As a field of study, the roots of organizational development (OD) can probably be traced back as far as the 1930's. However, the majority of assumptions, premises, biases, and thinking in OD evolved during the 1960's and the 1970's. In fact, much of the current theory and practice of OD is based on the premise that the social and cultural conditions which existed during these formative years are still prevalent today.

A review of published critiques, issues, and trends in OD (3,4,7,14,20) yields a body of literature focused almost exclusively on the topics of methodology, verifiability, theory versus practice, and quality control. Little, if any, attention is paid to the changing external environment and its resulting impact on the viability of the core values of OD. There should be little question that the core values of the field influence both the development of OD theory and practice. It is our opinion that this "missing piece" of analysis may have great implications for future trends, issues, and the development of the field as reflected in the literature.

The purpose of this paper, then, is to make an assessment of the field as it currently stands in order to raise the level of awareness of those directly involved in OD. To achieve this, our analysis will demonstrate that an important aspect of OD seems to be excluded from the body of critical literature, i.e., the impact of static core values on OD's ability to change.

In order to accomplish this purpose, several areas must be addressed. First, some definitions will be offered to insure clarity. Second, a clear conceptualization of values will be presented, and, third, a review of current literature on trends and issues in OD will be discussed. It is hoped that through these discussions, OD may be seen as a growing and dynamic field simply in need of a little "homework."

**SOME CLARIFYING CONCEPTS**

When one reads the myriad of literature surrounding the field of OD, the mind is astounded at the volume, the breadth, and, concurrently, the lack of conceptual clarity. Hence, it is not surprising that even on basic issues there is also a lack of consensus. While some authors caution that OD is plagued by unethical trainers, unqualified practitioners, and the lack of accreditation, others tell us OD is peace, love, truth and the American way, tempered by a healthy dose of humanism and participative democracy. To clarify the terms and aims of this paper, the following definitions are offered.

In this paper, when OD is referred to in theory or in practice, the referent is that group of people dedicated to the ethical practice of facilitating planned change. Specifically, those people who, whether new to the field or among its founders, constantly strive for dynamic growth in helping relationships. Clearly, the focus of this paper is not for those who feel OD is dying or is irrelevant or useless. Instead, OD is an ongoing pursuit of excellence, and this paper is directed to those who
hold this perspective.

A second clarification is more broadly concerned with the overall approach. OD is often described as being a "systems" approach to facilitating planned approach. In this regard, we refer to Thompson's (1967) concept of organizations as open systems trying to close their core technology off from turbulent changes in the environment. While organizations must protect themselves from such changes, the truth is that they must do so by constantly monitoring the environment and adapting to its upheavals. So, too, we feel OD as a system must respond to changes in its environment, especially those changes which affect the core values of OD.

The question which then arises (or should arise) is "do core values change?" We believe the answer is an emphatic yes. Organizational core values have changed and have had a resulting impact on management beliefs and practices. Management and organizational values constitute a great deal of OD's environment and, therefore, must be responded to as they change. Basic core values in OD include assumptions about the process, the technology, and the client-consultant relationship. If a two-way process of convergence with management and organizational values ensues, we get closer to optimal effectiveness of OD practice. Conversely, if OD values diverge from management's, the effectiveness of OD practice becomes less than optimal.

With regard to values themselves, even the briefest of reviews will yield many perspectives on OD values. When we speak of OD's core values, we refer to that set of orientations that have been relatively insulated from change or even from serious examination since their formation in the 1950's and 1960's. Among those that seem most prevalent are democracy, trust, openness, consensus, humanism, hope, personal growth, participation and self-assessment. While there is nothing "bad" about these values, they have the inherent tendency to preclude even the thought of adapting to changes in the environment, the lack of which may have impaired the actual functionality of such concepts. These values and their impact on the field will be discussed throughout the paper.

VALUES

Before embarking on our review of the literature, we would like to state a key conceptualization about values which the reader should keep in mind. Our perspective is best characterized by this lengthy quote from Margulies and Raia (1978).

Most discussions of OD values focus on them as ends in themselves; that is, that the change process is directed toward creating a particular kind of organization. This "ideal" organization is frequently described as one in which participation and democracy are emphasized and where close interpersonal relationships and social need satisfaction are desired ends. Although these results may be desirable, and perhaps should be aimed for whenever possible, it must be noted that the kind of organization created by an OD effort may not have such ideal characteristics. The resulting organization may in fact be highly structured, may foster authoritarian management styles and practices, and may limit the degree of interaction among its members--and this may be quite appropriate given the mission or purpose of the organization! (p. 145)

Thus we see that it is the process, based on and guided by the values, which is really the heart of OD. Additionally, it is the adherence to this process which constitutes whether or not one is "doing OD." It is important to review and, indeed, to update the values to reflect reality, without endangering the process. The OD profes-
sional is not "selling" a value system but instead incorporates the value system as a beacon which directs the process of organizational analysis, exchange, and development.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Currently, there is quite a voluminous body of literature available on where OD has been, where it is at present, and where it should head in the future. In order to present a comprehensive review, the information is roughly segregated into three eras: the past, 1940 to 1975; the present, 1975 to 1985; and the future, 1985 and on. The purpose of this review is to make the case that the emphasis to date has been almost solely an internal one and that this, in fact, as McLean et al. (1982) characterized it, may leave OD "... suffering from the ultimate indignity of failure to adapt to changes in its environment" (p. 8).

THE PAST

In this section, the OD literature from 1940 to 1975 will be reviewed in order to demonstrate the neglect of critical external issue coverage.

INSULARITY

The literature on OD has from time to time pointed to the field's insularity. A simple review demonstrates that few outside or on the fringes of the field have contributed significantly to the body of information available. While one would not expect those completely unfamiliar with OD to write about it, there are many who have studied it or been a part of it in organizations, and their comments are few and far between.

In Burke and Goodstein's (1980) edited collection on trends and issues in OD, we are informed that all of the contributing authors are well known OD practitioners and conceptualizers. In fact, no one from outside the field contributed to their review. Insularity is further demonstrated in Spier, et al.'s (1980) piece, where the Delphi technique is used to make predictions about the future. As was seen in virtually all the critiques on trends and issues in OD, the discussions and ideas come from "OD practitioners and scholars" almost to a one. As might be expected from such a one-sided perspective, Spier et al.'s (1980) categorization of OD references all have an internal focus (p. 14). While consensus is helpful in clarifying the majority's view, it may also dangerously insulate the field from external influence. Indeed, McLean et al. (1982) characterized OD as being rooted in the "assumptions of a more consensual and collaborative approach to decision making, and in the hippy culture of the late 1960's..." (p. 8).

OD EVOLUTION

While many authors (3,7,10,11,19,20) have discussed the evolution of OD over the years, most have chosen to concentrate on the changes in technologies, methodologies, and the provability of theories. Greiner (1980), however, gives a brief yet comprehensive overview of how the values and goals of OD evolved from the 1950's to the late 1970's.

According to Greiner's framework, in the 1950's the basic values of OD were openness, feedback, and personal change. In the early to mid-sixties, Greiner notes that there was a shift of emphasis to teamwork, integration, and organizational change. The academic group was joined by professional consultants and their goal was altered to that of selling new designs. In the early seventies, OD values seemed to have rigidified as a result of some defensiveness in response to a plethora of newly spawned OD critics. Goals also shifted to emphasizing results or, as many phrased it, to the bottom line impact of OD interventions. Finally, in the late seventies, Greiner notes that
there was a shift of concentration to the quality-of-work-life and to new issues of turnover, absenteeism, morale and productivity (Greiner, 1980). Burke (1977) remarked that values of democracy pervaded the field (p. 26). Harrison (1980) notes that there was a major cultural shift from the 1960's to the 1970's which affected OD; he characterizes this as a move from hope, peace, and love to winning, power, and influence (p. 150).

At first glance, one might surmise from this that OD was very effective at changing with the times during this period. In actuality, most of those changes were centered around goals, issues and technologies. As the quote from Harrison reveals, the core values, at least up to the late seventies, remained relatively intact since their inception. In fact, as the next section will demonstrate, rather than changing, these values are actually strengthened and become even more insulated with the passage of time.

THE PRESENT

The present, as we have delineated, covers the period from 1975 to 1985. During this period, there has been a great increase in the actual volume of material published and many new ideas have surfaced. However, as the next section will demonstrate, the core values of OD emerge from the period relatively unchanged. Additionally, these values begin to clearly diverge from the values of management, a topic which causes concern to many of the authors reviewed here. To illustrate these facts clearly, we will cover several topics, including: insularity, OD's continuing evolution, shifts in role and goal perceptions, and divergent values.

INSULARITY

There are several excellent examples of the continuing insularity of OD in the present. Rhinesmith (1970) states that "Culture and its normative qualities are expressed in an individual through the values which he holds about life and the world around him. These values, in turn, affect his attitudes about what form of behavior is appropriate in any given situation" (p.7). Burke and Goodstein (1980) add that OD training must reflect the values of "... involvement, open participation, freedom of choice ... " (p.213). Margulies and Raia (1978) define OD as "a value based process of self-assessment ... " (p. 24). Within these definitions, we see that OD's entire framework is bound by commonly held values. If Burke and Goodstein's comment that Od practitioners share "a set of normative goals based on our social philosophy and values" (p.5) is also true, then clearly what OD strives to achieve must lie within a culturally bounded realm. Further, in the historical development of OD, one finds a central group arising from certain microcosms of humanistic thought. Indeed, the cohesiveness of the group is such that it may be thought of as a cohort, sharing values and norms specific to OD, and OD alone. Certainly this base of normative values can be said to be relatively unique when compared to the values of management. This is further supported by the discussion of the evolution of OD during this period.

OD EVOLUTION

The idea that OD is continually evolving seems quite common in the material reviewed here. Burke (1977) commented that OD is still "... in the process of becoming" (p. 23). Burke and Goodstein (1980) together felt OD was having an identity crisis, due in part to the proliferation of goals and technologies which have emerged over the last two decades (p. 5). But, as will be demonstrated here, this evolution continues to focus internally on methods and new issues like politics and power. Many authors discuss OD values, but at no point are the core
values seriously questioned as to their efficacy for the field as a whole.

Burke (1977) outlines a shift in the primary values of OD from strictly democracy/participation to authenticity (p. 26). He also relates that genuine behavior is starting to be viewed as equal in value to the participative credo (p. 26). However, he maintains that we should not shift values but, instead, must show the greater efficacy of our values versus those of management. This would be accomplished by a cost/benefit analysis of particular actions to show the greater efficiency and/or effectiveness of the humanistic approach (p. 28-29). Burke goes on to say that changes in OD are largely responsive to cultural trends and a coherent value system (p. 35). The paradox arises then that OD need not change its value system (p. 35). The real question is, then, "If the environment substantially changes, how can the same 'coherent value system' continue to be applicable?" Certainly Burke is not the only author to present this paradox but simply served well for the purposes of example here.

These brief reviews clearly illustrate that OD values, derived from the culture of the 1950's and 1960's, have not substantially altered as we enter the 1980's. Clearly, the same cannot be said for management's values. While some evolution has occurred in OD, it remains internal in nature and has not been responsive to the turbulence in the environment composed of organizations and managers.

ROLES AND GOALS

Conveniently, those who discuss roles and goals of OD in the present seem to fall into two camps. The first camp consists of those who are concerned with defining what OD does, and the second with how OD performs what it does. Neither camp is particularly concerned with the underlying assumptions and values which both of these dimensions are based on (or, at least, it appears that the values are taken for granted).

Burke and Goodstein (1980) iterate that "The job and role of the OD practitioner is to help organizational members adapt to and cope with these externally derived factors" (p. 7), the externally derived factors being the environment. Interestingly, there is no mention of OD as a field changing and adapting to cope with the environment. Freidlander and Brown (1977) outline the objectives of OD as optimizing human and social improvement or optimizing task accomplishment, or a blending of the two (p. 56). While this marks a major transition from previous definitions by including task accomplishment, it still neglects to include an examination of values. Finally, Kanter (1977) states that OD's raison d'être is "... the effort to help organizations more fully and humanely utilize all of their human resources" (p. 108). When this statement is compared with earlier definitions it seems evident that the basic values of OD have not substantially changed in the last two decades.

In the second camp, concern is centered around how things are done. Srivastva (1977) separates the case of organizations (i.e., striving to succeed in growth, wealth, and production) from the cause of OD (i.e., people are open systems and can manage change better if group members have common feelings about change) (p. 101). If change is more easily implemented when group members share common feelings, then wouldn't it also hold true that those who seek to facilitate change need to have some common feelings with the group they are trying to assist? Herein lies the paradox of OD: there is only a one-way osmosis of values, from the practitioner to the members of the organization.

Much of the literature emphasizes the evolution of OD from an internal
perspective. The question of the efficacy of core values which have remained relatively constant for the last twenty turbulent years is quite simply left out.

**DIVERGENT VALUES**

We have tried to demonstrate through evidence in the literature that the basic or core values of OD have remained intact over two to three decades. The philosophical and practical question for the field is, "Should the values change?"

Up to this point, we have discussed the evolution of OD itself. If OD were independent of organizations, perhaps there would be no need for further discussion about values. However, OD as both theory and practice is symbiotically involved with real world organizations. Therefore, if it is maintained that changes in the environment have led to major changes in organizations, the question arises, how different are the values of OD from the values of the organizations we propose to help change and, more importantly, what are the implications for OD? Two perspectives emerge in response to this question. The first opts for a widening of traditional concepts in order to become more functional--more effective, if you will. The second view warns against such change, seeing it as a dangerous lowering of established standards, focus, and orientation.

McLean et al. (1982) state that OD is in a process of metamorphosis from the environmentally stable early days to the more turbulent current times (p. 8). They remind us that "Organizations and governments seem to be more concerned with survival than with development . . ." (p. 7) and that OD must respond to this change. They focus on the lessons learned thus far and try to delineate how we must change. The result, as they see it, is a more "mature" focus for OD, i.e., one which ultimately is " . . . relatively self-reliant, working more from an internal locus control, as compared with a predominantly external dependence on others for answers, techniques and ideas" (p.122). Thus, while they acknowledge the fact that external changes have occurred, they still seem to advocate remaining internally focused.

Hornstein (1980) relates that one result of the shifting of organizational values has been an increase in encountering "organizational nemises" in his consulting endeavors. Hornstein's "nemesis" are those individuals within an organization who hold grossly divergent values from the consultant. He sees a "counterreaction" by consultants to organizational nemises resulting in ineffective consultant behavior (internal consultant) (p. 310), practice, if you will. One can see that as the values between OD and contemporary organizations become more divergent, the frequency of encountering an "organizational nemesis" is more likely to occur. Clearly, the result of this is less effective consulting behavior, or an increase in counterreaction.

The second view to note here apparently subscribes to the idea that any change from OD's original perspectives and values constitutes some sort of "selling out." Indeed, in reviewing the literature there does seem to be an underlying sanction against even the suggestion of change in core OD values. Rather than reiterating these works (3,8,10), we feel it may be more useful to focus on McLean et al.'s comments on this issue and to add our own perspective.

McLean et al. (1982) see the "traditional" OD values of openness, honestly, clarity, consensus, and collaboration as a basis for the OD practitioner's repertoire, but they suspect that political values are also becoming prevalent (p. 2,7). They elaborate that especially among internal consultants, values are becoming less clear and there are in-
creasing chances for the consultant to be caught in a "web" of organizational politics (p. 57-59). Concurrently, many OD practitioners see themselves as neutral facilitators, when, in fact, they are not neutral but are seeking control of situations according to their own definitions (p. 106). McLean et al. do not allow for the possibility that the existing framework of normative values will not be effective at facilitating change in organizations without like values. To wit, they quote Kelman that "there exists no formula for so structuring an effective change situation that such manipulation is totally absent" (p. 59).

Interestingly enough, few are so brave as McLean et al. to challenge the carefully nurtured and insular values of OD. Indeed, the review shows that at present, even though some feel trapped by the humanistic value structure (McLean et al., p. 59), most express fear at the thought of change. In actuality, it seems that OD practitioners feel any change to the core values would mean that they were doing something different than OD (Greiner, 1980). Similarly, there is the implication--and a profound one, at that--that somehow all of the values of management are some how corrupted by tainted motives such as profit and productivity. The obvious result of this has been the notion, conscious or otherwise, that OD must convert management to OD's values and be careful not to become contaminated with their values in the process.

At this juncture, it may be that the theory and the practice of OD are quite divergent on this point. Clearly, the conscientious OD practitioner cannot completely ignore organizational values, nor would he or she want to. It is our contention that, in practice, most professionals are aware of and respond to the need to acknowledge the organization's values and may, in fact, agree with those values.

A final--and perhaps most interesting--point concerns the concept of changing management's values. The management literature seems more and more to focus on the need and design for implementing change in management's values. A good example is the recent attention given to Peters' and Waterman's In Search of Excellence and their stress on corporate culture and values. For some time, OD has viewed changing management values as its basic mission. The basis for this is two-fold: first, that management's existing values are not okay and, second, that there is some inherent "rightness" in OD's values and that, therefore, they must take precedence. The problem with this logic is that while the need for commonality in values is illustrated as necessary in order to facilitate planned change, at no point is there any question about OD's values changing. In the next section, we will sum up the projections for the future and try to relate them to these concepts to demonstrate that OD does not seem to be planning any change from the present perspective and that this would greatly reduce our overall effectiveness in the years to come.

**THE FUTURE**

There is an inherent problem in making predictions about the future. Whether the method of forecasting is time series analysis or expert opinion, it is well-nigh impossible to make accurate predictions of the future when major shifts in key variables occur. The forecasts for OD are all based on the expert opinion of professional OD practitioners and theorists. They cannot remove themselves from their already entrenched values and norms. As a result, OD's future is portrayed as an extension of current issues and problems, with an added dash of optimism that we will find solutions to these difficulties in the years to come.

While the forecasts (13,15,19,20)
do not break the patterns reviewed thus far, some do hint at the possibility for change in the value structure. The trends characterized in the literature are roughly categorized into internal issues, external issues, and value or cultural integration issues, and they will be discussed in this order.

INTERNAL PREDICTIONS

As previously mentioned, Spier et al. (1980) used the Delphi technique in order to gain a consensus view of where OD is headed. From this study they found that OD practitioners expect trends of formulating a unifying theory, increasing credibility, more and better documentation, and quality control (p. 26). This represents a continuation of both past and current concerns in the field. In the last few pages of their piece, however, Spier et al. do express concern about OD values. The sixth implication they infer states, "Question your values and truths. There is a strong tendency for persons such as OD practitioners . . . to deify their own disciplines and ignore those of others" (p. 36). Additionally, they comment that "conflict between personal and organizational goals . . . will be one of the paramount value issues for the field . . . " and that " . . . the dissenting view alerts us to the challenges involved in the rethinking and integrating of our traditional focus and values" (p. 21). This clearly demonstrates a budding concern regarding the divergence of management and OD values.

McLean et al. (1982) also broach the subject of values. The present a dichotomy between OD's humanism of the past and its increasing pragmatism in the present in response to a shift in organizational emphasis to survival (p. 124). They also remark that appropriate OD theories will be those in which both the organizational situation and the consultant's own values are taken into account (p. 120). Unfortunately, their answer to this need for adapta-

tion is the application of broader theories and not an examination of, or change in, traditional values. This view is common among most of the authors reviewed.

EXTERNAL PREDICTIONS

From a more externally oriented viewpoint, Spier et al. found " . . . the forecasts of key practitioners . . . of OD efforts reflect also the explicit and perceived expectations of the client systems . . . " (p. 12). From this, they maintain that the forecasts reflect external factors in environment and that as these external factors affect organizations, they also affect OD (p. 12). However, it is not clear how this affect transference occurs, nor that it actually does. While 28 of 41 of the experts opined that environmental turbulence had at least possible impact on OD, only ten were certain (p. 27). Woodcock and Francis (1980) concur that there will be increasing pressure on organizations to deal with environmental uncertainty in terms of coping with social and economic changes (p. 185). Clearly, then, some experts recognize this as an issue for concern, but none take it so far as to ask if the environment has changed, how those changes have impacted on OD, and what sorts of internal changes are required as a result.

Our perspective is that trend analysis continues to emphasize what, how, and to whom OD is done. There are no indications that OD is ready to undertake a basic internal restatement of mission or values or, at least, an assessment of such. Additionally, there seems to be no effort to measure if the organizations we seek to help have similar or totally different value and cultural bases from our own. Spier et al.'s second trend proposed that greater utilization of OD to increase productivity and profitability can be expected (p. 21). Interestingly, most of the panel chose to be outside the consensus on this. Many of those interviewed
seem to feel that there is a conflict between "human" needs and "system" needs, and they don't see any convergence of the two. Falling back on the concept that the organization is inherently evil and/or misguided in its motivations, many practitioners and theorists feel that an emphasis on system needs would mean being co-opted by the system (p. 21). One is prompted by this to question: if our emphasis is on helping, whose definition of what constitutes help do we use—OD's, the organization's, or some combination of the two?

An excellent example of this dilemma can be described as follows. If the emphasis on survival continues to be made necessary by environmental conditions, it is possible that security needs of organizational members may no longer be satisfied. If this is the case, should OD try to facilitate changes in the quality of work life through increasing "self-actualization," or should the basic security components of the organization be the target of the OD process? One can easily see, then, that productivity and profit may not be bad emphases; in fact, they may be what organizational members feel are the most important components in security the quality of work life OD seeks to facilitate.

A final comment in this section on external issues in OD's future demonstrates the omission of adaptability from our future plans. Greiner's (1980) section on the OD preferences questionnaire defines two ends of a spectrum for the OD practitioner: either overturning or joining with management. For the 1980's, it seems that the majority of OD people are in the middle ground. Greiner notes that while this may be good for survival, it is not likely to encourage growth in the field. He also comments on the feeling that as OD may have become so involved in implementation the question of values has been left by the wayside (p. 327). Nonetheless, he still stresses that organizations must be the ones who change their values. Here, as we stated before, lies the core difficulty for OD. It is mentioned in summary to illustrate that while we acknowledge the fact of environmental turbulence and its impact, we still seem to advocate a "wait-and-see" attitude before committing to change ourselves.

CONCLUSIONS: PLURALITY AND COMBINATIONS OF CULTURE

In this final section reviewing the literature on OD's future, we look to the works which have concentrated on the melding of cultures. The most recent OD Network Conference (San Francisco, 1985) began with the traditional emphasis on personal growth, methodology, growth and quality control of OD consulting, and the provability of the efficacy of OD.

As Chandler (1977) remarked about managers in the early 1900's, "By attending and participating in the same meetings, by reading and writing for the same journals, and by having attended the same type of college courses, these managers began to have a common outlook as well as common interests" (p. 468). One can easily see the applicability of this statement both to modern managers and to OD people. The implications are that both cohorts will have an entrenched system of culture and values and that these, considering their different backgrounds, are quite likely to be divergent. In this sense, then, when an OD practitioner, either internal or external, seeks to facilitate planned change in an organization, a great deal of cross-cultural management is required. Indeed, the entry stage itself requires the effective OD consultant to be able to identify clearly his own values, those of the organization, and some effective way of dealing with the two simultaneously.

It is becoming clear that we advocate examination at the very least and,
hopefully, some change in the core values of OD. While this has not been directly addressed as an OD issue, it has often been pondered upon for organizations. Morely (1980), in her work on managing integration, stresses the idea that organizations need to learn to live with cultural pluralism to effect successful integration in organizations (p. 124). In light of the information offered so far, we are prompted to put forth that this same ability to deal with cultural pluralism is sorely needed by OD, in both theory and practice. Since our culture is indeed different from that of the organizations we seek to help, it seems necessary that we cast our ethnocentrism by the wayside and learn to respond to the changing needs of modern organizations. In fact, if we do not learn to integrate out two cultures, how can we hope to achieve any of our goals?

Adler (1980) also discusses learning to manage cultural differences in organizations. Her piece about the management of cross-cultural organizations is rich with ideas which are highly applicable to OD’s situation with modern management. She outlines that when two cultures must work together, there are three assumptions which generally hinder their ability to succeed. These assumptions are ethnocentrism, assimilation, and the assumption of the primacy of domestic operations (p. 165). All three tend to be quite good at engendering hostility, low productivity and loss of valuable cultural differences which could result in enrichment of the unit’s operations, both social and economic. The solutions generally offered to cross-cultural management are either to take only what is common to both or to take what is common in the non-dominant organization and add it to the dominant organization’s culture (p. 168-172).

To date, it would seem that OD subscribes to an ethnocentric assumption about our culture and values. While the literature recommends that we be aware of culture and values which exist in organizations, the overriding viewpoint appears to be: when there is a need for values to change, management’s values are the sole target. Certainly the projections for the future have mentioned some thought about examining our core values, but at present this is not being done. The cultural boundedness of the OD professional combined with the insularity and cohort aspects of the field may leave the unwary practitioner completely ignorant of this process. Indeed, McLean et al. (1982) state that values are more evident after the fact than they are during the process (p. 15). Since the evaluation phase of consulting is the one most likely to be omitted, it is not surprising that this unconsciousness exists.

In summary, we have reviewed the literature on the past, present and future of OD. We have tried to demonstrate that the core values have not significantly evolved over the last few decades in spite of massive environmental turbulence and shifts in organizational emphasis. Additionally, we have shown that management’s values are diverging from OD’s and this is cause for concern throughout the field. Based on these facts, we contend that some adaptation of OD values is necessary if we are to successfully pursue our goals.
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