOD Phases and align with the activities of the "general model of planned change" (Waddell et al., 2004) – entering and contracting; diagnosing;

planning and implementing the change; and evaluating and institutionalising the change – as described in the Literature Review.

Interventions, which are implemented during the third phase, planning and implementing the change process, have been separated in the pOD Model as they form such a large component in the practice of pOD. They have been organised into three categories, which reflect the three levels of an organisation – organisational, interpersonal and personal. Group process, conflict resolution and coaching are examples of interventions in each of the categories. These and other interventions are outlined in pOD Interventions. Issues can also be categorised in the same way, as described in Problems and Issues.

There is a close relationship between both elements of the proposed pOD Model. Worldwork provides the philosophy that underpins the pOD Practice. Worldwork concepts are employed throughout the pOD Practice. The tools used to map an organisation's process structure, and take a structural viewpoint on issues are used in the first two phases – engaging and mapping the process. The unfolding techniques are used as interventions in the third phase, during the implementation of the change process. Relationship work and individual work tools are also used as interventions in this third phase, and throughout the pOD Practice.

Development or Change?

Over the course of my study, understanding whether there was a difference between organisational development (OD) and organisational change (OC) became important to me. Was my study actually an exploration of pOC rather than pOD?

Waddell et al. (2004) define organisational development as "a systemwide application of behavioural science knowledge to the planned development and reinforcement of organisational strategies, structures and processes for improving an organisation's effectiveness" (p. 4). They differentiate between organisational development (OD) and organisational change (OC) as follows: while OD can include OC, organisational development has a focus of transferring the knowledge and skills to the organisation, that will enable organisations to manage this and future changes themselves. Organisational development is "intended to change the organisation in a particular direction, towards improved problem solving, responsiveness, quality of work life and effectiveness" (p. 6). Organisational change, on the other hand, is more broad and can apply to any change in an organisation, including technical and managerial change, and social innovations. The focus of making the organisation 'more developed' is not a criteria in organisation change (p. 6).

It is perhaps significant that the Master of Arts Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change (MACFOC) program offered by the Process Work Institute uses "Organisational Change", rather than "Organisational Development" in its degree title. The program is described in the 2006 Student Handbook as a "post-graduate academic degree in the theory and methods of Worldwork and its application to conflict resolution and

community and organisational change processes" (Process Work Institute, 2006, p. 5). The subject in the curriculum which is most applicable to this study is called "Worldwork Applications in Organisational Change and Development", and looks at the "nature of change and growth in organisations, and at how the Worldwork model is applied within organisations" (Process Work Institute, 2006, p. 15). It is not clear whether terms organisational development and organisational change are differentiated in this subject, with references to both 'change' and 'growth', the latter implying some form of development.

Based on the differentiation given above by Waddell et al. (2004) I feel that this study is primarily an exploration of what organisational development (pOD), rather than organisational change (pOC), is from a Process Work perspective, as pOD best seems to cover what participants were referring to in their interview.

Chapter 8 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this chapter reviews this study of what organisational development is from a Process Work perspective. It then outlines the contribution to the field and makes suggestions for future research.

Review of Study

The application of Process Work, and more specifically Worldwork to organisations and to the field of organisational development is an exciting and relatively new area of work. While there are some people working in this field, they are in many ways pioneers and developing ways to apply Worldwork in this setting as they go. The literature available about this application is limited and no formal research has been conducted in this area. The Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change (MACFOC) was established in 2004, and includes teaching in the area of organisational change and development. The program adopts "an experimental approach in looking at new ways to integrate Worldwork theory and methods into organisational life", recognising that "Worldwork concepts and tools are just beginning to be used in a systematic way to organisations" (Process Work Institute, 2006, p.15).

This study sought to further the process of developing process-oriented Organisational Development (pOD), by contributing to the emergence of theories and formal documentation of this field and by providing a snapshot of the stage of development that pOD is at now, in 2007. The research question this study answers is: "What is organisational development from a Process Work perspective?"

The findings of this study were organised into three areas – 'Ideas Behind pOD', 'Applications of pOD' and 'pOD in Practice'. My review of the literature suggested that there was some writing on the first area – both in books about WorldWork (Mindell, 1995) and on various websites (Schupbach, 2006b and Diamond, n.d.b). Some applications of pOD were mentioned briefly in the books, and increasingly frequently so in the websites. The amount of information on the practice of pOD, the third area, was mixed – both the books and the websites contained information about some interventions, for example, group process methods. There was less information about other interventions, such as coaching techniques. Information about the actual process of consulting to an organisation in the area of pOD – from the moment contact is made with the organisation, until the final evaluation is complete, and all the steps in-between – was very limited, in both books and websites.

As my research question was a question of meaning, understanding and process, rather than a question of facts and figures, the problem was appropriate for qualitative research (Merriam, 2002, p. 19). A qualitative approach was taken for each phase of this interview study – research design, data collection and data analysis – within the philosophical framework of interpretive inquiry. The data for this study came from interviews with four Process Work faculty members that identified as working with organisations – Lesli Mones, Max Schupbach, Julie Diamond and Stephen Schuitevoerder – that were conducted from September 2006 to March 2007. The interviews were semi-structured, and each participant was asked the following open ended questions, followed up by various probe questions.

1. What sort of work do you do with organisations?

   a. What kind of organisations do you work with?

   b. What kind of problems do you work with?

   c. What's your role? (How is it defined from the client organisation's side, how do you define yourself? How would you describe the work you do?)

   d. How long does your work normally go for?

2. How would you define process-oriented OD? (If I read about it on a flyer, what would it say?)

   a. Is coming in for 1-2 days to work on a problem, organisational development?

3. What are the steps of process-oriented OD? What does it look like from the moment contact is made between you and the organisation and when you leave the project?

The interviews were transcribed and Microsoft Excel was used to manage the data. The data was analysed using a generic approach to thematic analysis based on Tesch (1990), made up of the following three steps:

1. coding data, finding patterns, labeling themes and developing a category system;

2. convergence and divergence in coding and classifying; and

3. interpreting findings.

A quality evaluation of the study was performed, in which my role as a researcher, the soundness of the study, ethical considerations and the study's limitations were discussed. My role as a researcher was explored, and my bias towards making this report highly structured in the way it is presented, was shown. Three traditional quality criteria – reliability, internal validity and external validity – were investigated. Ethical considerations including gaining informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity, data protection, dual role and intellectual property considerations were discussed. The limitations of this study were highlighted, the most significant of which being that there were only four participants in the study. Others included the participant selection method, the limited amount of time available to devote to this study, the age of the data, my lack of experience as a qualitative researcher and the complications of interviewing people more senior to me in terms of Process Work knowledge and expertise.

The findings of this study were based on the participant's views of the topics via their answers to the interview questions, which I represented as accurately as I could. The scope of the study was broad and as a result the findings only covered most areas relatively lightly.

'Ideas Behind pOD', the first of the findings chapters, defined pOD in a nutshell as "the application of Process Work and more specifically, Worldwork, to the field of organisational development. It identifies and brings awareness to the process of the organisation and facilitates the unfolding of that process". It then outlined the Worldwork concepts discussed by the participants: organisations as a living organism, process structure of organisations, field, roles and ghost roles, deep democracy and eldership, rank and power, levels of work and myths.

Worldwork tools were then described, including mapping the organisation's process structure, taking a structural viewpoint on issues, and techniques for unfolding the organisation's process.

'Applications of pOD' described the types of organisations and issues participants work with. The four participants have worked as practitioners of pOD in a wide range of organisations, including governmental, non-governmental, for-profit and not-for-profit organisations. Communication issues, issues around power and rank and dealing with strategic changes were the most common examples of problems participants named when talking about the kinds of problems they work with in organisations.

'pOD in Practice' presented the findings in relation to the practice of pOD. It proposed that there are four iterative phases of activity that occur when working with an organisation. I identified these four pOD Phases as: engaging with the organisation, mapping the organisation's process, planning and implementing the change process and assessing and integrating the changes. Interventions that were implemented as part of the third phase included organisational interventions, interpersonal interventions and personal interventions.

Based on all of these findings, the following pOD model was proposed. This model suggested that pOD is made up of two main elements – the first was Worldwork, the philosophy in the background of pOD. This provided the concepts and the tools that the OD practitioner draws upon in their work with organisations. The second is what I called the pOD Practice, the phases of applying Worldwork to the process of working with an

organisation, from the first moment of contact with the organisation until the work is complete, and included the interventions implemented as part of this process.

pOD =	**Worldwork**	+	**pOD Practice**

Background philosophy	**Phases of working with an organisation**

Concepts	**pOD Phases**
- Organisations as living organism - Process structure of organisations - Field, roles and ghost roles - Deep democracy and eldership - Rank and power - Levels of work - Myths	- Engaging with the organisation - Mapping the organisation's process - Planning and implementing the change process - Assessing and integrating the changes
Tools	**Interventions**
- Mapping org's process structure - Structural viewpoint on issues - Unfolding techniques - Relationship work tools - Individual work tools - Inner work tools	- Personal (eg coaching) - Interpersonal (eg conflict resolution) - Organisational (eg group process or strategic development) Interventions form part of the third phase, planning and implementing the change process.

This model provides a framework within which to organise existing and new knowledge about organisational development from a Process Work perspective. It makes it clear that there is a whole philosophy in the background of pOD, Worldwork, and a roadmap, the pOD Practice, that practitioners can use when working with organisations. It provides a simple overview of what pOD is, and a context within which the details of Worldwork knowledge can be placed. The model highlights the areas where the knowledge exists, and the areas where more knowledge is needed.

Contribution to the Field

This study provides an answer to the research question, 'What is organisational development from a Process Work perspective?', a question which has not yet been a topic of systematic inquiry.

Gap in Knowledge

As the Literature Review shows, little theory and documentation exists about many aspects of the growing and developing area of process-oriented OD. This study begins to fill this gap, contributing to new learnings in the field of pOD by extending the theory of how to apply Worldwork to organisations and documenting that by way of this thesis.

It is a first step of extended research in this area and identifies other areas where research and documentation are needed.

Importance of Knowledge

Identifying a gap in knowledge is one thing, but as Merriam (2002) points out, filling a gap is in itself not a justification for doing such research. Why is it important to answer this research question (p. 19)? Here I make a case for the importance of this research.

Contribution to the world. Organisations, and particularly large corporations, make a large impact on the world. They do this both internally, in the atmosphere and opportunities they create for their employees, and externally, in their interaction with society, their influence on governments and their effect on the physical environment. Any work which contributes positively to how these organisations function is important and a contribution to the world.

Process Work has an enormous amount to contribute to how these organisations operate, and one of the ways it already does this and will hopefully do this more, is through OD consultants understanding and employing the philosophies and methods of pOD in their work. This study contributes to the conceptual and practical knowledge base of pOD.

Contribution to pOD consultants. Providing information about what pOD is, where, when and how it can be applied is useful to Process Workers wanting to consult to organisations. It is particularly useful to those people who do not have a background as OD consultants, who require an overview about how to apply their existing knowledge about Process Work and Worldwork to working with organisations.

Existing OD consultants, who have their own framework in place for how they work with organisations, may be more excited by the existing Worldwork theory, which this study

only briefly covers. This study may, however, contribute to their understanding of how to apply and integrate the Worldwork philosophies and practices into their existing work.

Making public the work that the four participants of this study are doing in the world is exciting and encouraging for anyone interested in pOD.

Contribution to MACFOC. This study may also contribute to curriculum development and teaching content for future MACFOC programmes. It could do this in a number of ways. First, my study highlights and explores the areas of the application of Worldwork to organisations that I, as a student, did not grasp sufficiently during my MACFOC studies prior to this research. Secondly, it investigates and documents developing aspects of pOD concepts and practice, which may be added to the curriculum. Thirdly, it offers a model which could potentially be used to frame the theory as applied to working with organisations.

Contribution to Process Work credibility. Process Work itself benefits from this study through the choice of qualitative research as the research method. Qualitative research is an accepted form of academic research, and thus is accepted in the wider research community as an established and valid method. "Well-researched projects" says Jones (2006, p. 16), "add to the academic and professional credibility of Process Work, and help to develop and substantiate its theory and practice".

The detailed description of the methodology and my analysis process included in Appendix D may help future Process Work students performing qualitative analysis.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study is a first step, an early step, in the process of defining process-oriented organisational development. It is a broad ranging study and builds on the existing Worldwork and Process Work knowledge and extends the theory into some new areas. In doing so, it highlights exciting areas where further research is required.

My proposition of pOD Phases is one such area – the phases I propose need to be confirmed or developed further. One way of doing this would be to collect multiple case studies and analyse them for commonalities in these or other, yet to be identified phases. This research alone could become a book!

Another area is exploring what is meant by pOD coaching – how to apply Process Work's theory and skills into this increasingly popular area of organisational work. What makes a coaching session different from a Process Work individual therapy session? What extra knowledge or skills are needed for people with a Process Work background to work as coaches?

Evaluating the effectiveness of pOD would be another topic of valuable research – an example might be to take a few relatively simple Process Work exercises into organisations, and measure the results of the impacts on individuals – existing psychological measures could be used to determine changes in the individual's wellbeing and effectiveness at work, including their relationships with others. Or along the same lines, a study that held regular group processes with a team over a period of six months could track similar measures for each of the team members. Both studies could be

conducted quantitatively, thereby making a contribution to the professional credibility of pOD, and putting it on the OD map.

Repeating this study and interviewing the same people again, would yield very interesting results about how pOD is developing. Likewise, a similar study interviewing other people who identify as pOD practitioners would show how applicable this study is to the general field of pOD. Interviewing Arnold Mindell, the founder of Process Work about this topic would be fascinating.

Setting pOD in the context of the broader OD field would be another significant contribution to the field of pOD and to Process Work, in that it would enable practitioners of pOD to converse with general OD practitioners with some understanding of the general OD field. Additionally, it would enable pOD practitioners to understand the particular strengths of pOD in the general OD field, and position and market themselves accordingly to organisations. I begin this process in Appendix F, where I recategorise the problems and issues and interventions discussed in this study using general OD categories.

The topic of the study was extensive, and as such most of the areas were touched upon relatively lightly. Any research which deepens any of the elements of this study – the tools, the interventions or the pOD Phases – would make a significant contribution to pOD, OD and the world.

I will finish with two quotes from the interviews, which talk about the power of pOD, and the excitement with which it is being received. The first is from Schuitevoerder, speaking about his work with existing OD practitioners:

> They are unbelievably excited. Because they feel they are getting a tool which is so vital. And so many of them need it. So I think we've just got a remarkable tool there, which is really just at the beginning of creation. And I'm very excited to see how we go in it, over the next 20, 30 years. I think it's going to be remarkable actually.

The second comes from the interview with Schupbach:

> There are so many opportunities out there. There are so many opportunities out there. And everybody I meet is dying to learn more about it, and to get more involved, and to use it more.

REFERENCES

Block, P. (2000). *Flawless consulting: A guide to getting your expertise used*. (2nd ed.) New York: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Chenail, R. J. (1994). Qualitative research and clinical work: "Private-ization" and "Public-ation". *The Qualitative Report* [On-line journal], 2(1), 1, 3-13. Retrieved November 17, 2007, from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/BackIssues/QR2-1/private.html

Chenail, R. J. (1995). Presenting qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report, 2* (3, Dec). Retrieved August 17, 2007, from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/presenting.html

DDI, (2007). *Deep democracy explained.* Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.deepdemocracyinstitute.org/section/05%20what%20is%20ddi/

Deming, W. E. (1993). *Out of the crisis*. Massachusetts: MIT.

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Routledge.

Diamond, J. (n.d.a). Retrieved November 2, 2007, from http://www.juliediamond.net/about_julie.php

Diamond, J. (n.d.b). *WorldWork – Conflict resolution, facilitation, and group and organisational growth*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.juliediamond.net/process_work.php

Diamond, J., & Jones L.S. (2004). *A path made by walking: Process work in practice*. Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.

Dworkin, J. (2006). *Interventions levels for relationship work - handout*. MACF Lecture, March, 2006: Process Work Institute

Dworkin, J., & Menken, D. (2006, April) *The powers that be and the powers that are: Exploring the fluid nature of rank*. Retrieved November 13, 2007, from http://www.worldwork.org/Day-4-Jan-Dawn.pdf

Elden, M., & Chisholm, R. (1993). Emerging varieties of action research: introduction to the special issue. *Human Relations*, 46:2: 473-80.

Encarta. (2007). Retrieved November 8, 2007, from http://encarta.msn.com/dictionary_/organisation.html, 8/11/07),

Goodbread, J. (2004a). *Introduction to the Process Oriented Paradigm – lecture notes*. MACF Lecture, September 3, 2004: Process Work Institute

Goodbread, J. (2004b). *Process structures and how they express themselves on the levels of individuals, relationships and groups - handout*. MACF Class on 'Introduction to a Process Oriented Paradigm', September 4, 2004: Process Work Institute

Jones, L. S. (2005). *A guide to using qualitative methods in process work research*. Unpublished manuscript.

Jones, L. S. (2006). *Planning a final project: a guide for process work students.* Unpublished manuscript.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper and Row.

Menken, D. (2004). *Communication and interactional levels of awareness - handout*. MACF Class on 'Process Approach to Groups, Conflict and Change', September 12, 2004: Process Work Institute

Menken, D. (2006). *The different levels of focus of a group – lecture notes*. MACF Lecture, March 6, 2006: Process Work Institute

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam-Webster. (2007). Retrieved October 10, 2007, from, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/isomorphic

Mindell, Amy. (1999). *Coma: A Healing Journey; A guide for family, friends, and helpers*. Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.

Mindell, Amy. (2002b). *Alternative to therapy*. Newport, OR: Zero Publication.

Mindell, Arnold. (1988). *City shadows: Psychological interventions in psychiatry*. New York: Routledge.

Mindell, Arnold. (1989). *The year I: Global process work with planetary tensions*. New York: Penguin-Arkana.

Mindell, Arnold. (1992). *The leader as martial artist: An introduction to deep democracy*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Mindell, Arnold. (1995). *Sitting in the fire: Large group transformation through diversity and conflict*. Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.

Mindell, Arnold. (2002a). *The deep democracy of open forums: Practical steps to conflict prevention and resolution for the family, workplace, and world.* Charlottesville,VA : Hampton Roads Publishing Company, Inc.

Mindell, A., & Mindell, A. (2006a). *Worldwork terms, concepts and skills*. Retrieved November 5, 2007, from http://www.aamindell.net/worldwork-terms.html .

Mindell, A., & Mindell, A. (2006b). *Worldwork 2006*. Retrieved October 22, 2007, from http://www.worldwork.org/Day-1-Arny-Amy.pdf

Mones, L. (n.d.). Retrieved November 2, 2007, from http://www.processwork.org/therapylesli.htm

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Process Work Institute. (2006). *Student Handbook: Master of arts in conflict facilitation and organisational change*. Retrieved October 10, 2007, from http://www.processwork.org/MACF_Handbook2006.pdf

Sanghera, B. (n.d.). *Qualitative and quantitative research*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://uk.geocities.com/balihar_sanghera/ipsrmehrigiulqualitativequantitativeresearch.html

Schuitevoerder, S. (n.d.). Retrieved November 2, 2007, from http://stephens.home.igc.org/index.html

Schupbach, M. (2006a). *Glossary*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.maxfxx.net/glossary.asp

Schupbach, M. (2006b). *Hello and welcome to maxfxx*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.maxfxx.net

Schupbach, M. (2006c). *Transformation in organisations, communities, business, and the public space – An introduction into the perspective, methodology and attitudes in worldwork*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.maxfxx.net/ov.pdf

Schupbach, M. (2007). Worldwork - ein multidimensionales change management modell. *OrganisationsEntwicklung Ausgabe4/2007*, Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.maxfxx.net/my_publications/files/change-management%20schupbach.pdf

Schupbach, M. (2006d). *The trainer and facilitator*. Retrieved November 2, 2007, from http://www.cleconsulting.com.au/QLF/max.html

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York: The Falmer Press.

The OWL at Purdue. (2007). *APA formatting and style guide*. Retrieved November 2, 2007 from http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/

Tichy, N. (1974). Agents of planned change: congruence of values, cognitions and actions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19: 163-82.

Waddell, D. M., Cummings, T.G., & Worley, C.G. (2004). *Organisation Development and Change*. (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Thomson.

Walker, R. (1980). *The conduct of educational case studies: Ethics, theory and procedures*. In W.B. Dockerell & D. Hamilton (Eds.), Rethinking educational research. London: Hodder & Stroughton.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Wikipedia website. (2006). *Process oriented psychology*. Retrieved August 30, 2007, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Process_Oriented_Psychology

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Participant Background Information

Lesli Mones

Taken from http://www.processwork.org/therapylesli.htm.

Lesli Mones, M.A., is a process-oriented therapist in private practice and an organizational consultant and executive coach. Her central focus is assisting individuals and teams to develop the self-awareness needed to embrace and capitalize on conflict and use it as a springboard to innovative solutions. She is especially interested in how awareness of rank and power dynamics can help individuals/teams to become more accountable and get the results they want.

When the days are sunny and warm, Lesli loves riding her bike and gardening – she's also prone to having her nose is in a book trying to learn something new.

Max Schupbach

Taken from http://www.cleconsulting.com.au/QLF/max.html.

Max Schupbach, Ph.D., Dipl.PW, CPF, is, along with Drs. Arnold and Amy Mindell, a co-founder of Process Work. He is the founder and president of Maxfxx, a consulting and coaching firm that is active on all continents, with clients including Fortune 100 companies, International NGOs, public sector organisations and political parties. He is the founder and president of the Deep Democracy Institute, an NGO that develops and implements leadership programs in the Middle East, Africa and South America. Max has developed and led change management projects and other organisational development initiatives for Fortune 100 companies, government groups and NGO's on all continents. These initiatives include the reinvention of a U.S. organisation, a process that encompasses visioning, strategy development, and implementation. Max developed the subsequent change management program, including leadership training and coaching, large stakeholder group processes, the teaching and facilitation of community building practices, performance management approaches for improving productivity, communication and workflow, and goal-specific peer coaching training. Max's approach always reflects the unique nature and process of the organisation with which he works.

Max coaches individuals to understand and integrate the converging flow of the organisation's dynamics with her/his unique professional development. This results in career enhancement and greater capacity to achieve strategic input across hierarchical levels. He coaches leaders and teams from the worlds of business, NGOs, politics and government in Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, South and North America. He is an Internationally acclaimed keynote speaker and lecturer and has taught in numerous universities and training centres. Max has developed and is currently running a leadership training for the West Bank in Palestine. In addition, he has developed and is presently implementing a Deep Democracy Leadership model for the relief efforts of a group of International NGOs servicing client communities in several African countries. He has a

vast range of facilitation experience in diverse settings: from Serb and Croat groups during the war in former Yugoslavia, to U.S. cities on racism, and most recently, public open forums in European cities on the topic of Muslims, Jews and Christians living together.

Max brought Processwork to Australia in 1990 and has developed and led its training program. He has established Process Work training programs and centres in many countries, including Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Poland, Russia, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the USA. He has also facilitated the development of diversity training in several large business firms in South Africa. Max Schupbach grew up in the Swiss Alps and today lives in Oregon, USA.

Julie Diamond

Taken from http://www.juliediamond.net/about_julie.php.

Julie Diamond, Ph.D., a long-time colleague and student of Arnold Mindell, is one of the original founders of the Research Society for Process-oriented Psychology in Zurich, Switzerland, and the Process Work Center in Portland, Oregon. She is a principal co-author of the international training program in Process Work, and designed both Master of Arts degree programs at the Process Work Institute Graduate School: the MA in Process Work, and the more recent MA in Conflict Facilitation and Organizational Change.

Julie has been a central figure in developing learning centers for Process-oriented Psychology in Switzerland, North America, Australia and New Zealand. She has a private practice in Portland, Oregon where she works as a counselor, coach and consultant with individuals on personal and professional development. She also works as a facilitator and trainer with organizations and communities around the world, and is an international trainer in Process Work and its applications.

Julie's work as a group facilitator encompasses a diverse range of topics and applications. She has worked with communities, organizations, and non-profit groups on leadership, team development, and creating sustainable structures of internal government. Recent projects include working with trade unions in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) on enterprise development and transitioning to democratic structures, training government agencies in conflict facilitation in New Zealand, and community building and conflict resolution for non-profit groups and communities in the United States.

Julie has authored several important articles, books and papers on Process Work and related topics. She is the author, with Lee Spark Jones, of A Path Made by Walking: Process Work in Theory and Practice (2005), a comprehensive and widely-used text on Process Work theory and methods. Julie's background in communication theory and systems thinking is reflected in her writing on verbal and non-verbal communication,

group dynamics, power and democracy. Her first book, Status and Power in Verbal Interaction focused on power dynamics in group interaction using a network analysis of community. She has also applied her interest in power, rank and role theory to the issue of dual relationships in the helping professions. A recent article, "Where Roles, Rank and Relationship Meet," explores the theoretical background of dual and multiple role relationships from a Process Work perspective.

Julie's interest in the dynamics of groups and organizations finds her thinking about the intersection of psychology and politics. She has written several articles on the psychology of democracy. Her article, A Democracy Dialogue: Getting to the Essence of Freedom, explores how psychology's subtlest reaches expand democracy beyond freedom from constraint to the freedom of self-actualization. Julie is currently working on a new book, A User's Guide to Power.

Stephen Schuitevoerder

Taken from http://stephens.home.igc.org/index.html.

Dr Stephen Schuitevoerder is an international consultant, lecturer and facilitator based in Portland, Oregon. Stephen consults and presents seminars, lectures and workshops throughout the world including South Africa, Australia, Russia, Japan, Europe, South America, Mexico and the United States. He works with diversity issues, team building, executive development and organizational conflict and has worked with organizations in many diverse situations including facilitation for the United Nations to strategic consultations with corporate executives of both small and large corporations. Stephen is the President and a faculty member of the Process Work Institute.

Appendix B – Interview Transcripts

Lesli Interview – 26/9/06

HH: What kind of organizations do you work with?

LM: A wide range of organizations – it has changed a lot over time. I started working with intentional communities, schools, healthcare and government organizations, and currently am working with a couple of Fortune 500 companies.

HH: What kind of problems do you work with?

LM: You know, it always seems to come down to difficult relationships between people, regardless of the context. The problems get constructed around relationship edges. Perhaps people have a hard time being direct with each other – it comes out in all sorts of complicated intricate ways. I think that's always true – that all the issues get constructed around people's edges and then become organizational edges. And some, if they have a lot of money, can perhaps buy their way over their edges. You know, you don't have to deal with a lot of the really difficult issues because you can afford to get rid of people, they can afford, in the short term, to somehow compensate. And in small businesses and communities, they can't really buy their way out so easily, things are more on the surface. But a place like "MNC", one of the Fortune 500 organizations I'm working with currently, people are constantly changing roles and organizational structures are always being re-done as a way to try to manage relationship tensions – power struggles, issues of accountability, tensions between the US and offices in other regions.

All organizations grapple with how to deal with power. It is an issue around community living – where there is no sort of designated leader. Also in corporations with a matrix structure, where hierarchy is marginalized. Hierarchy really isn't popular today even in the most mainstream of organizations. People act as if there is no real boss – and thus all the power is marginalized. I think the essence of that really, is power, people are so edged out. They are afraid to congruently step in or out of their power. When power or rank does surface it is usually in ways that make it difficult for everyone to deal with—less tractable.

Until this MNC work, everything I've done is to deal with an immediate or pressing problem. It's been about a certain issue that's come up, a crisis of sorts, that they feel they need help with, and I've gone in there for a weekend, or a few days, or even one day, and kind of made a splash, gave a hand, did a group process and did a bit of relationship work, and that was kind of it. It's kind of helpful in that it shows patterns on the other side of their edge – but for me it is not really sustainable.

The thing I'm doing different at MNC is working on building a more sustained relationship/partnership, that's going to be about doing ongoing training to slowly work on transforming the culture, more internally. So it's different … my

intentions are really different. Training people to do the work themselves – day to day. In the past it felt to me to be more like a performance, you go in once, you do something apparently magical, in that the skills seem out of the reach of the participants, and then you are out of there. So this is kind of a different thing.

So that answers in terms of the role I see myself playing. I think my role now will primarily be around coaching, and facilitating, and beginning to introduce an educational process that people can really develop more participative, collaborative teams. I think that's the goal, the way to describe it.

HH: Do you see both types of work as OD?

LM: That's an interesting question. In my more skeptical mood I would say no – I'd say what I'm doing now is more organisational development, in that it focuses on on-going development and learning. I would say that what I did before was more of a therapy session for an organization. If you think about the issue of development, to me that's something that generally happens over time. Although a little hit over the head can work sometimes too. When I said therapy, I actually meant more like when somebody comes in for a one-time session. It's important. You can have a big experience, I do a session with somebody that makes a big impact on them, but what does it really do? What does it really do over time? Maybe you've touched something in somebody. I don't really know. Does it change how they deal with conflict, does it change how they orient themselves around relationships, how effective they can be in the world? I would doubt it. It felt good! I like feeling good.

HH: And they probably did too.

LM: But it's a feeling in the moment. I don't think we really address that development issue in Process Work, in terms of how you really build and sustain a developmental process over time. But I'm sure everyone else is going to say something different.

Because in a way, if you think that when you approach an organization, the first thing any organization is going to do is try protect itself from the new information. From change. Seeking homeostasis. That's just natural, a systemic thing. That's the first thing, when there's something new, that comes in – everybody has a tendency, at first, to protect. That protection looks many different ways. Right, it could look a lot of different ways depending on the culture. But there's that tendency to protect. And then something has to happen, where they can begin to take in new information, slowly expand and eventually evolve. But there's a developmental process there. And that doesn't happen in one day. Not really in the way that I'm interested in. Something happens. But I wouldn't necessarily call it organisational development.

But you know, everyone will have a different opinion on that. Everyone focuses on what interests them and each context calls for something different.

HH: It sounds like most of your work, other than with MNC, were basically one offs, or went for a couple of days.

LM: Yes.

HH: Did you check back with them, for a follow up, to see how they were going, for any of them?

LM: No, and I think that was partially my own … not really having that as a goal, at the time when I was working. I think I was happy, to go in and make a little splish splash. I don't think I really thought, in terms of what's going to be most effective. Like what am I really being asked to do.

Coming back to the what is OD question: Another organization I worked with, also over a longer period of time, was a women's midwifery clinic. It was a feminist organization and it had heavy power struggles, nasty. Nasty power struggles, between the woman who was the doctor, who they had to hire because they needed an MD, and all the lay people, and … really complicated. But I worked with them over, probably a 6 month period or so.

HH: On a semi regular basis?

LM: I went down there like every other week.

HH: So, would you call that more OD?

LM: Yeah, I would say that was. Cos for me there was really …they would try things, and I was able to come back, and see how they went. There was a process I was personally able to trace and engage with over time.

I guess the question is, do you call it therapy when somebody comes in for one session? Is that therapy? You know, it depends totally on how you look at it, right? So, if you talk about development, organizational development, it's nice to be able to talk about what is developing, what's the process? What are you supporting to unfold, and actually interact, you know, with that.

HH: It's a great discussion. It's not something I'd even thought about before. It's sort of like time is going to be a really important factor, I think. Or it might be…

LM: It's also an ethical thing. You think about, what are you doing as an outside person when you come in to an organization? Can changes that you point to and edges that you help people cross – are they able to sustain that over time, or are you just coming in and doing something kind of dramatic? And then you think okay. It's an ethical thing.

HH: I think we've naturally moved into the second question … how would you define process oriented OD? And, I'm also thinking it might be good to do that last, it might actually be clearer once we've talked about the third question. So, I had a thought… it might be easier for this third question, if you think of a case study?

LM: Sure.

HH: Would that be easier? I was thinking about MNC, would that be good? So all the steps from when you first had contact.

LM: Yes, I can tell you how it went. I had an ex-client who worked at MNC, who was on the executive team. Basically he just said, "you know I have a coach who has always done with me in business, what you did with me personally". Why don't you … you'd be great. So he introduced me to the guy who was head of HR, who

he'd been working with for many years. The primary team he was working with was having a lot of relationship issues.

I went in and prepared a little presentation about how I look at the change process and look at conflict and look at rank. The first thing I did was to try to make rapport with him. Then I gave a very short presentation about how I work with problems – my viewpoint about problems, as an opportunity for learning. And conflict – how most people tend to sort of move away from conflict, because they are scared of it. Or explode and make more trouble. That most people don't know how to use it, as a way to evolve and grow. And I introduced the idea that you really can't keep out trouble. That people try to keep it out and it ends up coming back in a more disturbing way.

So that was sort of like the general, first meeting – a process-oriented viewpoint of conflict and the value of disturbances. It's a huge paradigm shift for most people and it can be communicated very simply.

So we met for about an hour, and he said, "we should meet for longer. Come back next week, let's take two hours together".

HH: Oh!

LM: So I went back the next week, and I was all excited and freaked out, and prepared another presentation. All week long I prepared … but we basically just continued our chat. Pretty casual actually.

He was the head of the office in Europe for many years. He's been with MNC for 24 years.

HH: Wow, that's a long time. Is that common, just by the by?

LM: There's a lot of 'good old boys' there. There's a whole network of people who have been there – and these guys are in there 40's – they've been there since their 20's. They have basically developed their whole career at MNC. It's a totally insular culture.

HH: So back to the …

LM: He had been at his current job for 6 months.

HH: Oh, okay. So around for a long time, but just recently in that role.

LM: He was kind of freaked out with his new position, the tensions on his team – being in the USA, which is the headquarters, and his new responsibilities. Then this whole process began where, for a year now, of let's do this, let's do that, let's do this. I would prepare major presentations and be ready to travel across the world… then they would fall through. Change of plans … change of organizational structure … change of leadership. First he had all these grandiose ideas that I would come and facilitate. But then we realized the need to meet with everybody. To get a more accurate picture. So then I met with everybody on the leadership team and the one tier under them. So I did all these one-on-one interviews, and small group interviews and just tried to sense the field, and talk to many people, basically about

the same things around how relationships work, how things get done, how people deal with conflict.

HH: Did you have like a fairly standard set of question that you asked, so you covered the same ground…?

LM: Yes, I did.

HH: Purposely?

LM: Yes.

HH: So you essentially prepared yourself…

LM: Yes, I did.

LM: Then I wrote up each interview after I finished. After I finished all the interviews, I synthesized together all the information and put together a report – what was working well, what were the challenges and gave that report to my client.

HH: How many people did you interview?

LM: I probably interviewed about 30 people.

HH: Wow.

HH: Did it get boring after a while or was it totally fascinating?

LM: That's a great question. When it gets boring that's good because you understand the structure through the redundance. So when you start to get bored you think, 'okay, I get it now'. That started to happen at a certain point and I thought, 'okay, I get it'. Basically everybody is saying the same thing, and that is good. It's an indication that I'd been able to figure out what the process was about.

So then, after all the information was synthesized, there were going to be a couple of different situations where we were going to get together and we were going to present our findings to the leadership team. However, once again, it fell through at the last minute. I thought I was going to lose my mind. Finally, what I did was make a powerpoint presentation, and we gave it to the guy in HR, our client. He presented some of the findings to the leadership team . As kind of a taste as to what would come when we met with them next time they got together. He was a bridge of sorts.

HH: In the presentation, you synthesized some of the issues you'd seen and gave some suggestions about where to go from here, or was it basically this is what I see?

LM: Basically this is what I see.

HH: Right.

LM: This is what I see … it sort of implied different possibilities, I mean we gave the HR guy suggestions about how to go on, but not any of those to the leadership team.

HH: But they sort of, I'm imagining, somehow fell out of the findings?

LM: Exactly, it's sort of obvious, right?

HH: Why didn't you come up with more formal suggestions in the presentation?

LM: Because it was a meeting about a bunch of other things and the idea of this presentation, giving the findings, was to just to prepare for a meeting we were going to be going to, in Hong Kong, about a month later.

HH: Right.

And so it was more like, 'this is what they found, and they are going to come and talk to you about it'. But we didn't get to.

HH: When you synthesized your report, was that a written …?

LM: Yes.

HH: Did that have recommendations, or again, that was the same – this is what I found, full stop, not and this is what I suggest we'll go …

LM: Yes, we said, this is what we found and this is what we suggest, this is what a programme could look like, that would address that.

HH: In the written document?

LM: In the written document.

HH: And then the presentation was just, this is what we found.

LM: Yeah, basically, with some sort of learning points about conflict and teams and collaborations.

So it's been a year of preparation in a way. You know with people at this level, you can't "teach" at them. It's really about saying what's important and being really clear, and being able to match their primary process … MNC sees themselves as the most innovative company on the planet – number one, the best – and these are the people at the top of the company. They have a very particular idea about who they are and what they want to be reflected.

HH: And what's happening in LA?

LM: It's a meeting that they are having – they are just in a midst of a re-orginisation, and so the team that is considered the leadership is changing it's configuration a little bit. And this has changed how resources have been allocated, and there's a lot of different tension around that. That's one of the reasons for the meeting. They know that they need to be more collaborative. Because now the structure, the way it's set up now, is less collaborative, and more centralized. But they know they need to work more collaboratively, because of the fact that it's actually a more centralized structure.

HH: Are you going in as a facilitator?

LM: We're going to be doing a presentation of what we found, and then we are going to be facilitating.

HH: … for?

LM: Two days. Two days at that level – that's a lot of time, with them. Our client's going to help, so we won't be up there alone. I think the thing for me is, once we

get over the edge, I'll be fine. Once we relax. But breaking the ice is always … difficult.

And I also don't know what to wear.

HH: It's a big thing.

LM: It's huge!

HH: I saw a fashion consultant. She took me shopping, showed me how to put on make-up, gave me a hair cut. Because I just didn't want to worry about how I was looking.

LM: Smart.

HH: And I spent a lot of money, and she said this is what you need to wear.

LM: What do you have?

HH: Well, she helped me with my colours and things. So I described to her the kind of organization I worked with, and so we worked out where to pitch it, in terms of how business-like or how casual and where in between. Then she just took me by the hand and went shopping. And it was like, somewhere in-between.

LM: It's interesting, because at MNC people come dressed pretty casually, but …

HH: Not really? As in there's a little taste of …?

LM: Well, I think there's just an expectation that if you are a consultant, that you are not working at MNC, so what they want to see, in somebody who's a consultant, is different than what they want to see in themselves. They don't want to see themselves, but they don't want to see something too far away from themselves. So it's about pacing the primary process, and not matching it so exactly. They feel like if you're exactly like me then I have nothing to learn from you. Right?

So my high dream about where that goes is that it's a slow culture change over time, in terms of how people relate to each other. How teams work together. We have offered them a package: facilitated meetings (so that we would be there to facilitate), on-line learning, coaching and a learning lab. And the learning lab is something that would really be about a stress free environment where people can practice working with double signals, practice dealing with their own edges around picking up different things, dealing with rank stuff. Really where they are there to learn.

And that's not really going to be people at this level, they are not going to do anything like that, but people lower down the food chain might. These guys will do coaching, basically and facilitated meetings.

HH: How come you say that with that certainty?

LM: I know that from talking to our client, and who they seem to be. They not going go to go learn in an environment like that. Because they also don't want to loose face. They would do one-on-one. They would not do any other kind. Plus they also don't have the time. These guys are scheduled back to back-day after day …I mean

I spoke to my client last night, 8 o'clock at night. After his complete, full day of work starting at 6. They work really hard, they are traveling constantly.

HH: Everything you've just said, is that pacing their primary process?

LM: Completely. You have to find the doorway in … the way they can learn.

One overall point – it's a huge thing in an organization, to figure out what is their primary culture and what do they identify with, and where is their sort of more mythic and dreaming process. And what it really means, and what that looks like to help guide an organization into their more marginalized, dreaming, mythic parts – it's a different thing to working with an individual who is signing up for that. It would be a rare – I know MNC wouldn't consciously sign up for that. Maybe some more alternative organizations would. They just want to know, how can we be more effective? How do we make more money? How do we be competitive? How do we keep our competitive advantage? If you don't address that straight on— you're outta there.

They are like number one, it's bad if they slip to number two, and they are slipping. So, you have to frame so much from the perspective of the primary experience, like you can't make the competition go away. How do you use it? How do use the things that you are afraid of, and that are disturbing your intention as a business, to actually evolve, as opposed to getting more and more tight, and fear based? How do you use the disturbances in the field as information that will help you become more flexible and more nimble? And that's really what I see the overall goal being. And that's totally a change in thinking, to a more systemic kind of thinking, for people, rather than just this, 'if we push hard enough …'. That's really my goal.

HH: And the way that the actual processes are unfolding, sounds like it's very much in the moment. This is going to happen, then it didn't. So it's not really like how to get from a to b, it's in the moment.

LM: Completely. How I see all of that is what I talked about, in terms of protection. Is this going to be a good place? Is everybody on board? Because the man who is the boss of this team, is not into this work … he's scared. So everything is about politicking. It's crucial how you frame things. Central. So our client has really had to make relationships with a lot of people, and get really comfortable with us.

At one point, he was trying to make one more plan. I said, "I can't make one more plan with you. The bottom keeps falling out constantly, like, what the hell?" Finally he was able to say, "I really don't know how to talk about it with other people". So it was great to be able to go back into that, and help him. You know, you really have to work with the person who you are facing, because they will reflect the edges of the organization. He would get really excited in the moment, but then he couldn't really turn around and formulate it and talk about it with people. I think after that happened things started moving. In my own excitement and ambition I didn't really realize all of his edges. One part of him was really wanting to do this, but another part was really scared. He didn't know he was scared, he didn't know that he didn't know how to talk about it.

So, you can only look at 'what happens' – what people's feet do. He keeps dropping the ball – okay, but he's not dropping us, but he keeps dropping the ball. So what's going on?

To be able to be really direct in an environment where people aren't, is tough. In my last conversation, I thought that's the end, he's going to be done with me, cos I was sooo pushy. But it was fine.

HH: And in terms of the process that's evolved from first contact to now. How have you known what to do? This is the first step, second step, third step, and this needs to happen now.

LM: I think one of my biggest learnings was about not taking things personally. When I was taking things personally, I felt like I really didn't know what to do, because I felt really rejected, and was just swimming around in my own stuff. Therefore I couldn't see the bigger structure of what was going on, and couldn't use my reactions for the sake of the client. I was positively hypnotized. Looking at the bigger structure, it was easier to know what to do. He said he'd call me back in 5 minutes, and 2 hours later, it's the end of the day, and he hasn't called – it's nothing to do with me. For me that was such an outrageous thing. And realizing that helped me to sort out what to do. Does that make sense? Not knowing what to do, to me, is kind of like a defense. Confusion is kind of a defense. "I'm confused, I don't know what to do." It's because if you are taking it personally, you are protecting yourself. So when I'm not in that state I can see more clearly what the next step would be.

HH: So the thing you did, when you were able to see process of the whole organization was …?

LM: When I took myself out of it, I saw there's this whole thing where people are, as they like to say, passive aggressive – they say one thing and do another, they are not accountable – because they have a hard time being direct. That's what I found in all my research – that's true about him. He's afraid to be direct. People aren't direct, they are political. So I then crossed the edge, and I realized I wasn't being direct, I was being like a real schmuck, you know, so when I could be direct and say what needed to be said, my client was sort of able to meet me more. So when I went over my … cos you get caught in the culture of the field. Dreamt up. If you take yourself out of the way, which sometimes is really hard to do, and you don't take it personally, you can be more effective. You can use your reactions as diagnostic.

HH: I am interested in the process of OD. So, for example, you've already said, it's mostly unfolded in the moment, you [inaudible] the process and then track it …

LM: I don't know if that's always true. In this case it seems to be true. I don't know if it would be true if I did it all over again. I'm learning … I think partially because of the mystique of it being such a huge, well-known organization, and having got in so high up in the organization, it's put me partially in a trance. It's been hard to strategise as well, as I might be able to do in another situation, or take more risks, because of my own needs. I've walked more gingerly. So I think sometimes, in a way I feel like I've been led around by the nose, cos I've been willing to. I haven't

been able to say, "you know what, you do not communicate well enough. It has to change for us to work together". But because of that, I've also hung in, and it's been interesting.

The thing about being led from moment to moment, is partially my own … I don't know that that's the OD process. I think that's been the Lesli Mones and MNC process.

HH: And you think that if you were to do it again…?

LM: I think I'd be bolder. I think he would say "come to LA", after I don't know anybody and I hardly know him and I'd say, "no I don't think it's going to work, let's not go there. You don't feel safe enough with this yet, I don't feel safe enough. Let's just wait, this is what we need to do first". I'd be more directive.

I didn't know! I've never been in a company like that. I've just been reacting, responding. You want me to do that? Okay. You want me to do this proposal? Okay. You're going to pay me for it? Okay, sure I'll do it. So I was a bit of like a 'MNC slut!

HH: That whole ask/tell balance, is really complicated. You are the expert, but they also want you to do what they tell you to do.

LM: It's a really complicated thing, because he said to me from the beginning, tell me what to do, I'm coachable. He's said that so many times. And every time you tell him what to do, he does it.

HH: Oh!

LM: He does do it. But, I've never said to him, it's really essential you take us on this trip (Lesli thumps her fist a number of times), if you don't do it, blah, blah, blah. I've never done that with him. He's also a really powerful man and a really strong personality. It's also like you get 15 minutes with him, and you are rushing to get all the information. So there's always this kind of stress.

So yes, I think that's a big thing you point to there between being direct because you are a consultant, and they are hiring you to coach them, and yet …

HH: How explicit do you think that is? How explicit is your role, from that point of view?

LM: It's not so explicit. Except, that with everybody it's different. In a way it's like an intimate relationship that's developed over a year. It's not really intimate, but you know, it's a year long relationship. I think he has wanted me to be more direct than I've been able to be. I think if I was more experienced and I felt less afraid of fucking up, and less in awe of all the power, I would have been more direct. On the other hand, I think me being more amenable, has kept me in the saddle.

HH: I need to move us to the second question. How do you define poOD? If you had to write a flyer about it, what would it say?

LM: I would say that it's the process of working with an organization where you look at their strengths and what they do well, and that you also look at the things that disturb them, and take them away from their intention. And based on their culture

and what they are willing to go along with, you find ways to help them integrate the things that disturb them, so they can be a more resilient organization.

HH: Wow! That sounds great! And that's like at a conceptual level, somehow. If you were to take it down in terms of some of the applications, or something like that?

LM: Right, so the thing I really notice is they really like knowing what they do well. It's a deep thing where people are always told that they have to change what they are doing, what they are doing isn't quite right and they have to do something different. I think the more you can make the most of what people do well, the more successful you'll be, and the more successful they'll feel. So using what they do well – for instance, MNC's thing around being competitive, is what they do well. So in a way, the metaskill of using the primary process to work on the secondary things, can be really useful. So this thing around competition, and their whole thing that, no matter what, they are innovators – so framing, for instance, the idea of deep democracy, or everybody's voice being included, as the most innovative thing you can do, is the direction that you need to go with, them.

I'm going to say it a little simply – I would do it like this: "The numbers are showing that people are nipping at your heels, and to be really innovative, you need to draw on the wisdom of everybody in this group. Sometimes that's not such an easy thing to do, cos people are a pain in the ass, you don't want to hear from people". It's somehow modeling for them, that by listening to all the different voices – this is just an example – they will be able to capture something innovative that they weren't able to get to before. Or maybe didn't need to even get to before, when they were just number one. Using the primary process to really motivate them around secondary stuff.

Max Interview – 27/9/06

The transcript of the interview with Max comprises of the data exemplars included in the study and my questions/comments leading to his answers.

*****

HH: So there are the three main questions. One is 'what is the type of work you do with organisations', the second 'is how would you define process oriented OD?', and the third one is 'what are the steps of process oriented OD? What does it look like from the moment contact is made between you and the organization and when you leave the project?'

MS: Let me ask you something. Do you mind? Why these questions? What's the rational behind the questions?

HH: I came up with a whole list of questions, things I'd like to find out about, and had to narrow it down to something I thought would take an hour, for the interview.

MS: I understand, but why, I mean in addition to the things you say? If I would make a study on intimate relationships, my first question would be, "what is your first experience when you relate to someone, thinking about an intimate relationship?" Behind that would still be the paradigm, that first moments count, and that's what I am researching. Do you know what I mean?

*****

MS: I'm facilitating the three days of the retreat – I've developed a process-oriented strategy development model, that I am using. It also starts out with preparation for where they really want to go and who the stakeholders are. Usually the CFO gives a report, so I'll sit with the CFO to work out what numbers to present. What will they show and how do we want to present those? I go through every single detail regarding the present strategy. All of this finally gets mapped out as a three day group process, with different phases where we work with different individuals, teams and the whole group. It has a group process phase and a brainstorming phase in it.

*****

MS: The first phase – I'm a year and a half into the whole process now – is to convince those guys that the reason they are meeting with internal resistance, is because they are approaching the whole thing with an incomplete mindset. You can say that's a facilitation, coaching thing. A process might look like resistance to one side, as long as they don't understand the diversity issue behind it. What looks like resistance to the one with more rank, looks like liberation to the one with less rank.

And it's quite complex, because as you know, any group of this size, has a lot of internal political things. You convince one guy – you have a good discussion with

one guy – one guy buys into your model. Now the moment Mr So-and-So has bought in, Mrs So-and-So won't buy in anymore.

About a month ago we got the buy-in from everyone – great, we're going to go for it. Now we're developing this whole thing – it has large group process in it, it has small group process in it and it has coaching, peer coaching things in it. It has a newsletter in it. It has a bulletin board with the whole feedback system. The basic idea is – how do you create a group process, over a year and a half with 1400 people, that work in different regions all over a country?

HH: And the bulletin board with feedback system is one of the group process methods?

MS: Yes. One part is going to be an online thing, people write if they have different opinions – we don't like this, we like this, we don't like this, we want a different salary, this doesn't work, the union people […recording inaudible]. Then we cluster those as roles. So, with other words, that's a quite a big operation, with lots of facets to it.

Another thing I'm doing is I'm working with three NGOs. The smaller NGO is trying to hook up with the bigger NGOs. There's an unspoken rule in OD that says, the lower the financial stake, the more vicious the status battle in the background.

*****

MS: Worldwork is the overarching paradigm, that allows us to focus on long-term processes spanning the whole range of OD interventions, as well as to focus on a specific local issue, using the same perspective and interventions for both. One of the situations that I am working with involves a large international corporation, and includes teams and departments on all continents over the period of several years. Another situation focuses for example on a family issue of the local corner store. In both cases, the same paradigm and perspective can be used. And paradoxically, we cannot judge which of the processes will eventually have a larger impact on changing the world, because of sensitivity to initial conditions, also known as the butterfly effect.

HH: That's wonderful, having the same paradigm in the background. I've worked in some places where that has been missing, where they've pulled bits and pieces from all over, and there's nothing in the background holding it together.

MS: Wow. So therefore, so you can never say this went wrong.

HH: And I can never stand fully behind it, because there's something missing. It's like empty.

*****

HH: The third question is, 'what are the steps of process oriented OD? What does it look like etc.' As I ask that I have a sense it might be impossible to answer that in the whole sense, but that it might be easier to take a case study. I don't know, do you have like a model you follow?

MS: … One classical scenario in change management for an independent consultant, who is competing with a group of other consultants, is to be shortlisted. She might

get a telephone call from someone that says, "we've heard you do this and this, we've looked at various groups and you are short-listed. You ended up on our shortlist of 5 different people or groups. Are you interested in that? If so, would you send us a proposal?"

HH: And it has a problem definition, or some context?

MS: Yes. So that's especially for change management projects, not for consulting.

For consulting usually, you have a specific problem. They'll say something like, "we don't know yet if there's a fit, would you come over for a morning and say a little bit about what you do and who you are, so we can see if you are a fit?"

So they'll say, "would you come and talk with us so we can see who you are and see if you fit, if we want to use you as a consultant for a particular problem?" And I prefer now to say, "better would be that I come over and work with you on the problem." It's like if someone would say to me, "I'm looking for a therapist, how about meeting for a coffee to feel each other out, to see if we like each other, if we are a fit." I don't think it's as useful as saying "why don't I give you a session and we can see how that works out for you. So I prefer that to only going and explaining what Process Work is and all of that.

If you have someone who is asking for a proposal, you have an evaluator. This process is important for the organization, as evaluation serves to help the group to understand itself better, become more aware of who they are. Finding out who you fit with is like finding out who you are. Working together on an issue will bring that process up also, but with a framework of making it more conscious. So maybe a good way to work with this would be to say "let's work on it. Bring your worst problem, we'll work on it for an hour. And if you're not happy with it afterwards, you don't want me to be a part of it anyhow."

HH: It is great to hear about it! I love it.

*****

HH: How do you define yourself when you are working with organizations … who is Max?

MS: How do I define myself? I define myself as a facilitator whose task it is to help the group or the person connect to their myth. Their myth is not something like, 'that's my myth, and now I know my myth'. But the myth has a movement to it, a story line. It has a sentient characteristic, which means, it's also a particular groove, it's experienced as flow. It can be experienced as "the zone", which we know from sports. That's also the myth. And if someone finds that, everything will go better, or flow more easily. They'll work better, they'll flourish better, they'll sleep better, they'll develop new relationships with their competitors, and they'll have a new view on the market. Groups that are able to connect with that do as a whole much better. They have done much better financially and in terms of a general feeling about what they are doing. And it's all connected. You know that from yourself. If you are in the groove, it happens.

HH: So all the things that you say you do – large and small group process, coaching etc – somewhere in the background there's myth work?

MS: Yes, that it is a big part of it. … I see my task is to help them find the key purpose, and then notice it, and then celebrate it and then use it.

*****

HH: You mentioned all the things you do – coaching individuals, working with teams, strategic retreats, group process, your marketing model, your strategy development model, and your change development model. Would you call all of that process oriented organisational development?

MS: I think, really I would call all of that Worldwork. Process Work is the overall umbrella – that has the whole thing in it – but in return Worldwork also has the whole Process Work paradigm in it. And then Worldwork deals with areas that, to begin with, look like they are focusing especially on collective transformation. So if you think of things in terms of personal development, you think of the development of one person, one human being. Then there is collective development, which is anything larger than the human being.

What I call process-oriented organisational development, is Worldwork with for-profit and non-profit groups – either organized or networks – that are interested in becoming conscious about or working with who they are and where they want to go.

…

I think that whole idea of personal development and organisational development, as symmetric aspects, or isomorphic aspects is really helpful. It's contained in our processwork understanding of non-locality in psychology.

Julie Interview – 23/12/06

Note taking

HH: What kind of organizations do you work with?

JD: I work with businesses, mostly small to medium size businesses.

Non profit, NGOs

Government departments.

Intentional communities, co-housing or learning communities. Technical word would be associations.

Labour unions

Schools and universities.

HH: What kind of problems do you work with?

JD: Visioning and strategy development – where are we going, were are we headed and how to get there.

Team building, team development with leadership teams, and with other staff.

Executive leadership teams and staff conflict – collaboration, teamwork and issues like that.

And I've done training, straight forward training.

It's hard to seperate…; OD is often a blend of different interventions – mix of training, facilitating, coaching.

HH: Staff and executive leadership – are there some general issues?

JD: Leadership teams each have their own silos, and are used to being leaders of their teams. When they get with other vice-presidents or leaders, they become almost competitive. Almost afraid, fear of speaking out. Afraid to interact. Fear around disagreeing. People basically go along with things, they don't know how to disagree.

They identify more with their silos, operations leading operations team, IT leading IT team.

Collaboration – they're not used to it, don't know how to do it, not used to speaking out.

Staff conflict – entry level management problems come up a lot … staff and managers have conflict … people have trouble managing upwards. That's a big thing I see – people are not certain how to manage upwards. Don't know how to engage and interact and manage bosses, and bosses don't know how to empower people.

Audio Recording Transcript

HH: In general then, power seems to be a big thing you work with in terms of issues that you work with in organizations?

JD: I would say that comes up a lot. You know, it's sort of like if we were talking about individuals, it'd be like, why do people come to your practice? Well there's depressed, then they have relationship problems. These are the presenting issues. I don't want to make a diagnostic … I don't want to make too much of a big deal out of it, do you know what I mean? This is why process workers work with an organization. These are like presenting issues that people struggle with, it doesn't mean to say it's the sum total of what we do in organizations, they are like issues that bring people to therapy, so to speak.

HH: Are there some other "presenting issues" that other organizations have, that are common?

JD: I'm sure there are, this is what I've encountered primarily. I'm sure there are a lot of issues like strategy development, succession issues, leadership talent, leadership development. There are lots of issues. These are just the ones I've most recently encountered. There are as many issues that bring people into organizations as there are that bring clients into individual therapy, to create the parallel there.

HH: You mentioned that there are all sorts of different types of organizations and then these are some of the general issues. Have you noticed that different types of themes comes up, or is it really that we are all people and we all have relationship problems and we all struggle with our own power?

JD: No, not really. Certain structures seem to engender a certain type of process. There is clearly a non-profit organization structure, that is unique to non-profits, where funding comes from third party sources, frequently governmental groups or non governmental organizations that fund or fund raising drives. Or they are usually started out of activist principles or strong social justice issues, and so that creates a set of issues that are really unique.

You've got matrix organizations are very special, where you have got multiple lines of direct reports, multiple reporting lines, overlapping a lot of companies.

Structure gives rise to particular types of issues. I don't have enough data to make any definitive statements. This is just anecdotally what I've noticed.

And at the end of the day, yes, we are all just people and these are unique mythic issues relating to the organization, mythic meaning long term, chronic. And the resolution is often simple, basic people issues. It's not like a different set of interventions are required.

HH: When you say the resolution is often simple basic people issue type things, it makes me think the thing that might be special about working with organizations is that step beforehand, which is identifying what the issues are or, getting from their presenting problem to their next step.

JD: Certainly, absolutely. There are a lot of parallels that are useful between individual therapy and organization therapy, or organization development. The client comes, the client has a presenting issue, the client understanding of the issue itself is diagnostic – in the sense that it's not so much a description of what is, but a description of the edges and the structures and the roles and ghost roles of the client organization or individual. Absolutely.

HH: That's interesting.

JD: It's just like if you have a client of certain colour or gay – they are going to have certain issues that you're going to recognize. It's similar.

HH: So when the client is the organization, how do you 'see' them? It seems a client seems a much easier entity, there's one person in front of you, I guess with different parts in them. In the organization you're talking to one person, but there's also an organization in the back. It sounds more complicated.

JD: It falls under the theoretical framework of Worldwork, where you've got a group, and you've got people talking, one at a time, or you've got a similar thing. You think the person talking, you think these are roles, and there's a primary process, a role that needs to be satisfied, it's got goals and agendas and those have to be satisfied. And you look at what's troubling it, what's the secondary process, what are the roles that are ghost roles and how can we help facilitate a better connection between those roles?

Yes it's complicated, but we do it all the time with groups, and we are always looking at groups as organism, organizations as organism. So yes, it certainly requires a special set of skills, but it's not outside of anything we've already done with groups and group process and Worldwork.

HH: That makes me think of a general group work type question, which is not one I've thought about before, which is, you're working with an individual as part of the group, it's a special skill where you are seeing the whole group and the whole system, and yet you are still working with an individual. My question isn't particularly clear, I'm not sure if that means anything to you.

JD: Same thing – at the risk of being really simple, a client comes to you and they are a member of a family. They are talking to you about their family dynamics and family issues, and you listen to it and you think to yourself "okay, my goal is to help this person get along with their family. They are my client, they are the ones I get to work with. I can't influence other people outside my client, but I can help them with these edges. And what I hear from my clients are not just descriptions of facts, but also descriptions of their edges, that they need help with, and so that's my job."

And, depending on how they talk about the problem, I might need to see him or her work with the team. If it sounds like they keep talking about relationship things, and difficulties they are having, it may be that I need them to bring in the whole team. Or it may be that I can just do this one to one, and then help them with their edges. It depends on the person's role in the organization.

HH: I'm going to move then to question 1.3, which is 'what is your role, how would they define it, how would you define yourself?'

JD: Well, it's very different all the time. The word consultant is one of the more empty words in the English language. It's like 'whatever'. Sometimes I've been brought in to facilitate open sessions, like strategy or visioning. And sometimes people say, look I have team issues, so it depends, it depends a lot.

How do I define my role? People would say I'm a consultant, or a coach. Or I'm a trainer or a facilitator. The word is really not the more salient thing. It depends a lot on who brings me in. I don't think I can be more specific than that, I'm sorry.

HH: No, no, that's fine.

HH: And I'm thinking then, if you've been working with one person in an organization, and then they introduce you to the team, does that come up, what it is they call you?

JD: Oh absolutely, it's a very strategic thing what they call me in a team. Like I'm thinking about one business that I'm currently working with. I'm still talking with the manager about working with the management team and we're spending a lot of time discussing how he's going to introduce me to the team. That itself is part of the strategy. It's really like I'm working with him around his edges to him bringing in someone to work with the team.

You're really working with the manager's edges – if the manager knew how to work with the team, they wouldn't need me, so I'm working with his edges. So how he introduces me is part of the work that we're doing. It's not just like an inconsequential thing. Does he introduce me as someone who does team work, does he introduce me as a consultant or as his coach? It depends on how the team will embrace me, will they be suspicious, will they think I'm doing something on his behalf? So all of these things depend on the strategy to the organization development job itself.

HH: Fascinating. Moving then onto the next question. How long does your work normally go for? And I'm guessing that might change for different types of organizations. Or maybe there is something more general?

JD: It's completely dependent on what it is. There's all kinds of answers in that question.

One of the things about organizational work, that seems to be somewhat different than one-to-one work, for the first time I have a big difference here, is the courtship period. There's like this enormous lead time between, as you know. Negotiating what you're doing, what they need, what their problem is. Where it begins, when it ends, what's the scope? That just is a long process, for various reasons. It's rare that you'll get a call and you're out in two days. Usually you get a call and seven months later you're doing something. It's a long process of discussions and figuring it out.

A lot of times people don't know what they need and they don't know what they are asking for – they just know they have a problem, and typically they interrupt ... they

mess themselves up by trying to diagnose the issue and then they call you in to actually do an intervention. They say "could you come in and do x, could you come in and work with the team or could you come in and do this?" Then you have to back up and say, "what is the problem you are hoping the solution will address?" Sometimes you can and sometimes you can't get to that with them.

HH: Have you found that's the same with all organizations? I know that well for businesses – has it also been the same for non-profits, NGOs, governments, associations, labour unions and all the others you mentioned?

JD: I think that's pretty much across the board … I don't think there's a big difference there between the different types of organizations. I'm not sure, but that's just my first impulse, that's pretty much what I've found.

HH: And then once things are set up, once the initial courtship is complete, the actual work itself – I guess from the next step to when you leave the organization, how long does that work normally go for?

JD: That really varies. It depends on what's happening. I did this long work in the Balkans, with labour unions and NGOs, and it went on for three years. I've been called in to do a day facilitation, to work with a group on strategizing, just straight forward facilitation work. Is that organization development? Well, yeah, a piece of it.

HH: That's a really key question. Is that organization development work?

JD: Yes, organization development theorists also don't agree on the parameters of organisational development. There's a lot of overlap in what you're doing in organization development. There's working with the big organizational change process, there's facilitating. And there's working with all the processes of the organization, aligning all the systems.

For example, let's say the problem is like performance, getting people to perform better. And it's not just a question of training, and it's not just a question of better management and better performance evaluation, but you have to ask yourself, are all the systems aligned? Is the pay package, is the compensation aligned with the performance goal? If you want people to work better in teams, but the compensation package is based on individual performance, that's like a lack of alignment. I'm saying this is one thing organisational development works with.

Your larger question, which is how long? I said there's not a complete agreement on what organisational development is, and that's also in the field of organisational development itself. It's a relatively new field, it got a relatively untested methodology. There's a lot of debate over it, as a real thing, how to measure its effectiveness. There's a lot of group process in the field about that.

So just to come back to your question of what it is and how long it takes, really depends on what's being done.

HH: So in your own mind, if you went in to work with a group for an afternoon and facilitated a group process, would you call that organisational development?

JD: Probably not. Organizational work, or organizational consulting, facilitating maybe. Organizational development is basically assessing and designing interventions towards a particular goal.

To come in to facilitate something – it depends. Designing and rolling out training for a team? It depends. It's really a complicated thing. Like, for example, you are brought in and you talk to the HR person, and decide that there's a whole problem with the management team. And you want to design and roll out team development sessions. I guess I'd call that organizational development. I'm in an inner debate … I don't have a definitive answer.

Facilitating one single session? – no.

It depends on the length of time and it also depends on whether it is tied to a larger goal that you are also a part of. That's how I would get it. Okay, now I'm a little bit happier.

HH: So if we just look at the time component first. You've said one session by itself isn't organizational development, it's something else, maybe organizational work or whatever.

JD: That's what I'm saying – I don't think time is a good indicator, I don't think it's a meaningful indicator. I think it's what you do in that time. So if, for example, you go in for one day, and you work with the leadership team in that one day, and help them design a strategy or you help them with something and they work with their goals – I would call that organizational development.

So it's not time, it's what you do. It's the degree to which your work is imbedded in a larger goal that you are somehow a part of.

So for example, just to come in and facilitate a meeting with the staff on a particular direction for one project, yes and no. That's a bit of a grey zone. Or you're asked come in and to facilitate the conflict between two members of the staff – that I maybe wouldn't call organizational development because you're not brought in to help with an issue that then ties in with the larger goals that you yourself can help facilitate. You're doing it indirectly, but ….

HH: You're doing it indirectly and not necessarily with an awareness of the larger goal.

JD: Exactly, you may not be able to reflect on the goals with the people involved.

HH: Okay, so it sounds like it has a lot to do with a larger goal, understanding what it is and working towards it. Even if it's only a small part of the bigger strategy.

JD: Yes.

HH: Just back tracking a little, you said the work you did with the Balkans was over three years. What sort of frequency of contact did you have with them, how often were you working with them?

JD: I flew over there probably two to three times a year, for three years, for about a week at a time. And I worked on the phone with the consultant who brought me in, my partner on the project.

HH: And that person had more ongoing contact with them?

JD: Yes, that person was over there like several times a year, let's say. He was there a lot.

HH: I'm going jump around a little, because I've just had another thought around trying to define what is and isn't OD. I'm thinking about the parallel again with working one-on-one in therapy, and wondering whether there is a similar philosophical question around what is and isn't therapy. Is a single session therapy, or does it need to be something bigger? Do you think there's a parallel there?

JD: Yeah, well it made me think about mediation in therapy. You know coaching in therapy. I think therapy makes similar distinctions around the scope of the intervention that you are having with the individual. So maybe that's a parallel. If you come in to facilitate a conflict with somebody in their family, you wouldn't call that therapy if you are just helping them solve the issue of who gets the motor home, you know what I mean? But then, if you were to look at the larger issues of helping them get along better, maybe that would be more like therapy.

HH: So, this is a big open ended question. How would you define process oriented organizational development? If I was to read it on a flyer, what would it say, would be one way of tackling the question.

JD: Well, I'm going to dodge that and I'm going to say that process oriented organizational development is using process oriented methods to further the development of an organization.

HH: How do you go about doing that?

JD: Okay, let's keep using analogies here. If you were to say, what is process oriented coma work, I'd say, it's using skills and methods of process work to work with a comatosed patient. Same thing, same answer. What is process oriented work with addiction and substance abuse? Same answer.

Now if you said to me, what is it that you do with a comatosed patient, or what is it that you do with an addicted person, or what is it you do with a family, I'm going to have the same trouble as I have with an organization. There's a framework for understanding the development of an organization. There's a set of interventions we use that are designed for working with an organization.

So what I do, depends on what the problem is, it depends on who brings me in, and the scope of my work with them. So you see, I'm not going to be able to say what I do with an organization, unless we talk about … it's just like with a client – I can't say what I'm going to do with a client, unless I know what the client's problem is.

Unless you want to give the same very general answer that I would give if my father says, what is process work? And then I would give a very general answer – well, we follow the process of the individual, etc. But I don't think you are looking for that. Are you looking for that large an answer?

HH: Well, I think at one level I am, but I'm more interested in the detail. I need that, but I'm looking for something deeper. So I'm thinking there are a couple of ways we can do that. We could look at a case study, and go through the different steps, from

understanding the development to the interventions. Or before that, you said there was a set of interventions. Are they like coaching and facilitating and those sort of things? Maybe you could list those as a beginning point.

JD: Well, let's see now. We do a lot of basic group development work, where we help a group get over an edge. Or say the visioning – let's say the organization needs help with connecting with who it is, it's at a big crossroad, so we do mythic work. Which is exactly what we would do when an individual has big questions about their development. We look at the myth and the deeper symbols, and the persistent ghost roles or allies of the organization, and help it connect with its myth.

And we have a group process method, where we bring in the background ghosts and represent the roles that are more marginalized as a way to unstuck a group around something. We also work a lot with double signals and basic rank and signals. And helping people cross edges to really say and be straight, you know, learn how to interact more. We have a lot of communication interventions around that. That's part of the group process sometimes.

We also have a whole lot of team work interventions, which are different from group process. Team work is more about everybody identifying their strengths, and empowering people to bring out their own different strengths and to bring out those of others.

We have interventions around coaching – certainly working individually, helping leaders and managers in organizations with the issues that they have. So we do coaching.

Training is definitely in the organizational [inaubible], where you train as you work with a group – you share what you are doing as a training, so people can pick it up themselves.

We have an assessment – we can do interviews and assessment.

We can do things like helping an organization by looking at and analyzing the data, looking at what the members say. Assessing what people in the organization say about it and then helping someone interpret those data. So there's lots of different ways we can work with a group.

HH: That's great, that's wonderful. And then stepping back, you said there's a framework for understanding the development of the organization. Can you elaborate?

JD: The framework that we typically use is the Worldwork framework, where we look in terms of roles and ghost roles and we look in terms of the long term dynamics and pressures and influences that are part of the organization's wholeness. We work to give back the sense of wholeness to the organization, so they feel more empowered, so they have a deeper connection to their different parts. Including all stakeholders – clients, customers, shareholders – all the various parts of an organization.

HH: The next question goes into the specific details again. What are the steps of process oriented OD? What does it look like from the moment contact is made between you

and the organization and when you leave the project? I'm thinking, as a suggestion here, that you think of one particular organization you've worked with, and we work from the beginning to the end with that one, as a possible way of doing that.

JD: I just want to say as an interview meta-comment, there really is no … like with an individual, you can't say every client comes in and here's how it goes. That's not how we talk about process work, so we wouldn't talk about organization development work that way either. And organization development itself depends on what the basic problem is.

If we do talk about one case, which I think is a better way to do it, it's important that it's not formulated as though this is how it's done in every situation. Are you with me there?

HH: Totally. And I think the levels are important here. I'm sure there's still a beginning phase, a middle phase and an end phase, which are going to be similar. At a high enough level, there is making the initial contact, getting some understanding around what the identified problem is, coming up with interventions. There'll be something like that at a very high level, I think?

JD: Beyond what you just said, I don't think so. The organizational project in the Balkans ended because the funding was cut. So how things end is very different. Organizations are also really rapid and radical – things change from one minute to the next. A memo comes down and suddenly the person you were working with is gone! We were working with an HR person, and suddenly he's gone. That's it, he's been moved. And it's like, oh, okay.

So yes, you come in, you have an initial conversation. One of the things I do, and how I think, is that I ask myself, who's bringing me in and what's their relationship with the organization? And what are the edges they have and what are the problems they have? How is that related to the organization? How are the issues that they are having or the problems that they have, exactly what the organization has?

And who's upset that I'm in? What are the different roles? Who's happy I'm in, who's upset that I'm in? This person is having trouble with some part of the organization, and who am I meant to solve, by my presence? So I think about it that way – that's part of my initial entry into an organization – to think about myself as part of what the person is attempting to do. And that for me is a big piece of my strategy.

Then we talk and think about what the problem is, and what wants to happen? But sometimes people come in and they don't want to talk about the problem. They have a very specific something that they want you to do. And sometimes they just need help to figure that out, as well. And maybe what you are doing for a while, is just coaching, or you are just working with them on brainstorming what the problems are.

For a large part of what I did in the Balkans, I worked with my partner, on the project itself. And trying to brainstorm about how the project was going, where were the problems, how the problems could be solved. And in particular, some of

the dynamics between the different cultural groups – communist, post communist culture, labour culture, western Europe versus eastern Europe culture, poor versus rich, east versus west, those sort of things. So brainstorming on how to negotiate those cultural differences. So that was a lot of that work, figuring things out, as well as coaching and providing support. There was also working with facilitating some of the dynamics between the different factions of the NGO's, as they came together. So very, very different. That particular project had one goal in mind. It was designing and developing an enterprise development project, for labour unions and former republics of Yugoslavia.

HH: Could you think about one organization, and maybe more of a business type, or industry type organization and go through the steps from woe to go with them?

JD: That's a harder one.

HH: That's harder?

JD: Well, there are two of them I'm in the middle of, so I can't really say where I'm going. Is there a reason why you wanted it to be private industry as opposed to NGOS? Is it because of your own private interest?

HH: Yes. But if that's going to be difficult, it needn't be.

JD: Well, one got stopped because someone got promoted. Two I'm in the middle of. And two to three others were short term things that I did – like facilitating a conflict, and a visioning.

There was a small company and I worked with a conflict in the leadership team. The conflict reflected problems they had in the structure of their company, so I helped them make a link between the conflict and then changes in the organization itself. It was a small process, a small project.

It began with a meeting with the director of the company, and …

HH: Was the director the person who invited you in?

JD: Yes. I met with that person several times, and discussed the issue. Then, after hearing the issue and discussing it with him in detail, I proposed a method for how to work with it, based on what he told me about the company, the people involved, and everything.

I proposed that we sit together with the management staff and that we look at the conflict that emerged. It was one particular conflict that came up, a pretty heavy conflict that came up between two people in the management team – and we actually try to mediate or facilitate that conflict.

But also, we did two other things with that. We looked at the conditions that led to that conflict, and how they were part of a problem in the organization itself, that the individuals were in a way on a collision course based on a lack of clarity in the organization, and so their conflict wasn't just personal. We looked at different ways we could solve that, organizationally. Through certain types of training and also through certain organisational changes, like structural changes in the organization. So, I proposed that to him, and sent it as a proposal, and he said yes.

Then we met with the team, and did that, and then we followed up with the training aspect as I recommended, and then I worked personally with him. I wrote up my suggestions for changes in the organization. Structural changes, and how to follow up with that. Including promotional materials, how people report to one another and things like that. And that was it. It took all of a couple of weeks from start to finish.

HH: Did you then have some sort of assessment of how it went?

JD: You know I did – at the time I didn't assess how it went – I would now. This was about 6 years ago, and I hadn't done a whole lot – and I still haven't done that much – and I didn't follow up or do an assessment. I guess an assessment of myself is what you are talking about, right?

HH: And the effectiveness of the work.

JD: That's what I meant - a follow-up. I didn't do that, but an interesting thing happened. I had an opportunity to talk to this person recently, for another reason. As we were just chatting, I said how is it going? He gave me an update on the whole process.

I had actually written it up. I had written up a bunch of case studies, and wanted to put it up on a website – I ended up not putting it up on my website, because there were some sensitive issues and I felt a little awkward putting it up. But I had written it up, and I said, it's funny, I wrote up a case study of that for my website, I wanted to ask you permission for putting it up, would you mind reading it? He said, I'd love to. So I sent it to him. So in a way I had a bit of a follow up. He was very appreciative of the case study, he was very appreciative of the work, and so I got some feedback from him. I wished I got it earlier – I didn't feel I should have waited six years. I would do it now.

HH: And when you say he was appreciative of the case study, he was appreciative of the work that you did, in retrospect he could see how it had had an impact, and how something had changed?

JD: Yeah, and he also just really liked reading about it. He really enjoyed hearing about it from another source. He enjoyed reviewing it more academically, more theoretically, so that's what he liked. It was a really good thing. Which made me think, wow, I bet people would really like that. It would be a good thing to do.

HH: I think it's a little bit like being a client. It can sometimes be interesting being in the middle of it, and a day or two later you think, wow, I know I got it at the time, but what was it? I'm guessing having it written as a case study just to get back in touch with it all again and seeing it from outsiders eyes, is great.

I'm going to backtrack a little in some of the things you said in that process – that was fantastic, thanks Julie. After you spoke with him and understood the issues and came up with a proposal – was that a written proposal?

JD: Yes.

HH: And then one of the parts of the proposal was to sit together with the management staff and look at the problem and the conflict that emerged. And at one level it

looked like it was between two people on the team, and you worked with the two people in the team, in the larger group? Were the rest of the people there?

JD: Yes, in the larger group. But briefly and rapidly – it wasn't like a long drawn out relationship conflict. It was short, and factual. There's not a lot of tolerance, you know you can't really spend a lot of time going deep into people's emotions, feelings and issues. It's very counter-productive in a team, in a business.

HH: How long was it when you say 'very short'?

JD: Well we talked about the conflict, and finishing up the actual conflict between the people, I don't know, took like between 20, 30, 40 minutes.

Then we moved into the discussion of looking at it more in terms of the larger team and what happened, and how to understand that.

HH: And you did all of that in one session with the larger group?

JD: That was all one session, yeah.

HH: The main intervention with the people other than the director, all happened in one sitting?

JD: He was present, he was a part of it. The conflict focused on two people. Working directly with those two people on what happened and all that stuff was short. It then more rapidly went into a discussion about the whole team, and what the conflict meant for the whole team. And how it was a reflection of certain larger organizational dynamics, and how we could resolve that and what people thought about that.

Then there were certain training issues. That was a second session. And then there was a follow up on organizational structures – that was a meeting and a session and a written report and a couple of individual sessions with the director.

HH: Is there anything in what we've talked about today for you where I possibly moved us onto the next question too quickly, and you thought you had more to say about anything?

JD: I don't think so. I notice it was hard to talk about steps, like what are the typical steps. If we keep using the analogy of a client it sheds a light on it – there shouldn't really be a difference structurally between an individual client and an organizational client, a group client. So the actual steps of what you do with someone, was hard for me to get to. But I'm glad you pushed on that.

HH: I think we did get to some specific steps for the organization you used as a case study, and I understand it's not going to be the same for each organization, but in retrospect there are some specific steps and phases. You can see the story-line so to speak.

JD: Yes, that's useful for certain things, that's right.

But otherwise no, I don't have anything that pops up that I want to go back to or that I feel unfinished with.

HH: Well I think then for now Julie, that's been totally wonderful and there's a lot of great information in there, and I'm going to need to sit with it and put it into an internal framework and see where I go from there.

JD: Great, good, I'm glad. That's helpful. Have you found a consistency in answers among people? I'm quite curious. Or are you not allowed to say?

HH: There's a little bit of ... some consistency and some not. I think what I'm noticing is it very much depends on the person I'm interviewing.

JD: Sure.

HH: Actually, I don't think I'm ready yet to synthesize it in any coherent way.

JD: That was bad question!

HH: It's a good question, I'm just not ready to answer it yet!

JD: It's a naughty question. I'm curious in the learning, just like you are. Thank you for doing it too, thank you so much for doing it, and I look forward to seeing what you got in the end.

HH: Thank you for your appreciation, I'm looking forward to it too. It's such a big field, that I'm trying to go down a similar track with each person, so I can answer it from one point of view. Because I get the feeling that if I go down a different track with each person …

JD: You're going to get too many different views on it…

HH: That's right. It's challenging, as all research is, almost at a structural level.

JD: It's also uncertain, whether it is a new field, or is it just a new application? I feel like, for me, I know that process work has branched into new applications about once every five years. A major new application that starts to emerge – it deepens the theory, but it never changes it.

It's never like, oh, okay, process oriented coma work is this, and it's completely different and you need to learn a new set of theories or a new set of skills. It's the same transferable set of skills, so I'm guided by that thought when I'm doing this work.

When I try to think about what I'm doing with organizations, I go back to, okay, it's an application and what does that mean and how is that an application? Because it just looks different… the landscape looks different. Maybe the landscape looks more different, and the landscape makes us think that it's a much more different thing, but I don't think it's all that different. So, we'll see though.

Stephen Interview – 7/4/07

HH: What kind of organizations do you work with?

SS: What kind of organizations? I've worked with fairly small, and mid sized non-profits. I've also worked with international non-profits, such as the United Nations, and I've worked with small to mid size colleges, often in health oriented and social change projects, like native corporations. I've also worked for for-profit organizations, ranging from fairly small – mainly where their businesses have grown and they have to manage a number of people – so really small kinds of corporations, to fairly significant corporations, large multi-nationals.

HH: And what kind of problems do you work with?

SS: Mostly it seems that I'm pulled in when there's either individual, relationship, team or systems challenges, and mostly they are of an inter-personal nature. So when it's seen that what is required is a focus on an interpersonal or communication level. Whether it's team building, whether it's conflict resolution, whether it's whole organizational change, whether it's visioning or strategic planning. So those are the kind of things. Whether it's a deepening of interpersonal interactions that's required between people. So it seems to be mostly in the communications sphere that I've been pulled in. I've also been brought in for skill development and diversity work – so again, interpersonal work.

HH: So when you say interpersonal work, does some of that include conflict resolution?

SS: Conflict resolution isn't really the right word for me – it's really beginning to facilitate conflict and unfold it. Frequently in organizations, conflict is underground. So when I go into an organization, often there's a tension, there are symptoms. For example, you get this huge attrition in organizations, or you get tensions or problems or gossip in the office. Those are some of the symptoms that are indicative of troubles. Or you get unhappiness, people not showing up for meetings, that kind of representation. It's the kind of thing where the organization knows it's in trouble, but it doesn't know how to access it. And that's frequently when I get called in. Or when an organization wants to develop further.

HH: Develop, develop economically?

SS: Well, the way I frame it is really important – it's interesting, because organizations these days have the whole idea of the triple bottom line. So mostly the framing is that it does impact the bottom line, but it might not always impact finances. It might impact people in the organization, it might impact the social realm that the organization is involved in. So the way I would frame it depends on the orientation and motivation of bringing me in.

So I don't care how I work with people, the most important thing is that people are worked with, and that people are happier in organizations. What I know about that is that if people are happier they are more productive and more effective. So that's what I'm interested in cultivating. And if they have been more effective then of

course financially that impacts the organization too – they make more money. I'm happy to frame it anyway people want!

HH: That makes sense. And when you say you get pulled in for individual relationships and team challenges, are there any sort of challenges that seem to come up over and over again?

SS: Well, there are a number of factors that are really interesting in relationship to Process Work. One of the things that typically comes up in organization, is rank problems. And it comes when there's a very strong, frequently authoritarian style, or a style that doesn't like expression of people that are direct reports to the manager. So, sometimes unconsciousness of relative power that is held within the organization becomes problematic.

So that's one of the typical things that happens, and one of the frequent edges I come across is people being able to communicate directly to their managers. That's just one of the edges that's really very common.

HH: Yes. Are there others?

SS: Well, there are a number of major themes that happen in organization. There is frequently gender issues, in the background, there's frequently diversity issues, not necessarily only around race – sexual orientation, of course gender, as I just mentioned. You'll get issues of homophobia – I've worked with organizations around homophobia. Also work-life balance, is a huge issue in organizations.

What are the other themes? Then it starts specializing depending on the organization itself. It could be because there's a manager who is problematic, or an executive creates trouble. Even if you get rid of the individual, you've still got to work through that process with the organization.

Another one that typically occurs, is where one group in the organization feels marginalized, whether it's because they have lower rank – they have this role which is less recognized, and they feel under-appreciated, because they come from a marginalized group – or because they might have a different nationality. I had an interesting situation with a different nationality. It was an organization where a significant and highly educated section of the organization was actually brought from another country, because of their expertise. And they always felt terribly marginalized, because their English wasn't very fluent and they had trouble communicating with students. And the way of thinking of the United States was different to their own way of thinking. And so they weren't appreciated and recognized. Bringing out that kind of marginalization issue is important.

The issues then start to spread out, depending on the actual organization themselves. The toolkit, that I use, in terms of process work, that I find really important is: One, awareness of rank. Two, awareness of roles and ghost roles – frequently, things that aren't expressed get marginalized, and they get hidden and they manifest in terms of ghosts. The third one, that is super important, is edges. And edges are constellated around issues, but there are also personal edges, and many people who go into management positions often don't identify with their

power or have the ability to communicate effectively that power, so there are often communication edges that are present in organizations.

HH: While you're talking about the 'toolkit', let me ask, when you go into an organization, do you tend to think about what the primary structure of the organization is and what the secondary structure is? Do you think in those sort of terms?

SS: Absolutely, I'll begin to address primary and secondary from a number of areas. From the organizational chart – often if there are problems in the organization, they can be indicated through an organizational chart. For example if you look at many educational institutions, they have two functions, they have an administrative function and they have a programs or educational function, and those two often have a huge amount of tension. So if you have an organization which doesn't have a combining body of someone who is able to hold the diversity of both of those, it becomes problematic and one begins to attempt to serve the other. That's frequently a problem I've come up with. So depending on the structure of the organizational system, the organizational structure, you're going to get problems.

And there are just classic OD issues. For example direct reports – sometimes I'll go in, the executive is overwhelmed. I'll ask them why they are overwhelmed, and they'll say they are not sure. Then I find that they have thirteen or fourteen direct reports. I say, "well I understand, your organizational chart needs changing". In other words, it's on a systemic level that the change needs to occur.

That's one thing. The second thing is that when I go into an organization, issues are constellated around primary and secondary processes, so the whole system itself is going to have a primary and secondary identity, and it's going to have a myth which is often connected to the primary identity of the organization.

HH: Interesting you say that it's often connected to the primary identity.

SS: Yes, frequently I think the myth is connected to the primary, especially when they get into trouble. What happens is they create a myth, and the organization is supported and it's unfolded according to that myth. Then the organization begins to change and the myth still is the background figure that is followed and the question is then how to change that, how to change the vision and strategy of the organization? Then tensions occur when that myth begins to change. That frequently occurs in founding organization, when there is an original founder of an organization.

HH: Further down in the interview Stephen, I'll ask you about some of the steps of process oriented OD, so we might go over some of what you've just talked about some more then.

SS: Sure.

HH: So, I'm still finding out about the sort of work you do with organizations. What is your role? How is it defined from their side and how would you define yourself?

SS: Well that's really important. Before I go into an organization, I want to know what my role is. And I also want to know who has bought in and whose hasn't bought in.

So my role is actually fluid, and it's dictated – it'd be nice if I could dictate it all the time, but even if I were to dictate it, it doesn't necessarily mean that it's accepted as that. So it's very, very important, in going into an organization, to really identify what your clear intent is. Else you can easily get set-up – to really fulfill a role which is not what you anticipated. So, before I go into an organization, I often talk to the people that are employing me and I want to find out exactly what they are wanting me to do. And then get a sense of how I would operate within that, and then I have to find out how much buy-in they have for it.

HH: So if someone is asking you to work for them, do they think of you as a facilitator, a consultant…?

SS: Well, it depends what I'm going in for. Sometimes I'll go in as a trainer, sometimes I'll go in as a coach. Sometimes I'm going to go in as a facilitator. Sometimes I'm going to go in as an expert in conflict resolution.

HH: Okay. Does that cover most of the different 'hats', so to speak you might have on?

SS: I've often come in as a system analyst too, where I'm looking at the strategies. I'll have a look at strategic change. Maybe visioning towards a strategic plan. So I'll often help with that kind of structure. Not often, I have.

HH: And, have you done work in a situation where one person has brought you on board and then you've worked with the whole team?

SS: Yes.

HH: How have you been introduced in that situation?

SS: Often, because the team knows the one person is bringing me in to work with them, what I'll attempt to do is connect with as many team members as possible, because if one person brings me in, and they are not on board, they are going to come after me in the meeting and see me as allied with the other person. So if I come into a system, and I'm introduced by one person, I want to make sure there's the space to create that structure, especially if it's a team meeting. I'll try and introduce myself, at least to a few people, beforehand, but in particular the ones I perceive to be problematic. So for example, if I'm invited in by a manager, and she has specific problems, or he has specific problems with one of the direct reports, I want to go to that direct report. And the most important thing is the direct report feels that they can trust me sufficiently to be able to come to the meeting.

HH: Okay. And then when you get to the meeting, and you get introduced to the group, what sort of labels do they give you as the person, when they are introducing you.

SS: Well, it actually depends on my function again. If I'm coming in to resolve conflict, then I'm a conflict resolution facilitator. If I've come in to work toward their strategic plan, then I'm there to facilitate visioning towards strategy. So it really depends on the situation I've been invited in for. Consistently it's in the communication realm.

HH: So what do they call you then? A communications expert?

SS: A consultant. Often I come in as a consultant. And I consult in different places.

HH: How long does your work normally go for?

SS: It depends on what is needed. I don't have a time specific role. Unless I come in specifically for that – for example, if I come in to do training for three days, about group facilitation. In large corporations, sometimes OD departments will see me do stuff, and say, "hey, we want to learn this stuff, can you please show us so we can really see how we can apply it in the organization". Then it's time specific.

If I'm working in a group, then I'll allocate times that I come over. Like for the United Nations, I'll come over for a week, and I'll be available for that time. So then it's contained by the time of my visit. But in terms of my on-going connection with an organization, it's really open. It depends on what is required. So I don't close it off, and say "hey now I'm done". I'll say, "how are we doing, what needs to happen now?", and often then it will then become a combination of executive coaching as well as group facilitation.

So I don't have a specific that says, "I'm here for 5 days". I'll say "I'm coming in, we'll do some work, we'll see how it goes and we'll evaluate". That's what I've said, and people have said, "hey come and do more", and I've said, "check me out, see what I'm like, if you really like what I'm doing let's do more, if not let's close it down".

HH: If you think back over the last, say 3 or 4 years of work, and you think of the different organizations you've worked with, does the time you've worked with them go anywhere from one afternoon to years?.

SS: Well there are some organizations that I've spent years with, that I've come back regularly. They have retreats for all their members. I'm thinking of a mid-sized non-profit, with maybe 150 members, and they have retreats, and they invite me back regularly on a yearly basis. And I've worked on executive coaching with a number of the staff members. I've been in small team meetings, and I've been in regular monthly meetings, of 50 or 60 people. So they've pulled me back for years on that basis.

But now they don't need me anymore. They've integrated the model. The feedback I just got from the president is really nice, because I couldn't make a meeting because I was teaching, the master's programme. And, they were sad to miss me, and were worried about it – they got another facilitator who they said didn't do a very good job, but the group was so good they pulled the facilitator with them!

HH: That's amazing.

SS: The meeting was great, because the group was able to do it now. So that's particularly what I'm hoping for. That the group integrates sufficiently, to be able to do the work without me being there. Which I think is really a sign of good facilitation, when you become dispensable.

HH: That's wonderful! Good.

Okay, I might move us now to the second question, which is how would you define process oriented organizational development? So if I was to read it on a flyer, what would it say, for example?

SS: How would I define process oriented organizational development? The problem with OD, is OD is so broad. So when you say process oriented OD I think I can only say what is a process oriented approach, and then apply it to the area of OD that would be applicable. So I think I have a problem with the question, because OD comprises so much stuff. You know what I mean?

So I'd say, the process oriented approach, means, for me, that … I have the belief that the wisdom of change lies within the group itself, and it lies in the ability – should I use Process Work terms here or should I just speak more broadly?

HH: If you can speak more broadly that would be great.

SS: Okay. It lies in the ability of the group to embrace the diversity of the voices, in the group as meaningful. So process oriented facilitation, process oriented OD would be the method of awakening organization systems and groups within those organization, towards a deeper recognition of the value of the differences within the organization and begin to work with those differences in a way that actually enriches and enhances the organization. That's one of the aspects of it.

HH: And in Process Work terms, you're talking about deep democracy right?

SS: Yes, of course. In Process Work terms … so process oriented OD work would include ideas of deep democracy, they'd include ideas of eldership, they'd include ideas of wisdom in the group, include ideas that those who have power frequently, are not as conscious of the ways they use it as those who have less power, and that that feedback is often imperative for effective leadership. So those are some of the ideas that I would work with around a process oriented OD model.

HH: Are there others as well?

SS: Yes, the model also ascribes leadership as a fluid process which is role based rather than individually based. And that frequently leaders and wisdom in the group does not necessarily come from the ostensible leader, but can easily come from someone, who might not appear to have so much overt rank in the organization, or overt authority in the organization. And that change is frequently ongoing in groups and organization systems, and the ability to recognize change is critical to the ongoing development of the organization.

So for example, if you look at many organizations, where there is a lack of recognition of the ideas of primary and secondary in the organization – in other words what is wanting to evolve and emerge in the organization – if there's a lack of recognition of that which wants to emerge in the organization, the organization gets stuck. For example, many, many cultures, in the United States at least, and probably everywhere in the world, believe that in order for people to stay in organizations they have to be highly competent. So there's a huge amount of pressure of competence in many organizations. The result is that when you don't feel competent in an area, you are unable to express that in the organization, which means all that sense of incompetence goes underground, and the whole

organization, instead of being a learning organization, where people grow and develop and learn new things, has to be a competency based organization. Can you see what I'm saying?

HH: Yes.

SS: So that the organizations then get stuck in competency, and when people don't know, they don't admit it. And then, typically when you don't know and are stuck in having to know, there is only one way out, and that is to leave at some point in time – or to hide your mistakes. Then you get huge attrition in organizations. On the front they are highly competent, but in the background, all of the places that they are failing or weak aren't addressed. Because of the inability to deal with anything but competency. So you can see an organization actually thrives and develops, through beginning to unfold that, which is not accepted within the primary culture of the organization. In that situation, competency, is primary. That which is not accepted would be places we don't know, we are exploring, we are uncertain about, and yet those are the very things that are exciting about organizations, in terms of their growth.

HH: Yes. Great!!

If you were to come into an organization and work for one or two days with them, would you call that doing organizational development work with them?

SS: It depends what I'm doing. If I come in and I'm working with a whole team, sure! I'm assisting them for one or two days – that's plenty of time. I think changes can happen really quickly, I don't think they are time based. Sure. So it depends on what you are doing.

You can come into an organization and teach them something, and that's not quite organization change work. You teach them something and leave, it doesn't necessarily mean that there's any change or real development in the organization. It's just information, whereas you can go into an organization, and work with the system to change it, and you can be there for two hours. I went into an organizational meeting for two hours, and I felt, 9 months later, they were still talking about the meeting.

HH: Right.

SS: So you can really create significant change very quickly.

HH: This might be an impossible question, but how can we measure the change, or how you felt there was actually a change.

SS: You know, most change that happens in organizations is hard to measure, especially on a people oriented level – it's very subjective. And so most change I've got is through feedback. Which is really a change that we often have, you know for example, at the Process Work Institute. You know, you ask people, how were the classes and you get a sense of feedback. So feedback seems to be one of the most effective ways – asking people how they found it is often an effective way of evaluating. Because there's no motivation – if you are a consultant they don't have

to say it was great. There's less motivation to report positively. So people can be brutally honest.

HH: Getting positive feedback is one thing …

SS: What are the other things? Well, that's the external way of doing it. The internal way – I'm interested in edge changes. In other words, when I go into an organization, I recognize the primary and secondary issues in the organization, and as the organization goes over the edge, you begin to feel palpably, the system begins to change. And so I can measure it through a recognition of transition to secondary process in the organization. And frequently it takes time. Sometimes it's quick, and sometimes I've noticed people have to work that edge over and over again until it becomes fully integrated.

So I've noticed in organizational systems, where there's been an edge … for example in the example I gave earlier, of being direct with a manager or someone who has high rank. Someone has eventually got over that edge – initially there were symptoms that there were problems in that organization, and eventually someone went over the edge and actually spoke directly. There was this deadly stillness in the group – because they were afraid the person would get fired, for talking directly. The person didn't get fired, and yet no-one else went over the edge. And 6 months later, at another meeting, I encouraged them to work further, and a whole lot of people went and spoke directly to many managers in the group. And you could see the system change that began to occur. People were able to communicate directly with managers, there was a sense of realness in the interactions, managers were challenged where they weren't effective. They actually picked up the feedback in group, and you could see a change from repression to really fluid communication in the organization.

HH: Wonderful. So one definition of organizational change in a nutshell might be, as you said before, that transition to secondary process in the organization?

SS: When there's a transition from the primary to the secondary identity within the organizational system. – I'd say that's a clear definition for me of organizational change. Absolutely.

HH: That's great. I know I've never actually thought about it in these terms before.

SS: It's absolutely and it's systemic. And frequently, the whole organizational scene constellates around primary and secondary identities, and that's why picking up the disturbers in a way, is really helpful, because it presses the group to edges.

HH: Yes.

SS: But the first step frequently is to be able to bring out the ghost roles. And those things that are felt but not said within the organization. And check whether those things are safe to come out. If they are not safe to come out, then you have to address the safety issues first. Otherwise, after a day in the organization, a whole lot of people are fired, which you don't want. Frequently, as I approach an organizational system, the first things I have to determine, are what are the various edge figures, that will stop people from actually coming out and expressing what ghosts are present? And often I will, as the facilitator, talk to those edge figures.

HH: Okay.

SS: So for example…

HH: In a group process?

SS: In a group process, absolutely, I'd say, because I have rank as a facilitator, and I have to hold the group. So if there's a whole lot of tension in the group, and I know from talking to individuals that there's an edge to be direct, but they are afraid because of an edge figure that says they are going to get fired if they talk directly, then I would talk to that. And I'd say, "you know, one of the reasons I imagine folks won't talk, is because you might get fired if you do talk. Is that correct?". You see, because that won't get you fired. The next level, with what you say, will get you fired. So that discussion needs to be had, before you can go to the next level.

HH: Yes.

SS: So frequently I'll begin to address those concerns. Whether the concerns, by the way, are of the members in the group or myself. So I've had groups that have said, "hey, you're in the president's pocket, they are paying you, I don't trust you." And I've actually stood up in front of a group of 100 people, and said, "I heard this gossip", and then opened it out as a ghost. And then answered the ghost. I've said to the group, "I hear that folks, some folks might feel that I'm not fully trustworthy, because I have a friendship with the president. I want to tell you that's true. I also want to let you know, that my job here, is to support the facilitation and the development of the whole community. And, please check me out around that. If I don't support the diversity of the roles in the group, and I don't encourage that to happen, I'm no good for you. Please let me know, I want to grow and develop if that's the case, and if I can't support you, please fire me." And that was the end of the issue.

HH: Yes.

SS: I said fire me, I'm no good for you if that's the case.

HH: Did you check in with them again at the end, or it just never came up?

SS: They beamed, and they clapped for me. That's what happened. They beamed, they said, "listen, you're fantastic, thank you so much, we are watching your back". I said, "I need you. If I miss something, I need you to wake me up. Please wake me up, I want to grow." And they felt like I was part of them. It was actually a fantastic intervention.

HH: Wonderful.

The last question, and I think this is quite a big one, although we've already filled in a lot of that – what are the steps of process oriented OD? What does it look like from the moment contact is made between you and the organization, and when you leave the project?

SS: Now the problem is, the question is too broad again, it depends on what you've been called in to do.

HH: Well, would you like to maybe do it as a case study? Do you want to pick one organization that you've worked with, and we'll go through the steps with that particular organization?

SS: Sure. I'm going to protect the organization, but I'll give you the case study of one organization. The organization knew of me and called me up and invited me to do a residential retreat with all the staff members.

HH: Can just tell me a little about the organization, without telling me who they are?

SS: It's a non-profit, educationally based organization.

HH: About how big?

SS: The number of people working in the organization is about 150.

My initial contact was through someone in the organization who had seen me teach, and they thought I'd be fantastic at facilitating this meeting, and therefore invited me to come into the meeting. I then wanted to know a number of key members who'd be at that meeting, at all levels of the organization. I contacted people about 15 people, to interview them to know what was present in the system. This was going to be a large group meeting of about 100 people for about 3 or 4 hours for a number of days. So I want to know exactly what was present, so I came totally prepared.

HH: Did you have a set of questions that you asked each of the 15 people every time?

SS: No. I had an internal framework of what I was looking for. My tendency, when I interview, is not to ask specific questions. I'm looking for what are the background tensions, conflicts and processes, that I think are going to be present when I go and facilitate. I want to know about the organization. For this organization I didn't have to, but some organization, for example with the United Nations, I'd read about them. So I'd go and read as much as I could, I want them to send me information, I want to know exactly what's going on. So my preparation actually takes a lot of time.

HH: Can I slow us down a little bit?

SS: Sure.

HH: If you imagine I was one of the 15 people that you spoke to, can you give me an example of how you might frame some of the questions?

SS: I'd say, "I'm coming into the organization, to facilitate this meeting. I really appreciate you giving me this time. What would be really helpful for me, is to get a sense of what you anticipate will be important for me to know in coming in, and what you imagine are the areas we should focus on during the meeting. I want to make this meeting as useful as possible for you, so I really need your help with this."

HH: Okay, so you might start with that, probably something like that with all 15, and then take it from there.

SS: And then they'll say nothing! Then I'll say, "I understand it's really hard, but it's important for me, what do you think?". And then they'll be very vague, and they often will check me out. I'll also tell them, it's absolutely confidential. The problem with telling people it's confidential is, how do they know it is? And so this is something you develop in an organization over time, a sense of trust. Initially you might not have it, but over time you'll develop it.

HH: So in that first interview, even though you haven't necessarily established the relationship, you're getting enough information about what some of the tensions might be.

SS: And you are cultivating relationship. I remember in this particular organization, an executive director had invited me into the meeting. And I wanted to speak to a number of people. I spoke to the president, who I knew would be present. And I asked him about his philosophy, of the organization. I also want to know what I have permission to do. I'm not interested in setting up a philosophy or approach, which is against the organizational system.

So, for example, if I'm coming into an organization which is hierarchically based, and they really don't want any feedback – say a military based system – the military based system essentially says, you obey commands – if I give an instruction you do it, just because I'm the authority. Right? Now if I come in and I say, "well I'd like to get feedback from the person who is underneath you, your direct report", that's against the system.

So I need to know what I'm going into, so I can see whether I can actually facilitate that kind of scene, and whether facilitation is the thing that is needed from that organization. Do you know what I mean? So I need to check what my usefulness will be. And in some of those organizations, maybe there's even an edge to be even more clear, and more direct with your feedback. And so maybe the edges will not be towards openness, but towards directness and clarity.

So I'm interested essentially – this is a redefining, you might have to go right back to the beginning – so my deepest interest is in following the process of the organization. So for me organizational development consulting, is actually following the process of the organization, and helping it unfold into its next place. That's really what it is. It might be deep democracy, but it might not. Some organizations shouldn't be deeply democratic. So my job is actually to hold the deep democracy inside me, rather than imposing it on the organization. So I've changed my mind about what I said earlier. Talking about it makes it clearer actually.

HH: So you've answered 'how would you define process oriented OD'?

SS: That's right, following the process of an organization and helping it unfold into its next place

HH: Did you want to say a few more sentences about that?

SS: No, no, we can continue, that's all. It's just that I'm interested in the emerging process of an organization, rather than how I think an organization should be.

HH: Okay, great. All right, so you've conducted 15 interviews or so, with some of the people who will be at the meeting, to see what's in the atmosphere …

SS: I'm interested to see whether myself and the organization can work well together. And I'm interested in what the issues are and I want to prepare. So I cultivate a sense of preparedness. Once I've cultivated a preparedness in the organization, the next step is to go in. And often the format is either chosen by me, or I collaborate with the choosers. In this specific case study, the format was already chosen. I was invited into the organization to facilitate this large group work. They had different activities, and this was one of them, and I came in and facilitated the group regularly.

We had a number of hot moments. One of the edges which came up is one I've mentioned earlier, where the executive director at that time, had been quite authoritarian, and people were afraid to speak out. The executive director, by the way, was absent from that meeting.

HH: He was absent?

SS: The president was there, and some of his direct reports were there, but the executive director wasn't there. And he'd chosen not to be there. And that was fine with me. We used his role as a ghost. And someone else picked up his role at different times, and the meeting was remarkable. One person, who had been asked to leave the organization, stood up and confronted this role. The role was taken by a direct report who had been involved in the firing, and a profoundly deep and touching discussion occurred. With the actual manager apologizing – it was quite remarkable – and recognizing where they'd made a mistake. It was quite remarkable. And the whole organization changed from that.

After that, I was pulled into meetings with the president – the president liked what I was doing – so I began to work directly with the president. I began to work directly with the executive director, and went to a number of team meetings, small meetings, 4, 6, 10 people, and worked ongoing with the organization, both on a coaching and a team level. And then I was also asked to come back for a number of meetings with the larger group of people – not quite 100 or 150, but maybe 40 or 50 people.

HH: That first meeting you spoke about, where you were asked to facilitate the large group, the one where the executive director wasn't there – how many people were present at that meeting?

SS: I think about 90.

HH: And you said the format was chosen.

SS: Large group work. And my approach was this – when I go into an organization and begin to facilitate, I don't expect the organization to adapt to my style of working. So part of my interviews is to begin to understand style of the organization, and to match that in my facilitation. So I'm really interested in matching the facilitation style. That's super important for me.

HH: So in this particular case, did the group process look anything like, you know a group process say within the Process Work community?

SS: Absolutely, but it's framed. Let's think first about the traditional group process, from a Process Work perspective. Say there's no topic, okay? You go in, you check out the atmosphere, you sort towards consensus, you pick up the roles, you work with the ghost roles, you unfold them, you look for edges and hotspots, and you help unfold the process. Then you frame during that whole scene – is that correct?

HH: Yes.

SS: That's essentially the Process Work model. Now when I go into a group, I have that mapped inside me – it is me. So I walk in and I say to them, "it's an honour, a pleasure to be here, etc, etc". I kind of share a little about myself. And I'd say, "what should we do with this time?"

We're in a circle. I get away from tables and chairs. So I create a space where there's a circle, or two circles depending on the size of the group, or three circles. But I want that kind of space, where there's an open centre. There are a few things I require when I go into a group. Number one is a flip chart, the second thing is markers. I don't use powerpoint. And the circle is set up with no desks and tables.

And then I come in, and I say, "here we are. It's a pleasure to be here etc, what should we look at?" And I give it to the group. And I already know in my pocket, six or eight issues they are going to want to look at. And that's the advantage I have. And then I stay wide awake. Someone will bring up an issue, and someone will bring up another issue, and what I might do is say to them, "you know this issue looks like it's quite intense. And we have a whole bunch of time. Should we focus on an intense issue as it comes up, or should we try and get a whole bunch of issues, before we decide where to go?" You see we are just in the sorting process, can you see that? It's just organic. Now if they say let's focus on one as it comes up, I say "great". If they say let's get a whole bunch of ideas I say, "let me put them on the board for us".

HH: And what happens if one person says let's focus on one, and others say let's get the issues up?

SS: I give it back to the group. I'm facilitating, so I say, "well, it looks like we have diversity in the group about how to proceed. Well, how should we decide friends?" Or, "how should we decide?" – and give it back to the group. And the group decides how to proceed. Frequently, an early group will just choose to go with an issue that's hot, so I'll say "this looks hot, let's stay with that". But if the group chooses to sort towards a consensus, at some point in time I'll say "do you think it's time to choose an issue yet?" And they'll say yes or no. That's it. They don't know anything about process work. Then, once we get to making a consensus, I'll say, "how do we choose?", and people will eventually choose an issue and I'll say "great, let's go with this one". And we've got consensus. And if we don't have, I'll spend time there. And say, "you know it's really important for us to really sort

which is best, let's take time here. This is part of the community getting to know itself, or the group getting to know itself. No problem, let's take time".

HH: So you are framing it.

SS: Yes, I just frame it in a way that makes it helpful. I'd say "this is very important that everyone's voice be heard". Once we get there, we get into an issue, and I hear the voices coming out. I don't require people move necessarily. If I've been with the group for a number of times, I'll begin to introduce role play … you know role ideas, from one side to another. But frequently I'll use it as a town meeting. "There is one side, can someone talk to the other?" Sometimes I don't even say that, I just say "let's hear your thoughts", and I'm looking for the ghosts. Almost invariably you don't have to frame a ghost or find it, it will come up itself. And you've got to catch it as it comes up, cos it comes up subtly and disappears. So I catch the ghost, I say "hey, that's a voice that's important, can you say more about that?" And we help bring out the ghost. And there we are!

And then I'm watching for edges, and they'll often constellate between two people. I'll see two people in the group communicating intensely. And you'll see an edge and I'll say "let's go slowly here".

HH: Wonderful

SS: Actually, you can really do effective Process Work. I think Process Work is a profound model, and the profoundness of the model is that it's not a model, it's a process. And I'm following the process. I think that's why Process Work is so profound – it's actually what's happening! And then you're creating a framework for what's happening, and we're able to track it through the model.

HH: Yes, fantastic!

SS: Yes!

HH: I have two questions that come out of what you've already said. One is that you prepare, you talk to 15 people. When you say you prepare, do you go into roles that you might expect, and flesh them out? What does the preparation look like?

SS: In the first case, I want to know what the issues are. And so I can anticipate the types of tensions and conflict that are in the room by virtue of the issues. Then, if I find that there's a particular challenge that I'm stuck with, I'll go into the roles around it. And I find out what ghost roles I can anticipate. So, in this situation, where you can hear that people are upset with an executive director – typically in that situation, I can imagine the one who is upset, by virtue of rank, might have a difficulty in getting their voice out. So that's the first thing I'm watching for. And I already know some of the edge figures. I'm afraid I'm going to get fired if I say what I feel. So I've already got a whole lot of value. You know what I mean?

But once I am prepared, I drop the whole lot. I go in empty. You can't go in with a pretense, because that might not be the case of what emerges. And I have found, I've prepared and then other things come up, but I feel like I've got so much knowledge about the group already, that the group feels me holding it by virtue of my awareness of it.

HH: Right, that's great.

SS: So, so that's my task.

HH: and then you said …

SS: I'll give you an example. One of my next jobs is going into the United Nations, and I'm working with the heads in the country. United Nations Commission for Refugees, United Nations Development Programme, UNICEF, International Organization for Migration, World Health Organization – all of them are United Nations affiliates. So all the heads are going to be at the meeting together. I want a discussion with every head – at least once, if not more.

HH: Before the meeting.

SS: Oh, absolutely. I want to know all the dynamics, I want to know all the issues. I want to be as prepared as I can be.

HH: Wow! And then you're going to be facilitating that meeting, or co-facilitating?

SS: I'm facilitating it. It's not the international body, it's the national body. I'm not yet ready for New York! I'd like to be.

HH: Maybe this is the pathway to get there.

And just going back to this case study, you said after the group process, you said you also did some work with some teams.

SS: Yes, a whole range of teams.

HH: Can you describe that work?

SS: It depended on what the need of the team was. Some of the teams need me to come in because there are tensions in the team, and they feel having a facilitator is appropriate. That's often as a team. Other times, it's team building. They feel that if they have a facilitator they will make the meeting much more effective. So there are different motivations for me coming in.

HH: And team building in that sense is – that's such a broad term – training?

SS: No. I'm facilitating the small group process of the team. When I'm consulting like that, I don't do training. I will do training, but training is a very different form. And the only training I'll do is Process Work training – I won't do generalized training. If people want to integrate the model into the organization, I'll come in and train them in how to facilitate in that model.

HH: How long have you been doing organisational development work for?

SS: I started about 6 years ago. And it's been growing. It actually hasn't been my main focus – but it has become increasingly so. Given that I'm trying to not only be an OD consultant, but I'm trying to actually change an organization myself, as president. And I have to say it's much easier, to facilitate an organization than be a president and create change. It's incredibly hard – you really understand why, presidents and people in significant places in the organization need consultants. It's very clear.

HH: Because … say a sentence or more about that?

SS: It's hard! Because frequently you're a leader. Which means that you have one side, and the other side is irritating. And often the other side has an important message, and some really vital information that needs to be heard and integrated … that's why it's disturbing! The essence of the idea of the disturber in Process Work, is that the disturber comes in order to awaken us to information that we are not yet present to. And it's disturbing that which needs to be disturbed, which is frequently the primary identity of the organization. The disturber comes as an awakener of the primary identity, and encourages an emerging secondary process within an organization. And it's very hard if you are the president, to want to hear it. Because you have your own plans, and now they are in your way! That's my philosophy. That's why you need a huge capacity to do inner work and work on the disturber as an aspect of yourself, to enrich you.

HH: Is there anything else you'd like to add?

SS: Yes, I want to say one thing about OD work. What I want to say is that OD work, in process work, is unbelievably exciting. I have had so much exposure to so many consultants. I've been doing training series around OD work in application to executive coaching, group facilitation and leadership. And diversity issues, that's the next one I'm working with in South Africa. So I'm doing this series. And I can't tell you how turned on OD practitioners are.

HH: Oh really?

SS: I'm invited into exclusive groups of OD practitioners, I'm getting senior people that have been in the field for 30 or 40 years coming to my workshop. They are unbelievably excited. Because they feel they are getting a tool which is so vital. And so many of them need it. So I think we've just got a remarkable tool there, which is really just at the beginning of creation. And I'm very excited to see how we go in it, over the next 20, 30 years. I think it's going to be remarkable actually.

HH: Yes!

SS: An awesome tool, awesome tool.

HH: I agree, very exciting.

SS: Fantastic!

Appendix C – Tesch's Generic Approach to Analysis

Tesch's (1990) generic approach to analysis as cited in A Guide to Using Qualitative Methods in Process Work Research (Jones, 2005):

- Get a sense of the whole. Begin with first available data document (e.g. interview transcript), read it and other documents as they come in. Jot down ideas about the data, go to step two when you have about 1/4th or 1/5th of your data. Pick any document to start with – the most interesting, shortest or whatever you feel like reading first.
- Read and pay attention to switches or transitions from topic to topic. Make a distinction between content and topic. Ask yourself, "What is this about?" (not "What is said?") Write this as a one or two word topic name in the margin. Deal with substance later.
- Do this for three or four data documents, then make a list of all of the topic names you have written in the margin. Make one column per document, and place all the columns on the same sheet. Compare and connect topics, and cluster similar topics. Choose the best fitting topic name, or come up with a new one, for each topic.
- Go back to your data, make new copies of the documents you have worked with, and use the list of topics in the first and second columns as a preliminary organizing system. Abbreviate the topics as codes and write them next to text segments in one document. (This serves two purposes: it shows how well your topic descriptions correspond to what you find in the data, and may turn up new topics if you find that certain segments can't be coded with the preliminary system).
- Try the system on a couple more documents.
- Write notes (memos) as you go about what you are finding, ideas, comments about the analysis process, etc.
- Refine your organizing system. Find the most descriptive name for topics. At this stage, a descriptively named topic is called a category. Write the most frequently occurring categories in a list, and write any unique topics in another. (If you have some categories that don't fit in either of these lists, list them separately.) 25 – 50 is good number of categories to work with.
- Make a map of relations between your two main lists. Draw lines between them.
- Abbreviate names, add them to your list or map. Feel free to give various codes to one segment of text (multiple code).
- After coding, assemble the data material belonging to each category in one place. Perform a preliminary analysis, by looking at the collection of material in one category at a time. Look at content, identify and summarize it, then look for

commonalties, uniqueness, confusions and contradictions, missing information about your research question and topic. Keep your research purpose and questions nearby, and refer to them often, to focus your analysis.

- Re-code your existing data if need be. Use the results of your analysis so far to guide your next round of data collection. Repeat the process with subsequent data.
- Ask yourself if some categories can crystallize into research outcomes (themes which address your research questions). Structure the flow of research report around these themes.

Appendix D – Data Analysis Details

My analysis process was 'based' upon Tesch (1990), in that I used her analysis process as a guideline, rather than as a set of 'rules' that I needed to strictly follow (Patton, 2002, p. 57). There were six phases of analysis:

1. Getting an Overview
2. Defining the Categories and Sub-Categories
3. Assigning Categories and Sub-Categories to Text Segments
4. Assembling Categories into 'Sections'
5. Generation of Themes
6. Preparing MACFOC Presentation
7. Write-up

Details of each phase of analysis follow.

Analysis Phase 1 – Getting an Overview

According to Tesch (1990), the first step of the analysis is to:

- Get a sense of the whole. Begin with first available data document (e.g. interview transcript), read it and other documents as they come in. Jot down ideas about the data, go to step two when you have about 1/4th or 1/5th of your data.

I read the three interviews I had at that point in time and recorded high level summaries of the content in a column next to the data (code 2). The number of the question being answered was also recorded in a column (code 1). This was all done in MSWord, as per the example below:

Code 1	Code 2	Data
1.4	Varies a lot; Courtship period takes a long time	HH: How long does your work normally go for? And I'm guessing that might change for different types of organisations, or maybe there is something more general. JD: It's completely dependent on what it is. There are all kinds of answers in that question. One of the things about organisational work, that seems to be somewhat different to one-to-one work, for the first time I have a big difference here, is the courtship period.

The summaries were then cut and paste so that each question had an answer for each of the participants. The following is an example of the summaries for interview question 1c: "What's your role? (How is it defined from the client organisation's side, how do you define yourself? How would you describe the work you do?)":

1c. What's your role?

Lesli

- I think my role now is really around coaching, facilitating, and introducing an educational process that people can really develop more participative, collaborative teams.

Max

- I define myself as a facilitator whose task it is to help to find the person's myth, the group or the person's myth.
- I see my task is to help them find the key purpose, and then notice it, and then celebrate it and then use it.
- Coach individuals
- Group process
- Strategic retreats
- Developing business plan
- Change management

Julie

- People would say I'm a consultant, or a coach. Or I'm a trainer or a facilitator.
- How they define role – team worker, consultant, coach
- Changes with the situation.

This gave me an overview of the information I had gathered. This was useful as I already had conducted the majority of my interviews and was overwhelmed by all the information. It also highlighted that as expected, some of the data didn't fit neatly as an answer to the interview questions – other themes were beginning to show their presence.

It is important to note that this overview was mostly content based rather than meaning based. In subsequent phases the analysis became more focused on the meaning of what participants said, as is the nature of qualitative inquiry.

Analysis Phase 2 – Defining the Categories and Sub-Categories

The next steps, according to Tesch (1990), are to:

- "Pick any document to start with – the most interesting, shortest or whatever you feel like reading first. Read and pay attention to switches or transitions from topic to topic. Make a distinction between content and topic. Ask yourself, "What is this about?" (not "What is said?"). Write this as a one or two word topic name in the margin. Deal with substance later.
- Do this for three or four data documents, then make a list of all of the topic names you have written in the margin. Make one column per document, and place all the columns on the same sheet. Compare and connect topics, and cluster similar topics. Choose the best fitting topic name, or come up with a new one, for each topic."

After Analysis Phase 1, each of the transcripts was in MSWord in a tabular format, with each row of the table corresponding to a 'chunk' of information. To perform these next steps of the analysis I cut and paste each transcript into Excel. Each row was numbered sequentially.

Taking the first interview, I slowly read the transcript, giving each 'chunk' a topic name which described 'what is this about?' and recorded this in the column named Code 2. Where necessary, I split a chunk into multiple chunks. Some of topic names corresponded to the previous summaries, but most were changed to reflect the meaning based ('what is this about?') analysis. As I was using Excel there was no need to abbreviate these topic names to one or two words. Examples of the topic names were:

- who drives the pOD process
- pOD consultant's confidence
- steps of pOD – interview

The column with the topic words (Code 2) was then copied to another spreadsheet, and sorted into alphabetical order (a function of Excel) to start to group 'like' topics. Each topic word was then renamed to shorten it and to give some consistency between topic names – in this renaming process a two level system was used, resulting in 26 'categories' and 53 'sub-categories'.

Examples of 'categories' (that correspond to the topic names in the above example) are:

- Ask/tell balance
- Co pexp (short hand for consultant personal experience)
- pOD steps

Examples of 'sub-categories' are:

- Co pexp – confidence
- pOD step – interview
- pOD step – follow-up
- pOD step – interventions

With this early categorising system by my side, I read the second transcript in the same manner as the first, this time assigning existing categories and sub-categories where possible, and adding new categories and sub-categories where needed.

The categories and sub-categories from both interviews were then consolidated into one list of 34 'categories' and 82 'sub-categories'.

Analysis Phase 3 – Assigning Categories and Sub-Categories to Text Segments

Tesch's (1990) next data analysis steps are as follows:

- Go back to your data, make new copies of the documents you have worked with, and use the list of topics in the first and second columns as a preliminary organizing system. Abbreviate the topics as codes and write them next to text segments in one document. (This serves two purposes: it shows how well your topic descriptions correspond to what you find in the data, and may turn up new topics if you find that certain segments can't be coded with the preliminary system).
- Try the system on a couple more documents.
- Write notes (memos) as you go about what you are finding, ideas, comments about the analysis process, etc.
- Refine your organizing system. Find the most descriptive name for topics. At this stage, a descriptively named topic is called a category. Write the most frequently occurring categories in a list, and write any unique topics in another. (If you have some categories that don't fit in either of these lists, list them separately.) 25 – 50 is good number of categories to work with."

Taking each interview, I assigned each text segment a category, and in many cases a sub-category. I split text segments into two or more segments if required. If multiple categories and/or sub-categories corresponded to a text segment, I would assign the first category/sub-category to the segment. Then I would make a copy that text segment and assign the next category/sub-category to this text segment, changing the font colour of the text so I could identify it was a copy. All of this took place in Excel.

I wrote notes about my findings and ideas, and about the analysis process in a journal. My organising system, with its 34 categories worked well for this, and didn't need the refining as suggested by Tesch (1990).

Analysis Phase 4 – Assembling Categories into 'Sections'

The next steps suggested by Tesch (1990) are to:

- "Make a map of relations between your two main lists. Draw lines between them.
- Abbreviate names, add them to your list or map. Feel free to give various codes to one segment of text (multiple code).
- After coding, assemble the data material belonging to each category in one place. Perform a preliminary analysis, by looking at the collection of material in one category at a time. Look at content, identify and summarize it, then look for commonalties, uniqueness, confusions and contradictions, missing information about

your research question and topic. Keep your research purpose and questions nearby, and refer to them often, to focus your analysis."

Taking the 34 categories, I now grouped them into 9 'sections' or clusters, and named them as follows:

- question 1 - organisation information
- question 2 - pOD definition
- question 3 - pOD steps
- consultant
- pOD examples
- pOD general
- OD
- insights
- interview related

An example of how 'categories' were grouped into sections follows. The section called 'question 2 – pOD definition' included the following categories:

- pOD definition
- general pOD interventions
- pOD or not?
- TOD (therapy/OD comparison or individual/organisation parallel)
- development - as in organisation development

The next step was to combine all four interviews into one Excel file, and sequentially renumber each text segment (chunk) starting from 1001 for the first interview, 2001 for the second interview, 3001 for the third interview and so on. So the first text segment in the first interview was numbered 1001, the second text segment in the first interview was numbered 1002, the third 1003 and so on.

I then sorted the 'category' column alphabetically, and set up a separate Excel file for each of the nine 'sections'. I cut and paste each category into the corresponding section, giving each category its own 'sheet' in Excel.

Analysis Phase 5 – Generation of Themes

Tesch's (1990) next steps are to:

- Re-code your existing data if need be. Use the results of your analysis so far to guide your next round of data collection. Repeat the process with subsequent data.
- Ask yourself if some categories can crystallize into research outcomes (themes which address your research questions). Structure the flow of research report around these themes.

I read through each of the categories, and re-coded some text segments into other categories. I then wrote a high level summary for each category, and pulled all the

summaries together by topic into an MSWord document. This gave me the second overview of the data I had collected, with themes beginning to emerge.

I then worked through a topic at a time, analysing and summarising each more thoroughly and until the first round of research outcomes became clear.

Analysis Phase 6 – Preparing MACF Presentation

At this point in the analysis I needed to pull together all the work to date to make a verbal presentation of the study – this was a requirement of the MACF programme. I came up with an initial structure with which to present the study, and preliminary conclusions based on the analysis to date. This involved doing more detailed analysis of some of the themes, but in a less precise way than the analysis so far.

Analysis Phase 7 – Write Up

As I started choosing data exemplars to illustrate the various themes for my thesis, I found text segments in one theme that really belonged to another theme, and realised that my understanding of the themes was so much deeper now, that my earlier coding of each text segment was no longer satisfactory. I considered moving the text segments between themes, but sensed I'd end up in disarray. Re-coding the data from scratch seemed to be the most thorough thing to do at this stage. So, with my new understanding of the themes in hand, all the interviews were re-coded and the text segments relevant to each theme cut and paste into individual documents. This also served to bring me closer to the complete transcripts again, and to identify the data exemplars that I wanted to use in the thesis.

A large part of the analysis occurred when I was writing the thesis. It was the act of pulling together the data exemplars that belonged to a theme, working out what order to put them in and introducing them, that finally crystallised the themes into research outcomes.

Appendix E – Participant Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

What is organizational development from a process work perspective? An interview study.

Heike Hamann

This research project is being conducted as part of the Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change, supervised by Lee Spark Jones at Process Work Institute, Portland, Oregon.

Description of Study

In this study I am exploring what organizational development is, from a Process Work perspective. How is it done? What are the concepts behind it? I do this through conducting interviews with Process Work faculty members who identify as working in organizations. My research method is basic interpretive qualitative analysis – very briefly this means that my data collection has been in the form of interviews, which I have transcribed and then analysed, by breaking the information into 'chunks', and then re-assembling these chunks into clusters, which I am synthesizing into 'themes'. These themes will form the findings of the study, which I will present and discuss giving examples from the data collected in the interviews.

Participation

As you are aware, participation in this research involved taking part in an interview, about 1 hour in length. There may be a need for me to ask you some clarifying questions, to ensure I have understood what you have said. Should this be necessary I will communicate with you by email.

Confidentiality

All of the information collected in the course of this study, including audiotapes and raw transcripts of interviews, and journal entries, is being treated with the utmost confidentiality. I am the only person who has access to this information. In written reports of the research and presentations, any information you required to be kept confidential will be protected by speaking in general terms about it and omitting identifying information. If you request it, your anonymity will be protected by using a

pseudonym and omitting identifying information. If the research is published at a later date, the same care will be taken to respect confidentiality and preserve anonymity.

Intellectual Property

Any information you share with me (unless it was expressed as being confidential and therefore not part of this study) will be attributed to you, whether it be a quoted verbatim or paraphrasing what you have said. If you wish to remain anonymous, the information you share with me will be credited to you via your pseudonym.

Transcripts

I would like to include a 'tidied' up version of the transcripts as an Appendix to my report. I believe this adds to the contribution of this research, as so little has been written about this application of Process Work to date. I imagine readers of the study will be interesting in hearing what each of you said, in its entirety. I will 'tidy' up the raw transcripts to remove uhms and ahhs and 'thinking words' – so for example, "when I visit Canada I plan to … uhm, well, I'm thinking of … I may go to Calgery and go paragliding in Golden" would become, "when I visit Canada I may go to Calgery and go paragliding in Golden". This is to make the transcript easier to read and to put you in the best possible light. I mentioned the possibility of my including the transcripts to all of you during the interviews, and if you are still in agreement with me doing so, please indicate this below.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you are free to not answer questions, end your participation, or withdraw from the research at any time. Your refusal to participate or withdrawal of consent will not affect how you are treated in any way.

If you would like to discuss this research further, please contact Heike Hamann on 503 367 7093 or at heikehamann@bigpond.com or Lee Spark Jones on 503 281 8323 or at leesparkjones@earthlink.net.

Research Title:

What is organizational development from a process work perspective? An interview study.

I , ……, consent to participate in the research conducted by Heike Hamann as described above.

I do/do not (please cross out as applicable) consent to Heike identifying me as one of the participants of this interview study.

I do/do not (please cross out as applicable) consent to Heike including the 'tidied up' transcript in the appendix of her report. I would/would not like to see a copy of the transcript before it is included in the report.

I understand that the data collected will be used for research purposes as outlined above, and I consent for the data to be used in that manner.

Signed …….…….. …… Date ……

Appendix F – pOD in the Context of the General OD Field

Setting pOD in the context of the broader OD field would be an interesting and significant contribution to the field of pOD and to Process Work, in that it would enable practitioners of pOD to converse with general OD practitioners with some understanding of the general OD field. Additionally, it would enable pOD practitioners to understand the particular strengths of pOD in the general OD field, and position and market themselves accordingly to organisations. Here I begin this process by re-categorising the problems and issues and interventions discussed in this study using general OD categories. The general OD intervention categories are taken from Organisation Development and Change (Waddell, Cummings &Worley, 2004) and are summarised below.

OD Interventions

Waddell et al. (2004) breaks Interventions down into four categories (p. 159):

1. Interpersonal interventions
2. Technostructural interventions
3. Human resource management interventions
4. Strategic interventions

The following summary of each of the Interventions is taken from Waddell et al. (2004, p.160-164).

Interpersonal OD Interventions

Interpersonal Interventions focus on "people within organisations and the processes through which they accomplish organisational goals. These processes include communication, problem solving, group decision making and leadership." Interventions in this category are derived mainly from the disciplines of psychology or social psychology.

Examples of interventions include:

Interpersonal relations and group dynamics interventions

- t-group (specific experiential learning method to provide members learning about group dynamics, leadership and interpersonal relations)
- process consultation (interpersonal relations and social dynamics in work groups)

- third-party interventions (conflict facilitation)
- team building (helping work groups become more effective in accomplishing tasks)

Systemwide interventions

- organisation confrontation meeting (mobilisation of organisation members to identify and solve problems)
- intergroup relations (improvement of interactions between different groups or departments in an organisation)
- large-group interventions (large group process)
- grid organisation development (a specific way of managing an organisation).

Technostructural OD Interventions

Technostructural interventions focus on the technology and structure of organisations. Technology in this instance refers to how jobs are designed and task methods, while structure relates to the division of labour, say between departments, and the hierarchy of the organisation. Engineering, sociology and psychology are the disciplines in which technostructural interventions are rooted.

Examples of interventions include:

- structural design (how the organisation divides labour)
- downsizing (reducing the size of the organisation to reduce costs and bureaucracy)
- re-engineering (redesign of core work processes)
- employee involvement programmes (such as total quality management)
- work design (designing work to suit both technical and personal needs).

Human Resource Management OD Interventions

Human resource interventions focus on "personnel practices used to integrate people into organisations. These practices include career planning, reward systems, goal setting and performance appraisal" (Waddell et al., 2004, p. 162). These interventions "are rooted in the disciplines of economics and labour relations" and in recent years there has been a growing interest in integrating HR management with organisational development.

Examples of interventions include:

Performance management interventions

- goal setting
- performance appraisal
- reward systems

Developing and assisting organisation member interventions

- career planning and development
- managing work-force diversity
- employee wellness

Strategic OD Interventions

Strategic interventions focus on linking "the internal functioning of the organisation to the larger environment and transform the organisation to keep pace with changing conditions" (p. 163). Strategic management, organisation theory, open systems theory and cultural anthropology are the disciplines from which these interventions are derived.

Examples of interventions include:

Interventions aimed at managing organisation and environment relationships

- open systems planning (systematic assessment of environmental relationships and plans to improve interactions)
- integrated strategic change and (changing both business strategies and organisational systems in response to external and internal disruptions)
- transorganisational development (forming partnerships with other organisations).
- Interventions for transforming organisations
- culture change (develop behaviours, values, beliefs and norms appropriate to their strategy and environment)
- self-designing organisations ("helping organisations gain the capacity to fundamentally alter themselves")
- organisation learning ("the organisation systematically examines the way it operates to uncover patterns in its actions and the assumptions underlying these patterns and the alteration of those patterns").

An OD View of Issues

A way of grouping the issues and problems discussed in the study is into four intervention categories proposed by Waddell et al. (2004) as described above. Following a brief description of the categories a table showing the issues categorised using the Process Work levels and the OD categories is presented.

Interpersonal Issues – According to Waddell et al. (2004), interpersonal issues are issues related to how to communicate, how to solve issues, how to make decisions, how to interact and how to lead (p.157).

Strategic Issues – Strategic issues, according to Waddell et al. (2004, p.157), are the issues related to what products and services the organisation provides, how to gain a competitive advantage and in what markets they compete in. Strategic issues also include

how the organisation relates to its ever-changing environment. Questions regarding the values that guide the organisations functioning also fall into this category.

Human Resource Management Issues – Issues related to how to attract competent people to the organisation, set goals, appraise and reward them for their performance, career development and stress management make up human resource management issues (Waddell et al., 2004, p.158).

Technostructural Issues – According to Waddell et al. (2004), technostructural issues refer to issues regarding how to divide labour, how to co-ordinate departments, how to produce products or services and how to design work (p. 157).

The table below summarises the issues mentioned by the participants using the two categorising systems – Process Work and OD (as per Waddell et al., 2004).

	OD Category	**PW Category**
Work-life balance	HR management	Personal
Communication issues	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Difficulties in collaborating	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Rank problems	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Dealing with conflict	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Sub-group marginalisation	HR management	Interpersonal
Diversity issues	HR management	Interpersonal
Organisation chart	Technostructural	Organisational
Different functions in organisation	Technostructural	Organisational
Strategic change/myth work	Strategic	Organisational

When grouped using the OD categorising system, many of the issues fall into the category of interpersonal and human resource management issues, with issues in the other two categories being less common.

An OD View of Interventions

To get an overview of how the interventions discussed by the study participants might be viewed in the OD context, they have been summarised and sorted into the four intervention categories suggested by Waddell et al. (2004) – interpersonal, technostructural, human resource management and strategic. The corresponding Process Work category for is shown as a comparison.

	OD Category	**PW Category**
Coaching	HR Management	Personal
Peer Coaching	HR Management	Personal
Learning Lab	HR Management	Personal
Conflict resolution	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Communication intervention	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Bulletin board	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Team building/development	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Training	Interpersonal	Interpersonal
Diversity work	HR Management	Interpersonal
Work-life balance	HR Management	Personal
Group process facilitation	Interpersonal	Organisational
Systems alignment	Technostructural	Organisational
Organisation structure	Technostructural	Organisational
Policies	Technostructural	Organisational
Strategic visioning & development	Strategic	Organisational
Myth related work	Strategic	Organisational
Organisational assessment	Strategic	Organisational

The table shows a number of things:

Firstly, it is difficult to fit some of the pOD interventions into that particularly categorising system – the clearest example of this are the interventions we would categorise under 'personal interventions'. These have been placed under Human Resource interventions, but do not fit so well there. This may point to the need for an extra category, personal interventions. This extra category would reflect that work with an individual in an organisation, on their own edges and issues, will develop an organisation and is therefore organisational development. This premise is based on the holographic principle, and discussed in the section Holographic Principle and Levels of Work. As such, it is an exciting contribution pOD could make to the field of OD, at least as it is described by Waddell et al. (2004).

Secondly, most of the interventions fall into the human resources management and interpersonal categories, with less interventions mentioned in the other two categories.

Another way to analyse the interventions discussed during the interviews ('pOD Interventions) is to compare them with specific interventions listed by Waddell et al. (2004), as per the following table:

Interventions as described by Waddell et al. (2004)	**pOD Interventions**
Interpersonal Interventions	
T-group (specific experiential learning method to provide members learning about group dynamics, leadership and interpersonal relations)	
Process consultation (interpersonal relations and social dynamics in work groups)	Communications interventions
Third-party interventions (conflict facilitation)	Conflict resolution
Team building (helping work groups become more effective in accomplishing tasks)	Team building/development
Organisation confrontation meeting (mobilisation of organisation members to identify and solve problems)	
Intergroup relations (improvement of interactions between different groups or departments in an organisation)	
Large-group interventions (large group process)	Group process facilitation

Interventions as described by Waddell et al. (2004)	**pOD Interventions**
Grid organisation development (a specific way of managing an organisation).	
Technostructural Interventions	
Structural design (how the organisation divides labour)	Organisation structure
Downsizing (reducing the size of the organisation to reduce costs and bureaucracy)	
Re-engineering (redesign of core work processes)	
Employee involvement programmes (such as total quality management)	
Work design (designing work to suit both technical and personal needs)	
Human Resource Management Interventions	
Goal setting	
Performance appraisal	
Reward systems	
Career planning and development	
Managing work-force diversity	Diversity work
Employee wellness	Work-life balance, coaching, peer-coaching, learning lab.
Strategic Interventions	
Open systems planning (systematic assessment of environmental relationships and plans to improve interactions)	
Integrated strategic change and (changing both business strategies and organisational systems in response to external and internal disruptions)	Strategic visioning and development
Transorganisational development (forming partnerships with other organisations)	NGO Mergers

Interventions as described by Waddell et al. (2004)	**pOD Interventions**
Culture change (develop behaviours, values, beliefs and norms appropriate to their strategy and environment)	
Self-designing organisations ("helping organisations gain the capacity to fundamentally alter themselves")	
Organisation learning ("the organisation systematically examines the way it operates to uncover patterns in its actions and the assumptions underlying these patterns and the alteration of those patterns")	

This table highlights again the difficulty in categorising some of the 'pOD Interventions' using the categories suggested by Waddell et al. (2004).

This simple exercise of setting pOD interventions in the general OD context is interesting in that it begins to show the possible areas of expertise pOD practitioners have. It also puts forward ideas about other interventions pOD practitioners may want to offer in the future.