

A JOURNEY OF CHANGE: THE HISTORY OF TEAM BUILDING
IN ORGANIZATIONS, 1900-1989

by

Marilyn Sawyer Wesner

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Adult and Continuing Education

APPROVED:

Marcie Boucouvalas
M. Boucouvalas, Co-Chairman

Harold W. Stubblefield
H. W. Stubblefield, Co-Chairman

Tom Hunt by TWS
T. C. Hunt

Albert K. Wiswell
A. K. Wiswell

Cynthia B. Smith, Ph.D.
C. B. Smith

December, 1995

Blacksburg, Virginia

C.2

LD
5655
V856
1995
W446
C.2

A JOURNEY OF CHANGE: THE HISTORY OF TEAM BUILDING
IN ORGANIZATIONS, 1900-1989

by

Marilyn Sawyer Wesner

Committee Co-Chair: Marcie Boucouvalas

Committee Co-Chair: Harold Stubblefield

Adult Education

(ABSTRACT)

This historical study, covering the period 1900-1989, examined how team building became a discreet educational intervention in organizations. Team building, unlike other training interventions of the 1960s, continued to be used throughout the 1980s despite the major changes in organizations. The study reveals some of the story of how people in organizations worked to develop ways to get along with each other and to improve their performance.

The study is divided into three time periods. The first, 1900-1950, was a period of the discovery of the value of teams in the workplace. The second period, 1950-1969, when team building emerged, was marked by an increased focus on the social interactions of managers, supervisors and workers. The third period, 1970-1989, saw team building

change its focus. During the 1970s, team building became a stand alone educational process focused on solving productivity and quality problems.

The factor that most influenced the evolution and development of team building was the management theory and practice of the times. Ranging from team building focused on relationships during the era of human relations, to team building focused on problem solving for total quality management, this group learning experience continued to meet the needs for training groups in organizations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Harold Stubblefield and Dr. Marcie Boucouvalas, my co-chairpersons, for their guidance and support. Their patience and assistance throughout this long process provided an excellent learning experience for me.

My gratitude is also extended to Dr. Tom Hunt, Dr. Bert Wiswell and Dr. Cynthia Smith for their assistance as my committee members.

A special thanks to my husband, Darrell Wesner, for his encouragement and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	10
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	11
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	12
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.....	14
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	15
REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE.....	17
METHOD.....	19
DATA SOURCES.....	21
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.....	21
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY.....	22
2. DISCOVERING THE VALUE OF TEAM WORK 1900-1950...	25
FREDERICK TAYLOR AND THE SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT MOVEMENT.....	26
The Idea of the Functional Foreman.....	34
THE HUMAN RELATIONS MOVEMENT.....	36
The Hawthorne Studies.....	37
Interpretations of the Hawthorne Studies...	41

Early Impacts of the Hawthorne Studies.....	46
KURT LEWIN AND GROUP DYNAMICS THEORY.....	48
The Harwood Studies.....	50
The Center for the Study of Group Dynamics: 1945-1949.....	54
An Innovation in Training.....	56
CONCLUSION	58
3. THE EMERGENCE OF TEAM BUILDING: FOCUS ON SOCIAL INTERACTIONS.....	61
RESPONSES TO THE NEW KNOWLEDGE OF GROUPS IN THE WORKPLACE.....	63
Theories of Worker Satisfaction and Motivation.....	68
HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND T-GROUP METHODS: PRELUDE TO TEAM BUILDING.....	73
Laboratory Training.....	79
Industrial Training Laboratories.....	84
Early Team Building Efforts.....	87
ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT: TRUE TEAM BUILDING EMERGES.....	88
THE MANAGERIAL GRID AND TEAM BUILDING.....	97
The Grid Laboratory.....	100
Grid OD and Team Building.....	102

CONCLUSION.....	104
4. TEAM BUILDING WITH A PURPOSE: FOCUS ON	
PROBLEM SOLVING 1970-1989.....	106
THE GROWING INTEREST IN TEAM BUILDING.....	107
THE STATE OF THE WORKPLACE AND OD.....	111
TEAM BUILDING IN JOB ENRICHMENT AND WORK	
REDESIGN.....	115
Job Enrichment at Texas Instruments.....	115
Job Enrichment at AT&T.....	119
The Application of Job Enrichment at New	
Plants.....	120
Resistance to Job Enrichment.....	122
TEAMS AND QUALITY CIRCLES.....	123
Union Opposition to Quality Circles.....	126
TEAMS IN THE QUALITY OF WORKLIFE MOVEMENT.....	128
Assessments of QCs and QWL.....	131
TEAM BUILDING EMERGES AS A DISTINCT TRAINING	
INTERVENTION.....	132
Team building as More Than Structured	
Experiences.....	134
COMMON ELEMENTS IN TEAM BUILDING.....	135
Team Building by Zenger and Miller.....	136
Dyer's Comprehensive Model of Team	

Building.....	137
NTL Training for Team Builders.....	139
The Unique Characteristics of Team Buildin	

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

American corporations are in crisis, and in response to that crisis, a revolution in management theory and practice is underway. Layers of the management hierarchy are being eradicated, leaving little of the familiar organizational structure associated with traditional autocratic management styles. Competition in the global marketplace, a battle that some businesses in the U.S. appear to be losing, is causing business leaders to re-think their organization's structure and management system. The climate in organizations is transitioning from one of tight control and authoritarian management to a collaborative work environment, where teams of workers influence operational and strategic decision making. Team work, like other kinds of work, requires skills and experience. Team building, the topic of this study, is about how individuals and groups of employees learn these skills by learning about themselves, each other, and the collaborative efforts required in order to successfully work together towards common goals.

Team based management is not a new phenomenon. As early as 1955, training and development professionals were responding to the "cry for team work training" (Smith, 1955,

p.29) for U. S. managers. Today, training intact groups of workers for team work is commonly called team building (Patten, 1981) and continues to grow as an area of human resource development (HRD) practice. The focus of this research is an historical examination of the practice of team building as an educational intervention, in terms of its introduction into the organization, what it accomplished, and how it changed over the years.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Team building emerged as an educational response to several significant changes in the workplace in the U.S. since World War II. These changes precipitated a major shift in management theory and practice and the increased need for effective team work. The changing nature of work, the increasing diversity of the work force, and the quality movement were three key events compelling organizations to reshape their forms and functions, and correspondingly, the education and preparation of their employees.

Drucker (1950), in The New Society, attributed the change in the nature of work to the mass production principle (MPP). In MPP, labor was still divided into special parts and motion, along the lines of scientific management; however, integration of the work effort was

necessary to assemble the final product. This integration required people to work together, understanding their personal contribution to the finished output of their combined efforts.

Later changes in the nature of work were apparent in the post 1970s. Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983) characterized this period as the second industrial revolution, when the country moved from an era of manufacturing to one of information, service and new technology. Jobs created by the first industrial revolution required little decision making by the worker because scientific management had broken work into small, routinely performed measurable tasks. Jobs created in this second industrial revolution consisted of non-routine tasks, requiring the individual worker to use his own discretion rather than relying upon supervisory direction or a specific job description. This essential change became a major determinant in the shift away from a closely supervised, autocratic workplace to one where employees participated in decisions about the daily operational requirements of their work.

The second major influence in the workplace was the changing composition of the work force. Education levels of

workers steadily increased between 1959 and 1977, rising from 32% with high school diplomas to 42% (Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). Employees with college degrees rose from 14.7% of the work force in 1970 to 24.2% in 1983 (Best, 1985). The participation of women in the work force between 1972 and 1986 grew from 38.5% to 44.4% and minority participation doubled during the same time period (Fullerton, 1987). A trend towards earlier retirement reduced the percentage of men still working between the ages of 55 to 64 from 88% in the 1960s to 64% in 1988 (Erllich, 1988).

These dramatic differences in the constitution of the work force also brought with them wide variations in employees' values and attitudes about work. Employees were no longer willing to accept managerial authority without question (Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). According to Best (1985), workers' demands for many workplace reforms like participation in decision making, pleasant workplaces and considerate management developed as a result of the changes in social values during the 1960s.

The third event influencing major change in the U.S. workplace was the need for better quality control in the production process. In the 1950s, W. Edwards Deming, an

American, assisted Japan with the implementation of quality control techniques (Walton, 1991). American industry, noting the tremendous success of the Japanese auto and electronics industries, began its own quality initiatives in the late 1970s, commonly referred to as quality circles (Cothran & Kaeter, 1992; Hoerr, 1989). Lawler and Mohrman (1985) estimated that, by 1985, more than 90% of the Fortune 500 companies had quality circles in place.

Organizations responded to these significant events in the workplace in a number of ways, and in each of these responses the concept of team work and team building were at the center. Management training and development and organization development (OD) were both common educational responses to implementing, managing and sustaining change in the organization. Team building is generally considered a component of both.

Management training, prior to 1950, focused on the supervisory level, where supervisors were taught how to explain job skills to subordinates (Underwood, 1991). More recently, management training and development consists of teaching and developing skills that managers do not readily learn in school such as leadership, team work, interpersonal effectiveness and negotiation (Carnevale, 1988).

OD, in general use in organizations since the 1960s, is a large scale educational intervention intended to bring about planned organization wide change (Beckhard, 1969; Bennis, 1969). Using behavioral science methods, theories and research, OD practitioners assist the organization in determining the nature of the problems facing the organization, and recommend specific actions or interventions to bring about the planned changes (Burke, 1987). OD takes a systematic approach to improving organizational performance: assisting in strategic planning, restructuring the organization and examining and recommending changes in support systems for employees such as reward and recognition. Team work and team building are included as ways to improve organizational performance, as well as employee relationships.

Change of even the smallest magnitude is not without its difficulties, and although OD and management training assisted managers during periods of transition in organizations, they were not always readily accepted. Educational interventions like team building continue today (Gordon, 1994) but the organizational climate has not always been supportive of the ideas espoused by team work proponents.

The intellectual leaders of team work and team building continue to influence its acceptance in corporate America. Respected management, OD and HRD pioneers like Kurt Lewin, Douglas McGregor, Robert Blake and Jane Mouton all played significant roles in the development and application of team building in organizations.

A forerunner of team building, laboratory training, arose in the late 1940s from the works of Kurt Lewin and his associates at what became the National Training Laboratories (NTL). Their interests in teaching group members the skills they needed to enhance their own interpersonal skills led to the first experiential T-group in 1947 (Margulies & Wallace, 1973).

Douglas McGregor (1960), in The Human Side of Enterprise, discussed the importance of team work and the corresponding need for understanding and learning the skills necessary for group effectiveness. He specifically identified the need to help people obtain skills in group membership and refers to the laboratory method as an effective tool for doing this. McGregor, as a management consultant to many organizations, led some of the initial team building efforts as part of his overall work effort to assist organizations in improving their effectiveness.

Robert Blake and Jane Mouton are best known for the Managerial Grid, an instrument used by managers and supervisors in assessing their managerial styles and applying that knowledge to improve their effectiveness in the workplace. Blake introduced the concept of instrumented laboratory training, later called Grid Team Training in the early 1960s (Blake & Mouton, 1965). Grid OD, a further utilization of the Grid instrument in large scale organizational interventions also resulted from their work (Blake & Mouton, 1969).

The increasing complexity of the world of work called for more sophisticated educational strategies and methods. The team building of today looks different from that of yesteryear, where team members were called together to examine their managerial styles and learn how to work together more effectively. The students of team building are also different today. They are usually front line employees. In the past, supervisors and managers were the primary participants.

The changing face of team building and the many contexts in which it occurred has often appeared faddish and detached from any planned change efforts. In fact, many times the prescription for team building preceded the

diagnosis of problems or the need for organizational change. However, the contributions of a generation of social scientists, management theorists and respected HRD and OD practitioners provided the foundation for this popular educational intervention, and continue today to influence its form.

In today's business environment, where more than 3.4 million jobs have been eliminated since 1982, employees remaining in the organization suffer from lack of trust, feelings of insecurity and increased political infighting (Lee, 1992), hardly the conditions for building effective teams. Yet the importance of team building, as measured by executives of Fortune 200 companies was rated eighth in a list of more than 30 topics requiring high emphases in executive education and development (Mann & Staudenmier, 1991). And the popularity of team building as a training intervention remains steady (Gordon, 1994).

Research on team building as a distinct educational intervention is limited to studies evaluating its effectiveness (Friedlander, 1972; Nadler, 1984) and recommendations for change in context or format (Sopp, 1982). There has been no research to examine how team building became a discrete educational intervention, what

conditions existed for its emergence, and what the motivations were for its introduction and continued application in organizations. It is one of several educational processes that has endured over time and through an era of significant change in U. S. business. Consequently it is the aim of this study to explore the origins, evolution and persistence of this area of HRD practice.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In recent years, historical research in HRD has addressed broad issues in the field of HRD (Hicks, 1991; Underwood, 1991) and the more specific areas of management training and development (Mech, 1984). Related research on the history of organization development (Dunnette, 1976) and adult education (Stubblefield, 1988) has also been conducted. The subject of team building, its origins and development, has not been the subject of historical inquiry.

This study illuminates a specific educational response to change in the workplace during a difficult period for U.S. business, from 1900 to 1989, and provides a glimpse of corporate life as well. Team building began during this period and continues as a popular educational intervention in organizations today (Gordon, 1994), despite the current

trends in reengineering and downsizing, processes which often create high anxiety, competitive behaviors and distrust. Other interventions such as T-groups and job enrichment emerging during the same time period have all but vanished from the world of corporate training and development. Team building continues to fill a gap in the education of the members of the organization. This study attempted to discern why this is so.

Exploring the course that team building has taken through the years requires an understanding of its origins, its evolution and development, and the roles of the people who individually and collectively put their minds together to shape its application and form. Therefore, the problem investigated by this study is: What is the career of team building, as a discrete educational intervention? The concept of career provides a particular focus to the study, implying an examination of the passage of team building throughout recent organizational history. Although the term team building was not common on the literature prior to 1960, to fully describe this passage, the years 1900 to 1989 were examined.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The major purpose of this study was to describe the

emergence of team building, its development and subsequent widespread application and persistence in organizations. The primary objective of team building throughout the years has been to improve one dimension of organization performance, team work; however, the driving forces for the continued application of team building have changed based on the interactions of a number of people and events, both internal and external to the organization.

To understand the evolution of this popular educational intervention in organizations, team building must be studied not only as a collection of methods or techniques, but also as a function of its contextual requirements and the motivation for its adaptations over time. Therefore, a secondary objective of this study was to examine the surrounding organizational context in which team building developed.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following questions provide the framework for the research:

1. What were the origins and antecedents of team building?
 - a. What internal and external conditions were associated with the introduction of team building?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This historical study illuminates the progress of team building and tells some of the story of how people in organizations worked to develop ways to get along with each other and improve performance. A slice of life in the organization will also be revealed because it was the context from which team building emerged, developed and continues to mature. This history of team building connects the evolution of one area of current practice to management and organizational theories and their proponents in the past. From this vantage point, we better understand the forces and decisions which drive our practice.

Rapid changes in the competitive environment, technology and the work force have placed managers and employees in a state of perpetual change. As much of the work of the organization occurs through the team (Blake & Mouton, 1965), improving team performance is a highly desirable goal. The ability to readily create effective team building interventions requires a deeper understanding of the process and the theory surrounding it, what has worked and what has not worked, and what conditions in organizations most benefit from its application.

This study attacked the problem from a perspective

different from previous research on the topic of team building, exploring the past and telling the story of the human actors and events shaping this area of practice. This exploration provides the HRD practitioner with a better foundation from which to determine the applicability of team building for current organizational situations, expand its use, modify its technique and perhaps, improve its effectiveness.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Important terms used in this study are defined below:

CONTENT: The subject matter under discussion or the topic of the learning experience.

HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT: An organized learning experience provided by employers within a specified period of time to bring about the possibility of performance improvement and/or personal growth (Nadler & Nadler, 1989).

INTERVENTION: Entrance into an ongoing system of relationships between or among groups of people for the purpose of helping them.

ORGANIZATION: A complex social system whose outputs are dependent upon the inputs of people within the system, and the interaction of the social processes, the technological environment, and the internal and external

environments (Beer, 1976).

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT: An organization wide effort, using behavioral science knowledge and managed from the top, to improve the organization's effectiveness through planned interventions into the organization's processes (Beckhard, 1969).

PEDAGOGY: The act or process of imparting knowledge and/or skill.

PROCESS: With respect to groups, how things are accomplished or performed.

QUALITY CIRCLES: Groups or teams of employees who work together to improve product and service quality.

QUALITY OF WORKLIFE: A set of beliefs based on the idea that an organization can enhance both individual and organizational performance through worker involvement. The term is most often used to describe joint union worker involvement efforts in union organized companies.

TEAM: An interdependent collection of people who must rely on the efforts of each other in order to be successful in achieving group goals (Dyer, 1977).

TEAM BUILDING: An educational process which aims to allow group members to work together to identify problems, design and implement solutions to those problems and to

learn from the experience.

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

There is voluminous literature on aspects of the nature of team building. This study researched the problem from a particular perspective: examining, synthesizing and interpreting this literature within an historical framework. Industrial psychology, organization development, business management and human resource development literature were searched to determine what has been written about the history of team building. Only one reference, a dissertation on a proposed model for team building, was found that treated the history of team building as a separate subject (Sopp, 1982). The purpose of Sopp's study was to create a model for team building that incorporated the dimensions of organizational power and politics. The brief history of team building included was predominantly a chronology of events, rather than an interpretative approach to the history of team building.

A chapter in Nadler's Handbook of Human Resource Development (1984) compares and contrasts the roots and development of HRD and OD. Jamieson, Kallech and Kur, authors of this chapter, state that the disciplinary roots of HRD were in learning theory, instructional design and

individual psychology. OD's origins were found in organization behavior, social psychology, organization design and management. Team building is mentioned in this history as a primary tool for OD interventions.

Beer's chapter in the Handbook of Organizational and Industrial Psychology (1976) identifies the Hawthorne Works studies during the 1920s and 1930s as the genesis of OD. He goes on to discuss the significance of National Training Laboratories' (NTL) laboratory training and Blake's instrumented training labs in the development of OD. Team building is presented as a later extension of the laboratory method.

French and Bell (1972) identified laboratory training and survey feedback technology as the primary elements of the foundation of OD. In 1982, French added Tavistock sociotechnical and socioclinical approaches to organizations as the third element of OD's foundation. Another significant factor in the 1972 history of OD was the new consulting role given to the employee relations or industrial relations group to perform OD work in the organization. Team building was described as one educational process used in OD efforts in this history as well.

There are also historical studies of topics related to team building. Two recent dissertations provide life histories of influential men and women in HRD and OD (Hicks, 1991; Underwood, 1991). Two of the people studied, Robert Blake and Jane Mouton, directly influenced the development of team building with the development of the Grid OD seminar in the late 1960s (Blake & Mouton, 1969).

The descriptions of the process and content of team building in these histories sometimes differ, as well as the terminology (Beer, 1976; Nadler, 1984; Burke, 1987). Team building, team training and team development appear to be interchangeable terms (Blake & Mouton, 1965; Patten, 1981) and are often discussed concurrently with human relations training (Beer, 1976). However, a clear distinction is usually made between laboratory training and team building.

Numerous accounts of team building interventions are documented in case studies of a wide array of organizations, ranging from health care to public education (Burke, 1987; Burke & Hornstein; 1972). Many of these accounts include team building as one element of an overall change effort, rather than a stand alone educational event.

METHOD

The research method for this study was historical

research. The historical research method was appropriate for this study because team building has endured over time in various forms and continues to develop. An examination of the facts surrounding the changes in team building and the context in which they occurred provided a level of continuity and understanding missing today from some of the popular resources HRD practitioners rely on to learn about team building.

Historical research involves searching documents and other sources for answers to the questions posed by the researcher (Borg & Gall, 1983). The factual information uncovered in the search must be accurately and honestly recorded and interpreted by the analysis of the researcher (Gest, 1990). The subsequent story told by the researcher is not only a compilation or chronology of events, but also an examination of the contexts of the events and the motivation and influence of the human participants. Patterns of behavior, beliefs, and occurrences may emerge from an historical interpretation that allow the reader to understand the past and present, and to some extent, anticipate the future (Long, Convey & Chwalek, 1986).

A combination of a thematic and chronological approach was used in this study.

DATA SOURCES

Research sources for this study were primarily published materials. Practitioner publications such as Training and Development Journal, Personnel Journal and Personnel were reviewed for general and specific articles and conference proceedings related to the topic. Management texts and journals including the Harvard Business Review were also consulted.

Handbooks for facilitators and trainers, as well as off-the-shelf team building resources were examined for the content and method of team building. Case studies of team building and OD efforts were also searched for relevant information on the team building process.

Additional sources included histories of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), National Training Laboratories (NTL), Western Training Laboratories and the American Management Association (AMA) organizations. Biographies of key people and dissertations on related areas were also examined.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The data sources were read and analyzed for their contribution to answering the research questions. Sources were cross checked and existing discrepancies were

specifically noted in the study.

After all data were collected, they were first organized in chronological order. Within the chronology, the data were then further organized according to the research questions. This arrangement allowed for the development of the themes of the research by assisting in the recognition and identification of antecedent conditions and patterns of occurrences.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study is organized into an introductory chapter, three chapters describing the history of team building, and a final chapter which includes the summary and conclusions of the research. The three chapters describing the history of team building cover a specific time frame and are organized around a common theme for that period.

The introductory chapter includes a statement and background of the problem under study, as well as the significance of the study. The framework for the research is outlined in a series of research questions and definitions for important terms in the study are furnished. A brief review of relevant literature is also provided.

Chapter two examines the first fifty years of the 20th century, 1900-1950, for the origins and antecedents of team

building. This period is best characterized as one of discovery of the value groups of workers have in achieving the goals of the organization. The concept of collaborating with workers on workplace issues, also known as participative management, emerged during this period as well.

The third chapter covers the next two decades, the 1950s and 1960s. The publication of The Human Group by sociologist, George Homans, in 1950 marks the beginning of this period of greater understanding of the dynamics of groups in the workplace. The education and training of groups, or teams, as they became commonly referred to during these decades, developed during these decades. Towards the end of this period, team building emerges as one part of OD efforts, and is largely focused on improving interpersonal relationships among team members.

Chapter four, covering the years between 1970 and 1989, examines the explosive growth in the demand for team building and the management innovations creating this demand. During these decades, team building matures as a unique educational intervention with a consistent content and process focused on solving specific performance problems in the workplace.

The final chapter summarizes the findings of the research and provides conclusions associated with the research questions.

CHAPTER 2

DISCOVERING THE VALUE OF TEAM WORK 1900-1950

Team building shares its history with the work done with small group dynamics, human relations theory and organization development. Dyer (1977) traces the emergence of the team idea to the studies conducted on worker productivity and social conditions at work during the 1920s and 1930s, reported on as the Hawthorne Studies in 1939 in Management and the Worker by Roethlisberger and Dickson. To understand how the concept of team work and its added value to the organization was first recognized, it is helpful to first look at the context from which it emerged. The concept did not originate in a vacuum, but was the result of a combination of a number of significant movements, individuals' contributions and educational innovations.

This chapter traces several of the key events, actors and movements leading up to the development of participative work systems which involve collaborative work efforts among group members. Engaging people in a collaborative effort to reach a common goal is commonly referred to as team work today. But in the first half of the century, such ventures were uncommon. There were, however, antecedents of employee participation in the evolving management thought of that

time.

Three major influences during this period of American business history (1900-1950) had profound effects on the nature of work, the roles of the management and workers, and the education and training needs in the workplace. The first, scientific management, began in the early 1900s and is most closely associated with Frederick Taylor. The human relations movement which began in the 1930s was the second major influence, and Elton Mayo played a key role in its development. The third influence was the emergence of group dynamics theory in the 1940s from the work of Kurt Lewin.

FREDERICK TAYLOR AND THE SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT MOVEMENT

During the first half of the twentieth century, most management was authoritarian, supervision was close and workers were often viewed as extensions of their tools and machinery. Little, if any, interaction was required among workers to get their jobs done. This environment was primarily a result of the design of jobs. Prior to the creation of factories, workers possessed specialized skills and trades. The first factory jobs were designed with this in mind. And, although there were overseers of the workers, the control of work in these early factories remained in the

hands of the worker, for it was he who knew how to do the job.

The possibility of maximizing efficiency through the combination of specialized labor and machinery created the conditions for the emergence of scientific management (Duncan, 1990). The scientific management movement began in the early 1900s as a search for methods to improve the efficiency of production in factories. Work became more specialized and, with the specialization, a need arose for the coordination and management of the various functions. (Beal & Begin, 1982; Grenier, 1988).

The theory of scientific management or Taylorism is most closely associated with Frederick Taylor. Taylor rose through the ranks of labor to chief engineer at the Midvale Steel Company in the late 1800s. During his time at Midvale, he developed a task system for increasing worker productivity. Taylor, like many men of his time, was influenced by the Protestant ethic of hard work and making a difference to society (Boddewyn, 1961; Kast & Rosenzweig, 1974). And although Taylor said he was not an opponent of unions, many of the ideas he put forth were interpreted as management's response to the rise of industrial unionism (Beal & Begin, 1982; Grenier, 1988; Young, 1990).

In 1911, Taylor published The Principles of Scientific Management, originally prepared as a paper for presentation to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Taylor described his purpose in the paper as threefold: first, to point out the loss to the country from inefficiency; second, to propose that the solution to this problem was systematic management; and third, that the best management was a true science with clearly defined rules and principles.

In addition, Taylor believed that scientific management would solve the problem of the antagonistic relationship between management and the workers by uniting them around the common interest of maximum prosperity (Taylor, 1947). In other words, low costs for the company and high wages for the worker were not mutually exclusive if the principles of scientific management were practiced. Uniting both workers and management around a common interest served to eliminate the class character of work and as Grenier (1988) so aptly stated: "The goal of all such techniques is to convince those lowest on the totem pole that their interests are similar to those who carved the pole" (p. 160).

Taylor (1947) identified the four principles of scientific management as: First, to gather and reduce rules

of thumb into rules and laws for performing work; second, to scientifically select and develop workers; third, to bring science and the worker together at management's insistence, because it would not happen by chance; and fourth, to deliberately divide the work currently performed by the worker into two parts, one for management, and one for the worker, so that it was almost evenly split.

Taylor based his system of management on the assumption that "man deliberately plans to do as little as he safely can" (Taylor, 1947, p.13) by producing well below capacity to ensure that there would always be plenty of jobs. In addition, Taylor viewed the fact that the workmen possessed the only knowledge of how to do their jobs (and thereby had control of the work) as an obstacle to improving efficiency.

Scientific management was designed to shift control from a loosely organized foreman system to a centralized production planning system directed by higher management (Nelson, 1980). Taylor accomplished this by studying the work, breaking it down into incremental steps, determining the maximum safe output per worker, and then teaching the worker to do it exactly as described. Thus, the worker became an interchangeable part of the production process (Beal & Begin, 1982), easily trained and easily replaced.

The time and motion study aspect of Taylor's methods became one of the most enduring and stereotypical attributes of scientific management (Grenier, 1988; Schacter, 1989).

Although Taylor is hardly remembered as a pioneer in the area of motivation and worker participation, some later interpretations of his work reveal that those dimensions were present (Nelson, 1980; Schacter, 1989). Taylor advocated a wage incentive program designed to increase worker productivity. He also recognized the value of intrinsic motivators such as opportunity for promotion and positive supervisory relationships (Schacter, 1989).

Taylor also acknowledged that workers may have better ideas about production methods, and following their training, workers were asked for those ideas (Schacter, 1989). Those suggestions were included in experiments conducted by supervisors, and if they improved production, they were adopted. Workers who proposed successful changes had the new method named for them (Taylor, 1947).

In contrast to this more humanistic view of Taylorism, Young (1990), in his article on scientism in management, states that Taylor was "hated by the unions" (p.122), and that his method of compensating an individual for output was an attempt to bribe workers into "dumb subordination"

(p.123). Grenier (1988) argues that it was the humanistic characteristics of scientific management which were the most manipulative of the worker. Once management extracted the knowledge from the worker and separated the "thinking" work for management, and left the worker with the "doer" work, management gained control of the work and, in effect, the worker. In addition, Grenier states that uniting workers and management on the common purpose of the firm served to eliminate conflict, and perhaps the need for collective bargaining, a theme that recurs throughout the history of worker participation efforts.

Organized labor was not the only group to abhor Taylorism. Many employers disliked it as well (Nelson, 1980). Scientific management limited the personal authority and arbitrary wielding of power by owners and management (Perrow, 1979). The discord surrounding scientific management was so intense that in 1913 Congress conducted hearings to investigate it. Taylor, called upon to testify, said:

Now, in its essence, scientific management involves a complete mental revolution on the part of the working man...And it involves an equally important complete mental revolution on the part of those on management's

side--the foreman, the superintendent, the owner of the business, the board of directors,--a complete revolution on their part as their duties toward their fellow workers in management, toward their workmen, and toward their daily problems. (AMA, 1948, p.12)

Following these hearings, even though the practice of Taylorism continued in many places, Congress ordered Navy Yards and defense related industries to discontinue the use of time and motion studies.

The revolution Taylor referred to in his remarks before Congress is credited as the catalyst for many far-reaching changes in management and the workplace. The American Management Association (AMA, 1948) views its own origin as a response to scientific management. The creation of the National Association of Corporate Training Schools (NACTS) in 1913 was the forerunner of the AMA. At the first meeting of NACTS, in 1913, the keynote speaker, a college professor who had recently attended a socialist meeting on the rights of workers to strike, advocated the creation of training schools within companies to educate workers on the practical mission of the company (AMA, 1948).

Taylorism also created the conditions for the emergence of personnel management and industrial relations experts,

now known as consultants. A 1920 study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics unearthed hundreds of personnel research agencies assisting business in labor and personnel related issues. This group of agencies formed the Personnel Research Federation and published the Journal of Personnel Research, later to become the Personnel Journal (Grenier, 1988).

Whether Taylor was one of the first to advocate participative management, or a master of defining methods for the manipulation of the worker and the elimination of the need for unions, there is little disagreement that his work changed the industrial workplace significantly (Beal & Begin, 1982; Grenier, 1988; Nelson, 1980; Young, 1990). The power to control the flow and output of work, formerly possessed by the worker was now endowed to management. This fundamental change in management ideology caused a multitude of changes in the workplace.

One of the first groups to experience the practical impact of scientific management principles on their jobs was the factory foremen. Formerly an overseer of the work on the shop floor, foremen, according to Taylor, now had a completely new function.

The Idea of the Functional Foreman

Supervisors or "functional foreman" (Taylor, 1947, p.129) were to teach and coach workers on the proper way to do the job. The functional foreman was responsible for a group of men who performed the exact same tasks. Taylor stated as an "inflexible rule" (p.43) that the supervisor deal with the worker one-to-one to ensure that workers were developed to their highest levels of productivity. The one-to-one contact limited the ability of the workers to interact with each other, and to pass on the rules of thumb learned from more experienced co-workers. It also may have affected their ability to view themselves as a collective body and act accordingly. In this role, foremen became experts and teachers, rather than overseers (Sashkin, 1981) or as Taylor phrased it, foremen would create a "brotherly feeling" (p. 111) and a climate of "no longer master and men, but one helping the other" (p.111).

The functional foreman concept was rarely fully implemented, perhaps because it was too complex, or because it was too threatening to traditional management relationships (Sashkin, 1981). Nelson (1980) points out that often Taylor's ideas were more controversial among managers than the workers. One of the major changes

resulting from scientific management which did occur was increased attention to the education and training of foremen. One place where foremen could explore their new roles and learn their new responsibilities was in the Foremen's Clubs (Coopey, 1988).

The Foremen's Clubs

According to Graebner (1987), Foremen's Clubs were the carefully implemented creations of factory owners and managers designed to gain the foremen's commitment to the goals of the company and, in doing so, impede union efforts to organize foremen. Beginning around 1918, employers in Dayton, Ohio, brought the city's foremen together in the first club. The clubs were intended to help foremen improve the efficiency on the shop-floor and reduce labor-management conflict.

Topics for discussion at the club's meetings included how to help workers understand their duties, and the importance of subordinating individual goals for the goals of the group (Graebner, 1987). Eventually the National Association of Foremen, founded in 1925, provided outlines to follow for these discussions.

More important to the story of team building than the content of the Foremen's Club meetings was the process

used for learning. A 1921 YMCA study of foremanship, found that this working together created camaraderie and efficiency (Clark & Tipper, 1921). And, because of the nature of the discussion and learning methods used in club meetings, members were probably one of the first occupations to experience the impact of group process (Graebner, 1987). The discussion group format which involved the foreman directly in his own learning pre-dated the human relations movement, where group discussion became commonplace, by at least a decade.

THE HUMAN RELATIONS MOVEMENT

The work of Taylor and other industrial engineers of the era created the climate for the emergence of the next collection of ideas on worker productivity (Grenier, 1988). The scientific management movement of the 1910s and 1920s recognized that stringent supervision of employees did not increase production (Gillespie, 1991). Taylorism supported the notion of carefully studying both the technical and social dynamics of production and using this information to control the work force (Grenier, 1988).

Many corporations began to research workers' individual behaviors in the workplace to determine which conditions might improve worker productivity. Studies on worker

fatigue were commonplace (Taylor, 1947; Mayo, 1933). And in fact, the most famous and controversial series of experiments on workplace productivity, the Hawthorne studies, conducted at Western Electric's Hawthorne Works from 1923-1932, began as an outgrowth of fatigue and monotony studies (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939).

The Hawthorne series of studies is generally viewed as the beginning of the human relations movement (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; Perrow, 1979; Sashkin, 1981). The human relations movement was characterized by the concept of the organization as a social system composed of individuals, informal and formal groups and their interrelationships (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1974). To Grenier (1988) and others, the human relations movement, like scientific management, represented an attempt by management to create an environment where organized actions of workers were unnecessary and raised the issue of how to get workers to embrace the goals of management.

The Hawthorne Studies

The Hawthorne Studies, themselves, were not nearly as controversial as their many interpretations. The research at the plant near Chicago began in 1923. Western Electric,

in collaboration with the National Research Council, initially studied the effects of varying degrees of illumination on worker productivity. The intent of the research was to identify environmental factors which improved the efficiency of workers.

In the original illumination study, six women in the relay assembly test room were isolated from the rest of the workers. Their productivity and social interactions were recorded in response to changes in the lighting in their work space. The results from the research puzzled the investigators because both the experimental and control groups showed productivity improvements when lighting levels were either increased or decreased (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939).

Additional studies were conducted on the effects of rest pauses on productivity with more confusing results. Next, researchers began a massive interviewing program to determine what workers thought about their jobs, working conditions, supervisors and the company. Eventually over 20,000 employees were interviewed (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; Perrow, 1979).

The interviews with workers confirmed that, as Taylor had already indicated, workers deliberately restricted their

output as a result of informal agreements among the workers as to what was a fair day's rate (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Unlike Taylor's assumption that this behavior was due to man's nature, the researchers on this project continued their studies to determine the reasons why workers restricted output. They found that workers who exceeded the daily rate were subject to ostracism, threats of physical harm, and sabotage from their co-workers (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939; Perrow, 1979).

In 1932, data from the Hawthorne studies were sent to the Harvard Business School for further study and analysis. Results of the studies were published in 1939 in Management and the Worker, a detailed report on the chronology and analysis of the studies by Roethlisberger and Dickson. The research was also referred to earlier by Elton Mayo in The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (1933).

Elton Mayo's influence at Hawthorne

Although Elton Mayo had no role in the design or data collection of the research at the Hawthorne plant (Roethlisberger, 1977), he is well known for his interpretation of the results. Mayo came to the U.S. from Australia under a Rockefeller Foundation grant, first to the University of Pennsylvania and then to Harvard in 1926.

Under his direction, the fatigue laboratory was set up at the School of Business to simulate the conditions of work and measure the effects on people (Roethlisberger, 1977).

Mayo's political ideology was based on the idea that true growth and development in society would be achieved by collaboration among social institutions like businesses and professions, rather than from government. His attention to industrial relations grew from this belief (Gillespie, 1991). The elimination of conflict was a recurring subject of Mayo's and was perceived by Grenier (1988) and others as anti-union sentiment. According to Baritz (1960), Mayo referred to unions only twice in his writings and never said that unions were unnecessary. Grenier, however, interpreted Mayo's insistence that management create an ideal workplace in order to eliminate conflict as a veiled attempt to undermine the value of unions.

Mayo was initially brought to Hawthorne in 1927 to help interpret the findings from the Relay Assembly Test Room experiments. According to Fritz Roethlisberger, a graduate student of Mayo's and the on-site head of research at Hawthorne, Mayo quickly developed good relationships with the executives at Western Electric and became the informal chief advisor on the numerous studies which followed

(Roethlisberger, 1977). Mayo also helped train the interviewers who were conducting those thousands of interviews. In his role of interpreting the findings, Mayo also raised additional questions for research. He mainly interacted with the top executives at the plant, helping them to understand how they fit into the findings of the research, and they in turn, gave him the opportunity to test his ideas.

Roethlisberger (1977) was also quick to point out that Mayo never attempted to take credit for conducting the research; his contribution to the effort was his creative approach in identifying subsequent areas for study and interpreting the results.

Interpretations of the Hawthorne studies

The most popular account of the Hawthorne studies is found in Roethlisberger's and Dickson's Management and the Worker published in 1939. W. J. Dickson was a manager at Western Electric and the personnel department's liaison for research. Roethlisberger and Dickson concluded that production during the studies was improved as a result of humane supervision, the influence of informal groups and the counseling of employees (Perrow, 1973). In addition, they concluded that worker satisfaction was closely tied to

worker performance, and was supported in part by reports from the women involved in the Relay Assembly Test Room. When asked, these women reported that they did not know why their output increased, but that participating in the research was fun, that the normal supervisory control was missing and that they were allowed to talk with one another. They also reported that they agreed to carry one another when a group member was temporarily unable to perform at high levels due to health problems, etc. (Homans, 1941).

Mayo offered one of the widely accepted and enduring reasons for the positive changes in performance of the participants. Known as the Hawthorne Effect, it explained that productivity increases as a result of paying any kind of special attention to the worker or group of workers (Roethlisberger, 1977). In other words, the researchers and management gave special attention to the workers who were participants in the studies, and they, in turn, improved productivity, independent of the manipulated variables of lighting and rest breaks.

Mayo also suggested that the behavior of an individual in a group can be controlled by group norms. And that being the case, the informal group might be the key to any improvements in productivity (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger &

Dickson, 1939). This interpretation became a cornerstone for later studies in group dynamics and team work.

The original interpretations of the Hawthorne studies continued to be questioned. Katz and Kahn (1966) identified an additional explanation for the confusing results of the studies, the lack of control for numerous variables during the studies. One variable they identified was that in addition to providing participants with special privileges, participants were all supervised by the best supervisor in the plant. Perrow (1979) offered what today is known as group cohesiveness as another reason for the improved productivity. Perrow offered, as an example, a group of women who became friendly with each other and were later allowed to select their own replacement for a group member who had become uncooperative. The cohesiveness of the group might have caused individual results to improve because group members felt accountability for the success of the whole group, not just themselves.

The major criticism of the studies was not the experimental design but rather the support that Mayo's interpretations gave to his own philosophy. Gillespie (1991), in Manufacturing Knowledge: A History of the Hawthorne Experiments, states that the experiments

themselves were designed and interpreted within the context of the paternalistic management ideology of the time. In addition, the many interactions among the players, including Mayo, other academics, Western Electric's researchers, the supervisors and the workers themselves influenced the interpretations of the results. Mayo, according to Gillespie, saw himself as a "reformer setting out to ameliorate the harshness and conflict of industrial capitalism by changing the attitudes of the workers and employers" (p.267).

Mayo believed that collective actions by workers often restricted output and that through management's ability to create conditions where work groups identified with the goals of management, like in the Hawthorne studies, that improvement in the productivity was possible. (Gillespie, 1991). Even though Mayo ignored the issue of organized labor during the his work at Hawthorne, the approach Western Electric took to improving working conditions following the studies effectively resisted major organizing efforts by several national unions. As a result a much weaker company union, the Communications Equipment Union (Grenier, 1988) was established there.

Mayo's interpretation of the Hawthorne results may also

have been influenced by what William Graebner referred to as democratic social engineering in The Engineering of Consent: Democracy and Authority in Twentieth Century America (1987). The idea of deliberately modifying the beliefs and behaviors of groups through their participation in the process emerged near the end of the 19th century. Graebner's examples of democratic social engineering included the carefully orchestrated attempts to create desirable behaviors without coercion or force found in settlement houses, vocational guidance situations, and collective bargaining, where labor relations programs were designed to reduce labor management conflicts.

In fact, even before the Hawthorne studies, small groups were being used by companies to help govern and manage workers (Grenier, 1988). Benge (1920) reported on experiments with a "team system" conducted by an engineer at an Ohio utility company. The experiments found that work group productivity could be improved by transferring low producers to different groups (Grenier, 1988). Works councils, created by the National War Labor Board, during World War I, consisting of employee selected representatives and management were also given limited powers to govern the workers (Beal & Begin, 1982; Grenier, 1988).

Early impacts of the Hawthorne studies

The impact of the early knowledge of groups from the Hawthorne studies and other research during this time created changes in the training for supervisors. Supervisory practices and attitudes were often given as reasons for differing group performance (Katz, 1949) so supervisory training became an increasing focus of many companies. In 1939, a Conference Board survey found that of the 2700 companies responding, 18.7% had supervisory training programs in place. By 1947, this number had risen to 34.4% of the companies (Trends in Training, 1947). The chief emphasis of this training was personnel and labor relations. Katz (1949) identified the supervisory "task of organizing people so they can work effectively toward a group goal" (p.119) as the major problem at the time.

Many opinions on the content and methods for supervisory training were offered. Maier (1949) called for an improvement in supervision based on democratic leadership, leadership which shifted the responsibilities of decision making to the group. Hoslett (1946) thought that supervisory training required some ego involvement on the part of the supervisor in order to change the supervisor's behavior. He advocated role playing as a key method for

involving the whole person in the learning experience. Haire (1948) also recommended role-playing as a method for moving the learning from a solely intellectual experience to a level where it could be practiced in the workplace.

In addition to supervisory training, the personnel management function continued to develop during this time period. Hawthorne's large scale interviews spawned the use of attitude surveys to measure the workers' levels of satisfaction. Selection and testing of applicants also became common (Grenier, 1988).

Evidence of the influence of the human relations movement on organizations is still seen today. Supervisory relationships is still part of the supervisory training curriculum (Gordon, 1994). Employees continue to be surveyed on their level of satisfaction at work. Training and educational methods like the role-playing utilized by the participants in the movement are also still in use (Gordon, 1994). And attempts to defeat union organizing still include principles of the elimination of conflict through management's creation of an ideal workplace (Grenier, 1988).

The work of the early human relationists at Hawthorne identified the small group as a major element of the

workplace. Following this discovery, the focus of management shifted from the individual worker to the problem of how to get small, informal groups of workers to accept the goals of management. Much of what is known about the behavior of people in small groups today is the result of work of a rather large group of researchers, who during the late 1930s and 1940s began the development of what is now known as group dynamics theory.

KURT LEWIN AND GROUP DYNAMICS THEORY

Kurt Lewin is generally credited as being the founder of the study of group dynamics (Luft, 1984; Marrow, 1969; Weisbord, 1987). Lewin was born in Poland and educated in Germany. A psychologist, Lewin possessed a great interest in making psychology a true science, through experimentation which could lead to formal principles for human behavior (Weisbord, 1987).

Lewin was also interested in the concept of scientific management. In 1919, in one of his early papers, he discussed the role that the scientific psychology of workers and their interpersonal relationships might play in solving labor management problems (Marrow, 1969; Weisbord, 1987). His work in community relations and his interest in social problems began in the U.S. after leaving Berlin in

1933. In 1935, he joined the faculty of the University of Iowa.

Lewin is well known for the concept of force field analysis. In this method of problem analysis, unsolved problems were seen as "frozen in a field of forces" (Weisbord, 1987, p. 73) by both positive, or driving forces, and negative, or restraining forces. Lewin proposed that it was easier to solve a problem by the elimination of the restraining forces, rather than by adding driving forces. Any addition of new driving forces would likely generate additional restraining forces. Lewin referred to his use of mathematical models for describing human problems and relationships as topological psychology (Weisbord, 1987). Considering Lewin's early interest in Taylorism, it is not surprising that Lewin eventually applied his theories and models to the industrial setting in the U.S.

Elton Mayo's influence on Lewin is less well known. Lewin's biographer, Alfred Marrow, (1969) makes no mention of Mayo when discussing influences on Lewin. It is difficult to imagine that Mayo's work at Harvard in the fatigue laboratory and the Hawthorne Works went unnoticed by Lewin during 1938 and 1939, when he was a visiting professor at Harvard. In addition, at least two members of the

Topology Group, Lewin's study group on topological psychology, were Harvard faculty.

Although much of Lewin's work was conducted outside of the workplace, one well known series of studies at the Harwood Manufacturing plant are credited for introducing the concepts of action research, participative management and worker self-management (Marrow, 1969; Weisbord, 1987).

The Harwood Studies 1939-1947

Marrow, a member of the Topology Group, and an officer at Harwood, invited Lewin to the Harwood Manufacturing plant in Marion, Virginia in 1939. Management at the company was concerned that the workers in this southern factory were not as productive as their northern counterparts. This was the beginning of an eight year collaboration between Lewin and the plant's management (Marrow, 1969).

Lewin initially suggested several methods for solving the productivity problem at Harwood. One of which was to deal with the workers in small groups rather than individually. Lewin also recommended demonstrating to the employees that the production levels set by management were possible to attain. The company achieved this by hiring experienced workers who could easily meet the productivity requirements. Once the inexperienced workers observed this,

their productivity began to rise slowly (Marrow, 1969). Lewin also recommended that further research be conducted at the plant and suggested hiring Iowa graduate student, Alex Bavalas.

Bavalas' research at the plant attempted to further increase productivity by allowing the workers to participate in setting their own goals and controlling their output. Weekly discussions were held among the high and low performers regarding the various techniques for production, and they decided together what they needed to change to improve. Workers participating in this management and planning of production significantly increased productivity (Weisbord, 1987).

Additional work at Harwood during Lewin's and Marrow's collaboration included research in leadership and resistance to change. Following a landmark study by Lewin associates, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph White, on autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire management (Lippitt & White, 1947; Marrow, 1969; Weisbord, 1969), Lewin suggested to John French, another Iowa graduate student, that foremen at Harwood be trained in leadership. Methods French used for this training included role playing, sociodrama and problem solving. The success with these methods at Harwood

encouraged French to employ them later during the first session of the National Training Laboratories in 1947 (Marrow, 1969).

Lewin and French also planned an experiment on overcoming resistance to change, which was conducted by French and Lester Coch, the plant personnel manager, in 1947. The study involved three groups whose job responsibilities were changing. One group was not allowed to participate in working in advance on the details of the new job assignment. The second group appointed representatives who then met with management to discuss problems associated with the changes. The third group consisted of every member of the affected work group, who then met with management and discussed the changes, made recommendations, and helped plan the methods for doing the new job (Coch & French, 1948; Marrow, 1969).

The results from this study were striking. The non-participative group's production fell immediately with the change and did not return to its previous level. In addition, group members were hostile and complained to the union. The group with representatives who met with management took a few weeks to regain their previous productivity levels and were cooperative. The group in

which all members participated regained their productivity levels post-change in two days, and then greatly surpassed their former productivity level.

French attributed the difference to "the rate of recovery is directly proportional to the amount of participation and the rates of turnover and aggression are inversely proportional to the amount of participation" (Marrow, 1969, p.151). Lewin explained the results as the interplay among driving and restraining forces, where in the non-participative group, a new restraining force on restricting productivity was created by the new situation. Additional driving forces were created when the participating groups accepted the change and the management used their authority to improve productivity (Marrow, 1969).

Like the Hawthorne studies, the interpretation of the Harwood studies were controversial. Gomberg, (1966) in an article entitled "The Trouble with Democratic Management", stated that the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) was able to organize the workers at Harwood in record time as a result of the participative management practices at Harwood. Gomberg questioned if the full democratic participation of workers was just a "cleverly controlled managerial device to break up the solidarity of

the group" (July-August, 1966, p. 34).

A debate ensued between Gomberg and Marrow and other Lewinians in the next several issues of Trans-action on the exact details of the study, i.e., when the plant was organized, when the experiments took place, etc. Gomberg ended the debate by writing that he had not accused the experimenters of being "deliberately manipulative, but just unperceptive" (December, 1966, p. 48) with respect to real reasons productivity improved which included the powerful presence and control of management.

Regardless of the debate, the Harwood studies of the 1940s were a rich source of data on the behavior of workers in groups. While the research at Harwood was continuing, concurrent research among many of Lewin's students and associates contributed much to the field of group dynamics, which Lewin first referred to in print in 1939 (Lewin, 1939; Marrow, 1969).

The Center for the Study of Group Dynamics 1945-1949

In 1945, Lewin became a professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.). Cartwright and Zander (1968) suggest that the study of small group dynamics was established as an identifiable field there when, in 1946, Lewin began work in his newly created Research Center for

Group Dynamics at M.I.T.

In the September, 1945, issue of Sociometry Lewin defined the research methods the Center would employ to study groups, and the conditions and forces causing changes in behavior of group members. The major process for the research included experimentation with groups in the laboratory and the field. The leadership of groups and improvements in their functioning was an additional area of research for the center. Lewin further established that the research conducted would be action research or research which advanced scientific knowledge, while at the same time, solved real problems. Lewin was well aware of the need to provide practical applications from the work at the Center because of continued need for funding (Marrow, 1969).

The Center's work was built on the foundation of studies, like Harwood, by Lewin and his colleagues concluding that the properties of the group had effect on individual group member's behavior. Group dynamics concerned itself with these properties, the positive and negative forces which were constantly at work in groups, moving them toward and away from any change in condition.

Lewin and his colleagues at the Center published nearly 100 papers on their research, on topics ranging from the

use of matrix algebra to analyze sociograms (Festinger, 1949) to methods for changing food habits (Radke & Klisurich, 1947). In addition, 11 doctoral dissertations were published at M.I.T. and the University of Michigan (where the center moved) in the years between 1948 and 1949.

An Innovation in Training

At the same time Lewin was studying group dynamics at the Center, he also was working with the Commission on the Community Interrelations (CCI) of the American Jewish Congress to help determine how prejudice and negative interracial relationships could be changed by group methods.

In the summer of 1946, Lewin and his colleagues, Ronald Lippitt, Leland Bradford and Kenneth Benne were working on the design for a new approach to a workshop for the Connecticut State Interracial Commission (Benne, 1964). Lewin was interested in examining intercultural relationships to assist him in developing action programs against prejudice which communities could implement (Marrow, 1969).

The workshop was conducted in June, 1946 at the Teachers' College in New Britain, Connecticut. It lasted two weeks and used an experiential approach to learning. The staff collected data and observed the daily sessions,

sharing their data with each other in the evenings. Initially, trainees were not involved in the evening sessions, but when a small group of them asked to attend, Lewin allowed them (Benne, 1964; Lippitt, 1949).

In Training in Community Relations (1949), Lippitt shared his recollections of that first evening:

Sometime during the evening, an observer made some remarks about the behavior of one of the three persons who were sitting in—a woman trainee. She broke in to disagree with the observation and described it from her point of view. For a while there was an active dialogue between the research observer, the trainer and the trainee about the interpretation of the event, with Kurt as an active prober, obviously enjoying this different source of data that had to be coped with and integrated. The evening session from then on became the significant learning experience of the day..." (p. 212).

Bradford described the reaction people had to this data about their own behavior as a "tremendous electric charge" (Marrow, p. 212). The role of feedback on behavior as a significant tool for learning was identified by Lewin and his colleagues during this session. It later became one of

the key ingredients of the training of groups.

The following summer in Bethel, Maine, the staff minus Lewin, who died in February, 1947, continued to use this model of experiential learning through feedback and discussion in a three week training session. The insights gained from the sessions became the basis for T-group theory and the laboratory method, the precursor of team building.

Lewin's biographer, Alfred J. Marrow, in The Practical Theorist: The Life and Work of Kurt Lewin (1969), sums up Lewin's contributions as "he left his mark on a whole generation of social scientists. He put his stamp on a whole discipline, giving it a name (group dynamics), a scope (action research) and a purpose" (p.232). The work of Lewin and his associates "helped shift the focus of industrial management...The great interest in the humanization of industry stems in large measure from Lewin's emphasis on the dynamics of groups at work" (pp. 151-152).

CONCLUSION

On the surface, scientific management, human relations and group dynamics appear very different. However, closer examination of these concepts reveals several common elements among them with respect to their development and their impact on workers and the workplace.

The first common element is the idea of improving productivity by uniting workers around the common goals of management. And worker participation, from Taylor's suggestion system, to Lewin's participative group, was the favored process used to enlist the workers in the pursuit of company goals.

The second shared element is the inhibition of industrial unionism in the development of these movements. Although not specifically developed as anti-union strategies for companies, Taylor, Mayo, and Lewin all left the impression that unions would be unnecessary, if management utilized their ideas in the workplace.

The third similarity among the three movements is that each had some element of training and education associated with them. The training in scientific management was first focused on work methods for the individual worker and later, the supervisor. The human relations movement focused its education and training efforts on helping supervisors and management relate to workers in a more positive way. Group dynamics added both content, like force field analysis, and methods, like role play and feedback, to management training.

From these three major movements in the first half of

the twentieth century emerged a ideology of participative management, where workers were allowed to influence work processes in support of company goals. Workers were now also viewed as members of groups, as well as individuals. Changing the behavior of groups through their participation became a new approach to managing people. The management training and education which followed gave rise to a number of innovative educational interventions, many of which later became integral components of team building.

CHAPTER 3

THE EMERGENCE OF TEAM BUILDING: FOCUS ON SOCIAL INTERACTIONS, 1950-1969

The work of the early human relationists like Elton Mayo and Kurt Lewin, reviewed in the previous chapter, led to rapid growth in the area of training and development in organizations. Prior to the 1950s, training was primarily focused on the skills individual workers needed to perform certain tasks and the skills their supervisors required in order to relate to and teach the workers. In the 1950s and 1960s, the scope of training was broadened to include human relations training and executive development programs for management. The primary intent of this training and development was to improve the social interaction and interpersonal skills of supervisors and managers in an effort to improve productivity.

The relationships among the supervisor and the workers, both individually and collectively, took on more importance as management began to understand the impact of the dynamics of the group on individual worker behavior. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the training and education which emerged from the recognition of the importance of the group in the workplace. The evolution of laboratory training,

which began with Lewin's work in the 1940s, will also be explored further as early team building efforts emerged from what Blake and Mouton (1960) refer to as the development group laboratory. In addition, organization development (OD) will be examined, because team building became an important part of the OD practitioner's tool kit in the late 1960s and one of the most frequently used techniques in OD's extensive educational process for large scale organizational change.

The contributions of several other major theorists and foremost practitioners of human relations training and OD were selected for this exploration of group training and education during these decades. Douglas McGregor, Richard Beckhard, Warren Bennis and Edgar Schein worked together at M.I.T., and also in the field as consultants, and today are recognized as pioneers in this area. Their concepts and theories on organizational behavior, published and analyzed in the major business, personnel and applied psychology journals during this time, helped shape management and training in U. S. corporations. The Addison-Wesley series of books on organization development, begun in the late 1960s and in continued use today by many OD practitioners includes works by Beckhard, Bennis, Schein, Blake and

Mouton. Most, if not all, were profoundly influenced by the work of Kurt Lewin, and many knew him personally and worked with him at M.I.T. at the Research Center for Group Dynamics in the 1940s. Weisbord (1987) credits McGregor with bringing Lewin to M.I.T. in 1945. Others, like Rensis Likert, worked at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, which was where the M.I.T. center moved, following Lewin's death in 1947.

RESPONSES TO THE NEW KNOWLEDGE OF
GROUPS IN THE WORKPLACE

By 1950, the importance of the impact of the group in the organization was readily acknowledged. The work of Lewin's and his associates at M.I.T., National Training Laboratories (NTL), and Michigan had already caught the attention of management. Earlier, editors at Personnel Journal, a journal established and read by personnel managers, recommended in 1947, and again in 1948, that "Industry will do well to watch what the colleges and other research groups are going [sic] in their studies of group dynamics" (1947, p.125).

The beginning of the 1950s saw the publication of The Human Group, by George Homans (1950). This sociological study of 5 small groups was lauded in the introduction by

his colleague, Robert Merton, of Columbia University, as the most significant contribution to "a sociological theory of the structure, processes, and functions of small groups" in the last half-century (Homans, 1950, p. xxiii). In the preface to this book, Homans pays tribute to already well-known figures in the study of the group, including Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William Dickson of Hawthorne studies' fame, and Douglas McGregor.

Recognizing the existence of informal groups and the impact such groups might have, led to the development of methods to encourage and develop these work groups for the good of the organization. As a result, numerous how-to books, journal articles and educational programs were developed to utilize the knowledge available from the field of group dynamics. In the 1950's, The Journal of Industrial Training included articles on topics ranging from research on causal conditions for high level group performance (Harder & Harms, 1950), to group coaching methods for improving human relations training (Mayer, 1957).

In addition to growing interest in the behavior of groups, the word, team, began to be used frequently and almost interchangeably with the word, group, to describe the group in the workplace. References to the terms, team and

team work, began appearing in articles and books on leadership and development in the late 1940s (Plenty, McCord & Emerson, 1948; Selfe, 1948). In addition to the use of team to describe groups at work, the word, coaching, began to appear in the management and supervisory literature at the same time. Coaching was used to describe the on-the-job training a supervisor provided for his subordinates (Lewis, 1947; Pfiffner, 1949). Team, team work, and coaching were all words related to sports, and it is not surprising that the men of management at this time might recognize the resemblance of groups of workers, toiling under a foreman, to a sports team and their supervisor, the coach. A more overt reference incorporating this analogy is found later in the literature: "Just as no football player can put forth his best effort to a play without fully understanding it, no one on a manufacturing team can contribute his best without knowing the problem and the desired result." (Ferry, 1966).

As the word, team, became more frequently used, attempts at defining its unique usage in the world of work began to appear. Marshak (1955), in "Elements for a Theory of Teams," outlined the first step in analyzing problems in the organization in a scientific manner as the study of a simple form of organization called a team. He defined the

team as "a group of persons, each of whom makes decisions about something different but who receive a common reward as a result of all those decisions" (p.227). In 1960, Douglas McGregor devoted the last chapter of The Human Side of Enterprise to the importance of the "managerial team" (p.227). And in 1964, Blake and Mouton declared that "the word team is likely to be used to refer to any set of individuals who cooperate in accomplishing a single overall result" (Blake & Mouton, cited in Dyer, 1977, p.17).

The business and management community possessed a high degree of interest in determining how groups might assist companies in reaching their business goals. In Human Relations for Management: The Newer Perspective (1950), Robert Johnson, chairman of Johnson & Johnson, defined team work as being "broader than labor management cooperation" (p.3). He recommended that companies recognize that workers form their own groups, independent of the work. And with that in mind, Johnson suggested that human relations directors attempt to get these worker groups to take an interest in the economics of the company. In addition, Johnson recommended programs for workers (including their unions) on team work, communication, and participation.

Along with management's interest in groups in the

workplace, social scientists and educators continued to study them in more depth. In the already mentioned The Human Group (1950), George Homans proposed three concepts for understanding groups and the behavior of individuals in groups: shared activities, interaction among members and shared sentiments or feelings. Each play constant mutually dependent roles. For example, the more activities group members share, the more interaction they have, which, according to Homans, leads to more shared sentiments and vice versa. Therefore, as one element changes, so do the others. In addition, Homans addressed the important role of group norms, the code of behavior members come to accept as proper for their group.

In Men at Work (1961), W.H. Whyte, author of the well-known 1959 book The Organization Man, suggested studying the informal organization as a way to understand what really happens in organizations. In research he conducted with Miller in 1952-1953, Whyte studied teams of artisans, contemporary glassblowers, to identify the elements of their informal organization. The characteristics the team possessed were identified as work processes that allowed freedom of movement and human interaction, strong informal leadership and freedom from the control of technology and/or

management.

Other properties of the group under study at this time were confirming the earlier findings of Mayo, Lewin, and Homans: that group members exert pressure on other members to conform (Festinger, 1957), and that groups possess accepted norms and standards for the behavior of their members (Bales, 1950).

This interest in group behavior was more than a passing fad. Improvements in group functioning were seen as ways to obtain the improvements in productivity that were sought earlier in the century during the scientific management movement. The search for the answer to increasing worker productivity gave rise to a plethora of theories, concepts and methods for improving production, not all of which were associated with the impact groups had on work.

Theories on Worker Satisfaction and Motivation

Frederick Herzberg, Chairman of the Psychology department at Case Western Reserve during the 1950s, and now famous for the motivation-hygiene, or two-factor, theory of motivation of workers, disagreed with the group dynamics approach to improving performance, popular at the time. In The Motivation to Work, (1959), Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman rejected the human relations or "group" (p.10)

approach to improving productivity. They characterized it as not aimed at achieving business results because "the idea has grown that a supervisor is successful to the degree to which he focusses [sic] on the needs of his subordinates as individuals rather than on the goals of production" (p.10).

In Work and the Nature of Man (1966), Herzberg went further in his criticism of the human relations movement as one which was fast approaching defining all human problems in industry as those of "inadequate interpersonal skills" (p.185). Mayo's work at Hawthorne was dismissed as "another incomplete conclusion" (p.38) that man was motivated by irrational needs such as the need to belong.

Herzberg's two factor theory did attract a lot of attention at the time because he hypothesized that the factors leading to satisfaction were not, simply by their absence, dissatisfiers (Perrow, 1979). Hackman and Oldham (1980), currently well-known for their work in redesigning work, describe Herzberg's theory of motivation as the "most influential behavioral approach to work redesign" (p. 57). The notion of "work itself" (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.57) as a major motivator of performance was reason enough to begin to examine how to create work that would maximize worker motivation. Warner Burke (1987), a prominent

consultant in the field of organizational development, credits "job enrichment, a significant intervention within OD and a critical element of QWL projects" (p.34) as a "direct application of Herzberg's theory" (p.34). According to Hackman and Oldham (1980) problems with Herzberg's theory include the difficulty in measurement of the factors and the failure to take individual differences into account.

Unlike Herzberg, who approached improved performance from a motivation perspective, several significant management theories at the time approached the problem of improving production as primarily a function of the manager's ability to successfully interact with subordinates. Douglas McGregor provided one of the most noted of these theories. At the M.I.T. School of Industrial Management (now the Sloan School of Management), in the 1950's, McGregor conducted a number of studies with Alex Bavalas and others in an attempt to answer Alfred Sloan's question of "whether successful managers are born or made" (McGregor, 1960, p. v). In the celebrated The Human Side of Enterprise, published in 1960, McGregor identified the perception of managers towards people and work as the key determinants of successful management behavior, not formal management development programs. McGregor divided the

assumptions about human nature held by the manager into two major groups or theories, Theory X and Theory Y.

Theory X, or the "The traditional view of direction and control" (p. 33), assumes that people have an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it, if at all possible. Therefore, management would necessarily have to coerce, control, direct and punish people in order to maintain or improve production. On the other hand, Theory Y, or "The integration of individual and organizational goals" (p. 45), assumes that people will exercise self-direction and control in efforts to reach goals to which they are committed. In addition, people will seek and accept responsibility. Managers subscribing to this theory would need to determine effective ways to utilize people at work and create the environment which allowed people to grow.

Although it is relatively apparent that McGregor thought managers holding the Theory Y assumptions were the right kind of managers, he, himself, said that this approach did not always work (Morse & Lorsch, 1970). Managers became confused when thought they must choose between these two highly conflicting approaches, and in practice either misused the theory, or were inconsistent in the application.

Rensis Likert also played a significant part in

supporting the role that interpersonal relationships between manager and subordinate played in improving production. Likert, director of the Michigan University Institute for Social Research (established when Lewin's Center at M.I.T. was transferred there), worked along with other notable social and management scientists of the time with recognizable names like Lippitt, McGregor, French, Cartwright and Festinger (Capshew, 1992). The Institute, funded by industry and government grants, conducted both basic and applied research on groups and organizations (Perrow, 1979).

Likert's 4 Systems approach to management styles was similar to McGregor's Theory X and Y. System 1 management was the most extreme authoritarian, controlling form of management. System 4, a relationships oriented management style based on trust, was at the other end of the spectrum and was characterized by both supervisors and co-workers working together closely to achieve the goals of the business (Likert, 1967). Like McGregor, Likert advocated one best way to manage people (Perrow, 1979).

The focus on the interpersonal relationships of the manager with individual workers and groups of workers, which began at Hawthorne and was augmented by those who studied

group dynamics with Lewin, continued throughout the 1950s and 1960s. A whole industry grew up around the assumption that managers could be trained to do better in leading workers to greater performance (Perrow, 1979). Motivation theory, management theory and group behavior theory were overlapping fields of inquiry which supplied the foundation and continued support for the training and education efforts encountered in the organization during these decades.

HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND T-GROUP METHODS:

PRELUDE TO TEAM BUILDING

Team building, like other kinds of training and education, did not appear first as separate or distinct classroom courses or methods. Its antecedents are, however, clearly seen in the training content and methods which were implemented in organizations during the 1950s and 1960s. The activity and research during these decades related to improving management's ability to motivate workers to greater productivity through improved interpersonal relationships and more inclusive management styles. Much of this research, including Likert's and McGregor's, was conducted in large companies. As a result, these companies and others became interested in learning how to change supervisor's and manager's behaviors to match what the

experts were identifying as key elements of successful management.

By the 1950s, human relations training became a major part of supervisory and management training. Business and industry were keenly aware of the need for increased productivity and the failure of scientific management to provide the continued gains needed to compete effectively. The Ford Foundation granted funds to Harvard Business School in 1951 to "design and implement a program which would prepare people to do human relations training and research in a variety of formal organizations such as, for example, business" (Roethlisberger, 1977, p.3). A 1950 survey study published in the young Journal of Industrial Training (now, Training and Development Journal) indicated that human relations training was the area of greatest activity in training in the companies which responded (Guyon, 1950).

A later study by the American Council on Education in 1957 of more than 1600 companies confirmed just how widespread human relations training had become in the 1950s. A major portion of in-company courses offered by these companies were in supervisory and executive training (Serbein, 1961). The courses were aimed at improving managerial capacity and ability, especially at the executive

and middle management level. Three representative training curricula were examined in depth in this study. They provide a look at what supervisors and managers were learning, as well as what methods trainers were using in the 1950s. Each of the three cases studied included at least one of the following courses: a course in human relations for shift foremen, a human factors course for management, and a human relations course for managers.

The focus of these human relations training courses was on improving social interactions at work. The role management and supervisory interactions played with the workers and their effect on workers' performance was also a key element of the training. The importance of "humanics" (Serbein, 1961, p.53) or the "application of the same time, skill, effort, logic, understanding, knowledge and competency to human resources which management applied so successfully in the past to physical resources" (Appley, 1949, p.429) was stressed. In addition, the supervisors also needed to "analyze the basic wants and urges" (Serbein, p. 61) of workers, in order to determine what the supervisor could do in order to satisfy those needs. All this content was presumed necessary so that the supervisor could motivate employees to do their best because they wanted to, rather

than that they had to.

The methods employed in these three representative courses included lecture and discussion, case studies, role playing, audio-visuals, job rotation, and field trips. Specific education on team work was included in some of the training, but nothing resembling team building was mentioned in any of the material in the study.

Implicit in the content of this, and other, human relations training of this era was that most problems in the workplace were caused by the lack of relationships skills of the supervisor. Articles published in the Journal of Industrial Relations (which by 1955 had become the Journal of the American Society for Training Directors) supported this idea. Various reports of problems organizations encountered because of the supervisors' lack of interpersonal skills were reviewed and a number of cures were proposed, which were, not surprisingly, most often more training programs. In addition, a variety of techniques were suggested to help the supervisor learn how to improve their subordinates' performance. How-to books for supervisors in the early 1950s stressed that supervisors take a manipulative approach to workers, i.e., satisfying their needs, so that they would improve performance (Ohmann,

1950).

A frequent criticism of human relations training at the time was that its values and practices resulted in sacrificing the individual for the group (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik 1961). One of the more well-known critics was Malcolm McNair, a faculty member at Harvard Business School. In "What Price Human Relations" (1957) he strongly criticized the human relations training of the 1950s as "a fad, a cult" (p. 15) which paid too much attention to human relationships i.e., satisfying employees which, in turn, caused them to feel sorry for themselves and led them to shirk their responsibilities. He also observed that dealing with people was only a small part of the manager's job, and that the education business executives were receiving seemed to be too heavily weighted towards people issues. In the same article, McNair suggested that human relations training resulted in conformity, or a failure to build individuals.

The content of the courses was not the only element of human relations training under criticism. Roethlisberger (1951) in an address to the American Society of Training Directors (ASTD) convention in Philadelphia in 1951, said the time had come to stop lecturing supervisors, and to help

them learn from their own experiences.

Leland Bradford (1958), one of the original members of research group with Lewin at Bethel, stressed the importance of providing management with more than the supervisory interaction skills training included in most courses in human relations. He recommended that major emphasis also be placed on helping the manager work effectively as a team member, as well as leading other teams. He also stressed that in order to become an effective team member, managers must learn about themselves, their teams, and their organization.

Although the human relations training of this era did not ordinarily relate to the establishment of intragroup relationships among workers, as much as supervisory relationships with individual workers, a very early effort to create a "harmonious team" was reported by Argyris and Taylor in 1951. The format of the training was a member centered conference, where members of the same work group got together to work out mutual problems. The objective was to change members who were hostile and uncooperative with the rest of the group. This conference method also allowed participants free expression in a permissive atmosphere (Argyris & Graham, 1951).

Human relations training for managers, as it was practiced in the 1950s, was not the panacea to the problems in the workplace. The training itself was primarily an approach to changing the behavior of supervisors and managers in hope that they could motivate individual workers to perform better.

Laboratory Training

By the early 1960s, major changes in both the content and methods of management training occurred. In 1961, Edgar Schein, who later became one of the leading consultants in a new field called organization development, published a report on his research on the socialization methods of large corporations like International Business Machines (IBM) and General Electric (GE). He found that the human relations training of the 1940s and 50s created the conformity McNair suggested earlier. Many of the largest companies used these processes to indoctrinate employees, to create spirit and common ways of thinking in the workplace. And, the companies were proud of these accomplishments. But, wrote Schein, by 1960, it became fashionable to move towards producing self-actualized employees rather than promote conformity. "'Indoctrination' either moved underground, was re-labeled, or was replaced by 'development' programs which

emphasized opportunities for the integration of individual goals with organizational goals" (Schein, 1981, p. 56.). In addition, according to Schein, managers who were once proud of manipulating workers were made to feel ashamed.

Management training and development programs had shifted once again to reflect the ideas of leading management theorists and their followers in U.S. companies. Nowhere was this clearer than in the widespread use of laboratory training. It became one of the most controversial and popular methods used for management development (Bennis, 1969) and remnants of it are still seen today in the experiential learning exercises used to build teams.

In addition to the traditionally taught supervisory relationships training, laboratory education was first applied to the industrial setting in the 1950s (Burke, 1987). Much of the controversy surrounding laboratory training stemmed from two concerns, the experiential nature of the learning, and the ability of participants to transfer this kind of learning back to the workplace. A closer examination of the laboratory training method is warranted because the later, customized laboratory training events which evolved from it were actually the first team building

efforts. Many early T-group facilitators like Edgar Schein, Robert Blake and Jane Mouton, went on to become consultants for large companies and began to adapt the methods of the T-groups for application in the workplace (Blake, 1995).

The research and work with laboratory training methods at National Training Laboratories (NTL) continued following the 1946 Bethel experience. NTL was established in the late 1940s under the auspices of the National Education Association and a group of universities to conduct research and training in human relations and group dynamics (Knowles, 1977). NTL was not the only source for lab training. Western Training Laboratories, Intermountain Laboratories and various universities including UCLA, NYU, Boston University, GWU, and Temple were also conducting training labs (Schein & Bennis, 1965; Bennis, 1969, Blake, 1995). Early attendees of these labs were staff members of the YMCA, the YWCA, the Red Cross, Boy Scouts and Camp Fire Girls (Schein & Bennis, 1965).

NTL characterized their educational offering in their 1963 brochure as:

"Human relations training focuses on the individual, the small group, and the organization. A major training goal is increased interpersonal competence in

the many roles each participant plays-on the job, in the community, even in the family. The objectives include both the individual satisfactions derived from the full use of one's capacities and the organizational strength achieved through good working relations. The training activities make it possible to experiment with more effective ways of learning and new ways of behaving" (NTL, cited in Schein & Bennis, 1965).

Laboratory training was referred to by a number of different names, including sensitivity training, training (T)-groups, and encounter groups (Argyris, 1963; Bennis, 1969). Although some attempt at differentiation was made among these various types of learning, they had more in common, i.e., the lack of structure, the role of the facilitator, and the importance of feedback, than they had differences.

Argyris (1963) described the core of laboratory training as a group experience allowing participants maximum opportunity to expose their behavior and receive feedback on those behaviors. In addition, participants were given opportunities to experiment with new behaviors to develop an awareness of themselves and others. Schein and Bennis (1965) identified the theory of learning in use in

laboratory training as providing participants with cyclical opportunities to receive unconfirmed experience and feedback which, in turn, yielded attitudinal change, new behaviors, and new information and awareness.

There are a number of elements which constituted a generic training lab. The group of trainees included approximately 10 to 15 members who were not necessarily known to one another (stranger group) before the training experience, or who would not have any reason for an ongoing relationship following the training (Schein & Bennis, 1965). The training was held at an off-site location or "cultural island" (Blake, 1995, p.24) where day-to-day issues could not interfere with the group's activities. There was no planned agenda or group leader, although a facilitator was present to observe and occasionally provide conceptual and operational input on how the group was functioning (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961; Schein & Bennis, 1965). Another key characteristic was the group's focus on the here and now, rather than past or future events (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961)

Discussion in the group usually centered on clarifications of interpersonal issues which arose during the experience. There were also some focused exercises,

later to become known as structured experiences, like role playing, observation of group behavior, and large and small groupings of members for discussion purposes (Schein & Bennis, 1965). Due to the action research nature of the lab, participants became both researchers and students.

Industrial Training Laboratories

The industrial training laboratory differed from the generic labs in content and attendees. The trainees in the industrial lab were all from the same organization, although usually not an intact group of peers. In addition, they were almost always managers and executives. The foremen who had earlier been the recipients of most of the human relations training "in the anteroom off the factory floor" were now joined by executives attending laboratory training at "off-site resorts" (Strauss, 1968, p.62).

Some industrial training labs also had a specific content focus, like leadership. A UCLA sensitivity training session on leadership principles and practices was designed as one that would allow participants to "learn by doing" (Tschirgi, 1960, p.23) skills in human relations. The focus in the industrial labs, like the generic labs, continued to be on the individual participant's learning and development.

Industrial laboratory training also incorporated the

knowledge of group dynamics more overtly in the sessions. Rather than just learning by doing, more conceptual information was provided to the trainees in forms of discussion and lecture. Robert Blake (1960), one of the creators of customized laboratory training for industry, included in his version of the industrial training lab lectures on theories and topics ranging from Lewin's change theory (freezing, unfreezing, refreezing) to the concepts of group behavior with respect to norms, hidden agendas, and leadership styles. Additional concepts Blake presented to the participants were: the organization and the concepts of authority and obedience; intergroup relations, including the ideas of intergroup competition and collaboration; and problems with decision-making and group influence on individual behavior. Personal learning on defenses and needs occurred from the feedback, similar to the original laboratory training effort.

Blake, an enthusiastic supporter of industrial training labs, predicted in 1960 that within 25 years, industrial training laboratories would not only be a part of industrial training but the core of the curriculum. And, in fact, in 1963, there were 159 professionals at NTL involved in lab training, and by 1968, the number rose to 289 (Buchanan,

1969). Industrial training labs did not become the core of the curriculum as Blake predicted, however; team building is probably the one place where the vestiges of the lab are seen most often today.

Not everyone was as enthusiastic about laboratory training as Blake. Herzberg (1968), who continued to develop his motivation-hygiene theory, wrote his now well-known article, "One more time: How do you motivate employees", in the Harvard Business Review in response to what he called the demand for new kinds of "snake oil" (p.54) in a market already overflowing with solutions to the problem of motivating employees. He declared sensitivity training a failure in motivating workers and "an advanced form of human relations KITA (kick in the pants)" (p. 55) because it addressed hygiene factors like good supervisory relationships, etc., which might better satisfy employees for a while, but would not cause them to work harder.

McGregor (1960), who generally supported lab training, thought that one of its problems was that the training seemed "mysterious" and "esoteric" (p. 223) to non-participants because of the participants inability to communicate what actually occurred during the sessions. Other criticisms of the training were centered around that

removing people from the work setting for learning allowed for little transfer of training back to the workplace (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961).

Early Team Building Efforts

Although the term team building was not yet used to describe the work being done in industrial training laboratories with intact groups, several examples exist of a design variations on laboratory training which closely resemble some of the components of what is now known as team building. One was the work centered laboratory.

The work centered laboratory varied from the typical industrial training lab because the emphasis was on the day-to-day work problems of an intact group, with lesser emphasis on personal learning. Schein and Bennis (1965) referred to the work centered labs they conducted as team training or family group training. They recommended the work-centered lab for groups that were initially diagnosed as not ready for a full-blown lab experience. The team for this training was identified as an interdependent work group which was small enough to operate daily in the face-to-face mode.

The evolution of the family group, or work centered, laboratory from the original T-group was a key event in the

story of team building. Up until this time, the linkage of the learning from the lab setting to the daily operation at work was unclear, at best. To many of the organizations already including laboratory training in their management development curriculum, the work-centered lab represented a dramatic innovation which improved work performance (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Organizations expected that the more the family group approach were used in T-groups, the greater their impact on the organization (Bennis, 1965). The rapid spread of this new T-group configuration, emphasizing the growth of the group, rather than the growth of the individual participant was a significant one, with many consequences, one of which was the emergence of team building.

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT: TRUE TEAM BUILDING EMERGES

Although the work centered laboratory shifted the focus of laboratory training to the growth of the group, it was not until organizational theorists and consultants began to work with large scale change efforts in the total organization that team building as we know it today appeared. Human relations training, including the various forms of laboratory training, was concentrated on changing individuals and groups within the organizations. However,

it was difficult at best, to determine if changes of singular components of the organization, i.e., an individual, or a group, actually had any impact on the organization's performance as a whole. Organization development, or OD, became the vehicle for implementing changes across the entire organization.

There is some disagreement on who coined the term, organization development, and exactly when it was first used. Burke (1987) associates it with Robert Blake's work in sensitivity training sessions at an Esso (now Exxon) refinery in the southeast in the late 1950s. Blake (1995) describes two versions of the emergence of OD. One, was his own work with Herb Shepard at Esso in 1953 and 1954. Blake (1960) identified this work as "the first, wholehearted large scale, determined application of social science knowledge towards improving practices, procedures, and interpersonal relationships" (p.21) throughout an organization. The other version of the emergence of OD was Douglas McGregor's work at Union Carbide, which Blake attributes to an initiative of Richard Beckhard (Blake, 1995).

Broader than human relations training, OD's foundation was, however, also rooted in the fields of social

psychology, management, and organizational behavior. In addition, the tools of human relations training, i.e., laboratory training, survey feedback, and action research, to name a few, were integrated into the development and practice of OD (French, 1982). So many of the tools and techniques from human relations training were conveyed to OD that, according to Blake (1995), Leland Bradford expressed his fear that this shift in focus to organizational growth rather than individual growth would "be the end of Bethel" because "Why would people come here if they can transfer training into the organization?" (p. 28). Despite Bradford's fears, Bethel and NTL continue to flourish today.

Warren Bennis, one of the major practitioners of OD in the 1960s, described OD as "a response to change" and a "complex educational strategy intended to change beliefs, attitudes, values and the structure of organization development" (1969, p.2). Bennis identified Douglas McGregor's work at Union Carbide in 1964 as one example of OD. Instead of an example of OD, this work actually more closely resembles a singular component of a larger OD effort, team building, because most of the work focused on improving a management team's performance, rather than an overall effort to change the organization through various

widespread educational interventions.

McGregor's earlier mentioned book, The Human Side of Enterprise, dedicated an entire chapter to the "managerial team" (p. 227). He attributed management's inability to accomplish positive results through group effort as a lack of skills and understanding about the uniqueness of group functioning in the workplace. He identified the eleven characteristics of an efficient and well-functioning team:

- a) Relaxed working atmosphere where people are interested and involved,
- b) Participative discussions on work related issues,
- c) Clarity and acceptance of the objectives or task for the group,
- d) Willingness to listen to each other,
- e) Constructive forms of disagreement,
- f) Consensus decision making,
- g) Constructive criticism,
- 8) Free expression of feeling, as well as ideas,
- h) Clear assignment of responsibilities,
- i) Shifting leadership which is not dominating, and
- j) Frequent self-examination of how the team is doing (1960, p. 232-235).

Still in print today, The Human Side of Enterprise has been read and used by thousands of managers (Weisbord, 1987).

Working as a consultant to Union Carbide, McGregor used these eleven characteristics as the basis for his consulting intervention (McGregor, 1967). He was given the task of

building an effective management team (Bennis, 1969). In The Professional Manager (1967), McGregor wrote about this experience and provided some insight on the importance of team building: "the complexity of the environment and the goal structure of the enterprise create a situation in which it is no longer possible to comprehend or conduct the operation without some form of teamwork and team building" (p. 181).

In the course of his work at Union Carbide, McGregor developed a scale which identified eight dimensions of an effective team, ranging from the degree of mutual trust to the nature of the organizational environment. From it, groups, using their own self-ratings, were able to obtain feedback on the group as it related to themselves, and determine where action needed to be taken to improve the group's functioning (Bennis, 1969). The participants in this early team building intervention were, unlike today's participants, all managers.

Marvin Weisbord (1987), author of Productive Workplaces and a current well-known OD consultant, attributes McGregor with bringing together and influencing some of the most recognized OD experts while he was at M.I.T. between 1937 and 1964. Richard Beckhard, Warren Bennis, Joseph Scanlon

and Edgar Schein were all colleagues of McGregor's there (Weisbord, 1987). According to Weisbord, it was while Richard Beckhard and McGregor were consulting with General Mills in the 1950s (not Union Carbide), that McGregor coined the phrase organization development.

Bennis (1969) provides a better glimpse of how all encompassing an OD effort could be. He describes a year long effort in 1960 at a small refinery facing bankruptcy. The effort began with a management survey, followed by intensive feedback on the analyzed data to the affected units. Weekly seminars by prominent theorists were then held for managers to help them begin thinking about ways to accomplish the desired changes in the organization. Laboratory training was given to all managers to improve their interpersonal skills and intergroup cooperation. And finally, following all of these educational interventions, the resultant solution to their problem was identified by the participants, in this case, the implementation of a plant wide system for participation and efficiency improvements.

Bennis (1969) sums up his description of OD interventions as concentrating on the "values, relations and climate" (p.10) of the organization, rather than its formal

structure or goals. He also clarifies what "OD is not 17). It is not sensitivity training, but uses experiential learning techniques in the educational programs. Nor is it permissive leadership, or any other specific style of leadership.

The idea that OD might be human relations training revisited, only bigger, caused its major practitioners and theorists to address the issue head on. NTL, whose associates were now heavily involved in OD efforts, in an article entitled "What is OD?" described it as a "short title for looking at the whole human side of organizational life" (1966, p.1). Further description of OD in the same article included the shift, although subtle, from the focus on individual learning and development to group development. The value of tying these educational efforts more clearly to improved business outcomes was not lost by NTL, either. As a result of OD interventions, NTL said, work would be organized to meet the needs of people as well as the needs for "highest quality and productivity" (p. 1).

NTL's focus in 1966 was on the group learning component of OD, including the delivery of "managed processes of increasing openness about positive and negative feelings" (1966, p. 2) for group members which resulted in "strong

identification with group goals" (p. 2). This concept of improving performance through assisting groups in the identification and pursuit of common goals is one that continues to survive today. This work with groups was viewed by NTL as a way to obtain ownership of the organization's objectives throughout the entire organization.

By 1966, OD had developed a technology all its own, characterized by a series of research like steps including a) problem identification, b) selection of the key problem for resolution, c) collecting and sharing data on the problem, d) involving all parties in action planning, e) testing alternative solutions, and f) selecting and periodically reviewing and revising the preferred solution.

A critical actor in implementing the OD process was a change agent, or consultant. Bennis (cited in Beckhard, 1982) described the consultant as much like a practicing psychoanalyst or physician in the organization. NTL (1966) recommended that the consultant initially share in the work but that the long term goal was to move the organization to self-sufficiency. Beer (1976) suggests that although many of the techniques of OD were based on previous research and theory, some of the techniques may have been created by

consultants' real-time responses to the organization's needs. Team building was, most likely, the creation of several of those consultants. Blake, in his work at Esso, and McGregor, in his work at Union Carbide, were both heavily involved in improving team performance, as were many unknown or unrecognized change agents. By 1967, McGregor spoke specifically of team building in The Professional Manager.

The idea that teams could learn and develop continued to intrigue both researchers and practitioners alike. In 1958, William Schutz, a social psychologist who trained as a T-Group leader at NTL (Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974) expressed the developmental structure of the work group within the framework of members' needs for inclusion, control and affection. The Fundamental Interpersonal Relation Orientation (FIRO) instrument, developed by Schutz in 1958, measured the strength of individual team members' needs and their ability to satisfy their own needs for inclusion, control and affection. FIRO continues to be used today in modern team building sessions. In addition, another psychologist, B. W. Tuckman's (1965) well known rhyming list of the four stages of team growth: forming, norming, storming and performing, developed in 1965, continues to be

recited by consultants when working with teams at all stages of development. In 1977, Tuckman added adjourning to the list (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977).

Further evidence that interest in team training and development in the 1950s and 1960s was growing was apparent by the number of articles and books published on the topic. The Journal of the American Society of Training Directors included numerous articles on the topic, by experts such as Leland Bradford (1958), Robert Blake (1960) and Jane Mouton (Blake, Mouton & Blansfield, 1962). The Business Periodicals Index also shows references to team and team effectiveness under the heading Group Behavior, beginning in the late 1950s. In addition, the 1962 annual conference of the American Society of Training Directors (ASTD) included concurrent sessions on "The Developing Revolution in Management Practices" which concluded that team training was the best way to learn how to manage people ("The developing revolution," 1962).

OD, then, provided the stimulus for the rise of many tools and processes for creating large scale change in organizations. The role of the change agent or consultant was also a key outcome of the OD movement. In the 1960s, OD efforts were widespread and consultants were gaining fame

through the customization of their own OD methodologies. Two of the most well known were a pair of professors from the University of Texas (U.T.), Robert Blake and Jane Mouton.

THE MANAGERIAL GRID AND TEAM BUILDING

Between 1955 and 1987, Blake and Mouton published more than forty books and over 200 journal articles, many focused on the development of human resources (Blake, 1995). In his early career in academia, Blake was associated with many of the early NTL leaders, and was a T-group leader as well. Jane Mouton, a psychology professor, was also active in the T-group movement, contributing to the work of Southwest Training Laboratory, located in Austin at U.T. (Blake, 1995). Blake and Mouton were also co-founders of Scientific Methods, a consulting company still in business today, and continuing to sell various design variations of The Managerial Grid.

Significant in the history of team building is the work of Blake and Mouton and their creation, the ubiquitous Managerial Grid. The Managerial Grid was discussed at the 1962 ASTD conference as a primary tool for helping managers learn how to manage people. By then, Blake and Mouton (1964) had already begun to use a form of laboratory

training, the Managerial Grid Laboratory, to help managers understand their leadership styles and change their behaviors to become more supportive of people.

More descriptive than theoretical (Burke, 1987) the Grid is a graphic representation of the interaction between two dimensions of managerial behavior, the concern for people and the concern for productivity (Blake & Mouton, 1964). These popularized terms represented two earlier concepts of leadership, development of interpersonal relationships and task accomplishment, respectively (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). Concern for people included caring for employees in terms of trusting them to do their jobs, providing them with adequate salary and benefits and respecting them as individuals. Concern for productivity was not limited to the narrow definition of producing objects, but also covered what the organization, as a whole, was trying to accomplish.

Blake and Mouton created a self-assessment instrument for managers to measure their own perceptions about people and production. The output from the questionnaire was then scored and plotted on the Grid. Scores ranged from 1 to 9 on both the productivity and people dimensions, with 9 being the optimum. Although there were 81 possible combinations

of scores, Blake and Mouton focused on the 4 extreme scores and midpoint (5,5). A manager scoring top scores in both categories, or a 9,9, was referred to as the "ideal manager" (Blake & Mouton, 1964, p. 10). These 9,9 managers accomplished their work through the commitment of their people to the common good of the organization. Burke (1967) referred to this one best way to manage concept presented in the Grid as a "normative approach to OD" (p.45). According to Blake and Mouton (1964), these managers obtained both bottom line results and career success. Later referred to as "team management" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977), the 9,9 management style was one of the training programs developed by Blake and Mouton and sold by Scientific Methods.

The Grid Laboratory

The Grid laboratory, another creation of Blake and Mouton, was different from other labs because it was structured around the two concepts the Grid instrument attempted to measure (Beer, 1976). It was also smaller in size, usually between 5-8 participants. Pre-work for the lab typically included filling out the Grid questionnaire and proposing individual solutions to work related problems, usually of an interpersonal nature. In the lab session, the group would then work to jointly develop the solutions to

the problems they solved individually. This group problem solving exercise would usually generate interpersonal behaviors which interfered with the group's ability to perform their task. The participants would then evaluate themselves against a standard, and give each other feedback on their leadership styles (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

This session, referred to as the Grid Seminar, was not designed to create the large scale organizational change which OD had as its goal, nor was it considered team building. Blake and Mouton, however, did view the team as the "fundamental building block" (1965, p.170) of the organization because teams possessed all the basic elements of the organization, the power system, group norms, unity of purpose and goals, and relationships required to perform. Of importance to note here, is that Blake and Mouton considered the team as made up of supervisory level or above in the organization. Grid Seminars during the 1960s did not include the rank and file.

In their 1964 book, The Managerial Grid, Blake and Mouton had already detailed a 6 phase process leading to excellent organization performance. It included the Grid Seminar as the first step where managers learned the concept of the grid, and some of the associated behaviors of

managers. The second phase was referred to as team work development, where teams of managers applied the Grid theory to increase their learning and effectiveness. The third phase looked at intergroup development to allow groups to work better with each other in order to improve results. The remaining three phases included top management development of an ideal model for the organization and the planning, implementation, and revision of that model. Blake and Mouton estimated that the complete process would require five years to change the organization to the 9,9 ideal (Bennis, 1965).

Grid OD and Team Building

In 1969, Blake and Mouton entitled their new book, referring to their 6 phase process, Building a Dynamic Organization through Grid Organization Development. Phase 1, the Grid Seminar, was broadened in scope to include a more systematic approach to teach skills for more synergistic behaviors among team members. Phase 2, the team work development phase, differed significantly from the earlier description in 1964, because the teams worked in intact groups, that is, the teams of participants in Phase 2 sessions were formed according to the those who actually worked together daily. Pre-work for Phase 2 included an

evaluation of team work, team member actions, and how the participants viewed himself as a team member. The session lasted a full week and included discussions on the team's current approach to planning, patterns of communication, and goals in the context of actual work problems. The intent was not to solve any specific work related problems, but only to reveal the current attitudes of team members to problems (Blake and Mouton, 1969). The other phases of Grid OD remained virtually the same as the original 1964 process.

The changes in the first two phases of Grid OD were significant in the history of team building for two reasons: First, in phase 1, the Grid Seminar included the idea that the behaviors of the team, as an entity, could achieve greater performance than the separate efforts of individuals (synergy). Second, in phase 2, Blake and Mouton asserted that learning as an intact group was fundamental in improving the team's functioning in all levels of performance, from planning, to communications, to goal attainment. There was, however, little change in the organizational level of the participants in Grid seminars, the majority continued to be supervisors and managers.

There was at least one incident where the Grid was used in a development program for the rank and file. A "team

improvement laboratory" was developed in 1967 (Borwick, 1969) for use with supermarket employees in Canada. The purpose of this lab was to teach employees problem solving techniques and help them set and achieve goals. This early example of engaging people of all levels in the organization in learning problem solving skills and implementing tactics to achieve objectives foretells the story of modern day team building.

The acceptance of the Managerial Grid and OD was widespread. Large corporations like AT&T incorporated the Grid into introductory management training courses in the 1960s. Grid OD included the interpersonal skill building that lab training and human relations training provided, and it also clearly recognized the need for concern for production. By closely linking the two, and working with intact work groups, the earlier criticism of the lack of transfer of training to the workplace, which other management training and development sessions encountered, was diminished.

CONCLUSION

Although the term team building was being used interchangeably with team development and other words to describe various OD interventions aimed at improving group

learning and functioning, team building became the predominant term by the end of the 1960s.

Nineteen sixties' style team building was characterized by a number of key elements. First, team building in the 1960s was generally only one ingredient of an overall organizational change effort, not the stand-alone educational event seen today. Second, as team building was consultant led in its early stages, it had almost as many variations as there were consultants using it. However, most of these sessions had in common a primary focus on social interactions and interpersonal relationships as the key to smooth group functioning. Little, if any, actual problem solving was done by the participants. Third, the methods used by team builders in the 1960s included many of the original lab training methods like discussion and feedback, and several variations in team building utilized instruments to evaluate group behaviors, like McGregor's team effectiveness survey and Blake's and Mouton's Managerial Grid. The final characteristic of team building in this decade which distinguishes it from present day, was the hierarchical level of the participants; most were managers, a few were supervisors, and fewer still were front-line workers.

CHAPTER 4

TEAM BUILDING WITH A PURPOSE: FOCUS

ON PROBLEM SOLVING 1970-1989

The evolution of team building continued during the 1970s and 1980s. In the 1950s and 1960s, as shown in the previous chapter, team building had become one element of a major organizational change effort, usually called organization development (OD). Managers and executives were the primary participants of these OD efforts. Most often, team building included as part of OD had, as its major objective, improved interpersonal relationships among the management team members.

The following decades of the 1970s and 1980s saw enormous growth in the number of teams in the workplace, which, in turn, created a greater demand for team building, and also a need for more consistency in the team building process. For the purposes of this chapter, several themes were distilled from the analysis of team building during these two decades. First, unlike the large scale OD efforts in the 1960s and 1970s, team building in these later decades became a stand-alone educational event. In addition, the teams of executives and managers who were the earlier participants of team building were replaced by teams of

front line workers. These new teams had as their primary focus discovering solutions to specific work related problems. This chapter will examine the key factors influencing this rapid increase in the number and kind of workplace teams, as well as the changes in the purpose, format, methodology and participants of team building.

Following a review of the literature of this period, two worker participation initiatives were selected as major influences on the growth and development of team building: job enrichment (sometimes called work redesign), and the quality movement. Each of these workplace innovations used teams as the vehicle for involving workers in making decisions on improvements in their work environment and the work, itself. Before examining these two efforts more closely, some understanding of the prevailing climate in the American workplace during this period is warranted.

THE GROWING INTEREST IN TEAM BUILDING

A sense of the growth in the prevalence of team building in the 1970s and 1980s can be gained from examining several of the better known publications for personnel and training practitioners during this time period. These practitioner oriented publications were selected because team building was often designed and facilitated by

personnel and training managers within the organization. A review of Training and Development Journal, Personnel, Training Magazine, and The Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators (now called The Annual: Developing Human Resources) was conducted for relevant topics and articles associated with team building during these two decades.

The frequency of team building training in organizations rose significantly between the beginning of the 1970s through the end of the 1980s. In 1970, team building had yet to appear as a heading in the index for the Training and Development Journal. A report published that year in the Journal on a survey of training in companies entitled "The Most Frequently Used Training Techniques" made no mention of team building, but two of its predecessors, programmed group exercises and laboratory training, were listed (Utgaard, 1970). For the first time, in January, 1971, the index of Training and Development Journal included team building as an index heading and listed one article on the topic. The indices between 1971 and 1989 listed 42 articles specifically devoted to the topic, or more than two articles per year.

An examination of the indices to Personnel during the 1970s and 1980s found the first articles on team building

listed in 1973 under the category, Job Enrichment. By 1977, team building had its own category in the index, with two articles listed. During 1981 and 1982, the indices listed a seven part series on team building.

Another indication of the high level of interest in team building during this time was found in the Harvard Business Review Index 1966-1975, Ten Year Index. A list of the 25 best selling reprints during that time frame included "Breakthrough in Organization Development", by Blake, Mouton and Greiner, first published in the Review in 1964. The description of the article reads: "This large scale program (Grid OD) produces evidence that behavioral sciences concepts of team learning can be applied to industrial realities with identifiable, measurable results" (Harvard Business Review Index 1966-1975, Ten Year Index, last page).

As telling as the count of articles published on team building is, the topics associated with it provide the most information about the evolution of team building. For example, during the 1980s, the Training and Development Journal index listed articles on team building under various headings, including Team Training, Quality of Worklife and Team Development. Likewise, the Personnel index listed team building articles under headings for Worker Participation

and Job Enrichment.

These index headings related to team building provide clues to the story of the growth and development of team building during the 1970s and 1980s. Although team building often stood by itself, its relationship to other organizational activities like job enrichment and worker participation provided the stimulus to explore these areas as well. This growing experimentation in employee participation in the workplace throughout these decades created a number of activities which were closely linked to team building. As established in the previous chapter, prior to 1970, it was rare for non-management employees to be included in team building. During the period of 1970 to 1989, it was the front line workers who became the major participants in team building. This fact alone contributed to much of the increased demand for team building during these decades, as workers significantly outnumbered managers.

The abundance of articles written by and for training practitioners provide evidence of the growing interest in team building during the 1970s and 1980s. However, the nature of team building during this time is better advanced by examining the widespread activities supported by

management to more fully involve the worker in the daily operation.

THE STATE OF THE WORKPLACE AND OD

By 1970, the idea that workers were dissatisfied, bored and alienated was so prevalent that even the Federal Government took notice. In 1972, Senator Ted Kennedy introduced a bill called "The Worker Alienation Act", calling for the study of the perceived alienation of the American worker and potential remedies (Mills, 1975). In addition, Elliott Richardson, then Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), advocated that work needed to be more humanized in the publication of the HEW report, Work in America (Mills, 1975).

The work of management and OD theorists during the 1960s had already sensitized managers to the needs of people at work. During the 1970s, Daniel Yankelovich, known for his research and analysis of social trends in the U. S., conducted landmark studies examining peoples' needs for self-fulfillment. Published in 1981 in the book New Rules: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down, Yankelovich described the workers of the 1970s as balking at the old distinction between workers and managers which kept workers from having a voice in matters affecting

them. From his research, he concluded that workers wanted interesting work which allowed them to set their own goals, seek responsibility, and be creative. In addition, workers revealed that they enjoyed work more when working in small groups (Yankelovich, 1981).

Despite this growing dissatisfaction of workers and the perception that workers needed to become more involved in the decisions regarding their work, no quick solution was to be found. Organization development, one of the favorite management interventions of the 1960s, became the subject of much criticism. Two of its leading proponents, Warren Bennis and Chris Argyris, saw the weaknesses of OD and remarked on them during interviews in Organizational Dynamics in 1974.

Bennis, a behavioral scientist formerly at M.I.T., and President of the University of Cincinnati at the time of the interview, discussed the weaknesses of the OD of the 1960s. One of its greatest weaknesses, according to Bennis, was the encouragement of a tainted form of "participatory democracy in our institutions-too many worthless meetings that lead to shallow decisions" ("Conversation with Warren Bennis", Organization Dynamics, 1974, 2(3) p. 66). He also quoted Charles Perrow, noted organizational theorist, as equating

OD's efforts to match theory to practice in the organization as the "Buck Rogers' School of Organizational Theory" (p. 51).

In a later issue that year, Argyris reflected on the failure of OD practitioners to help create a successful total organization. He attributed this failure to the practitioners' lack of competence in business issues, such as financial analysis and management information systems, and an attachment to the "old T-group values of closeness and not concerned enough with effectiveness and competence" ("Conversation: An Interview with Warren Bennis", Organization Dynamics, (1974), 3(1), p. 61).

The notion that OD and its tools were not the solutions to the organizational problems of the 1970s was echoed in a number of other articles (Duncan, 1974; Walton, 1974).

Duncan (1974) suggested that "old tools (like team development) are not to be discarded" (p.26) but needed to be changed and used appropriately. He provided examples of the eagerness of organizations to use OD "fads" (p. 26), like the Managerial Grid and Transactional Analysis, as similar to the approach, "Well, Doc, it's 1974; shoot me up with everything that was discovered in 1973" (p.26).

The proliferation of theories, instruments and

techniques resulting from the work of OD practitioners created confusion as to what worked, and what did not work, with regard to creating a more satisfied and productive work force. The linkages among good interpersonal relationships, satisfied employees and improvements in productivity were often difficult to prove, and it was even more difficult to assess cause and effect. A comprehensive analysis of 600 studies on job satisfaction over a 15 year period, conducted by Srivastva, et al., (1977) found in the correlation studies that employee satisfaction was related to numerous variables ranging from autonomy to the intrinsic nature of work itself. In the 57 field experiments analyzed where cause and effect could be determined, improvements in performance and employee satisfaction resulted from a large number of variables, ranging from increased worker autonomy and work restructuring, to more participative management styles.

The heightened interest in the 1970s in participative management systems, worker satisfaction and the potential for improved productivity, caused U.S. companies to begin far reaching experimentation involving the worker in the decisions affecting their jobs. The first widespread effort was known as job enrichment or work redesign. Charles

Heckscher (1988), currently professor at the Rutgers University Labor Management Institute, identified job enrichment as one of the first processes of changing the work of the traditional supervisor, and the forerunner of problem solving groups and autonomous teams.

TEAM BUILDING IN JOB ENRICHMENT AND WORK REDESIGN

The concept of job enrichment and work redesign arose in the 1960s following Herzberg's works on the two factor or motivation-hygiene theory of worker motivation, but it was not until the 1970s that the results of job enrichment efforts began to be generally known. Hackman, in a 1973 journal article, predicted that "work redesign (or job enrichment, or job enlargement-call it what you will) is to be the darling of the mid-1970s" (1973, p. 20). Texas Instruments and AT&T published two of the better known stories of job enrichment.

Job Enrichment at Texas Instruments

M. Scott Myers (1970), a personnel manager at Texas Instruments (TI), published the first major work, Every Employee a Manager, on the practical application of job enrichment principles. Myers wrote this book with the purpose of "bridging the gap between theory and practice" (p. xii). The book was a combination of Myers'

interpretation of job enrichment and a broad analysis of the work in this area at TI. Every Employee a Manager, as the first in-depth book on the practical application of the Herzberg's two-factor theory, led the way for more employee involvement in the workplace. It was read by many managers, and became required reading for students in the supervisory training courses developed in AT&T in the early 1970s.

According to Myers, job enrichment was the process through which the theory of worker satisfaction and motivation added practical business value. In the foreword of the book, Myers captures this idea: "Involvement of people in the planning and controlling as well as the doing of their work must be understood not as an act of good 'human relations' nor as a means of exploitation but, rather as a sound business practice" (p. x). This became the overarching reason for changing the nature of work during the next two decades.

Job enrichment was the first widespread effort to involve front-line workers in planning and controlling their work, rather than just "obedient doing" (Myers, p. 69). Myers described job enrichment as "a process for developing employees so that they can think and behave like managers" (p, xii). Furthermore, Myers identified the "primary group

or team" (p. 27) as the medium through which workers acquire their "attitudes, values and goals" (p.26). The conformance pressures of the group were also cited as key to obtaining alignment on goals. For this reason, Myers advocated that the supervisors exercise their influence through the group, rather than one-to-one relationships with workers.

Myers challenged the views of Herzberg by eventually involving the front line worker towards the end of the job enrichment process. Earlier, Herzberg (1968) advised managers embarking on job enrichment to "avoid the direct participation by the employees whose jobs are to be enriched" (p.62) because they would inject "human relations hygiene factors" (p.62) into the process. Myers thought that the involvement of the incumbents was the most effective means, although he limited their participation to the problem-solving and goal setting portion of the job enrichment process. To complete the process effectively, Myers recommended training in problem solving for all team members and their foremen.

The relationship of job enrichment to team building is demonstrated by a more specific example of job enrichment conducted by William Roche, a former TI training manager, and Neil MacKinnon, a quality assurance manager at TI's

Attleboro, Massachusetts plant. The job enrichment activities at the plant were aimed at creating "motivating work" (Roche & MacKinnon, 1970, p. 80) and looked very similar to what team building later became in the 1970s.

Unlike Myers' advice to involve workers late in the job enrichment process, Roche and MacKinnon conducted a series of cyclical "conferences" (1970, p. 84) involving both the supervisor and the workers of a particular operations area almost immediately. The first conference, or meeting, was often also the first time supervisors at Attleboro had ever met with their entire group together at one time. This meeting was spent on identifying the problems workers had in getting their work done. Once the problems were identified, the supervisor assigned them to the appropriate people or groups for their solutions. Between the first and second meetings, everyone assigned worked to solve the problems.

At the second meeting, the supervisor reported on the progress of any problem assigned to him or her. Particular emphasis was placed on any actions taken, and the subsequent results. Others in the group who had been assigned projects did the same. At this meeting, and every meeting after this, the group continued to identify new problems, and checked to determine if previous solutions were still

working. The continued involvement of the worker in problem solving allowed them to eventually set production goals associated with the solution and track performance against them.

Roche and MacKinnon (1970) reported that results were mixed during the two years this job enrichment formula was used for improving productivity. Those groups who succeeded often had spectacular performance. Those that failed usually did so very quickly.

The unique contribution of the work of Roche and MacKinnon at TI in Attleboro was the early involvement of the worker in the job enrichment process. Not only were workers allowed to participate in problem solving and goal setting phases like Myers' recommended, but they also helped management identify the problems in need of solution.

Job Enrichment at AT&T

In addition to the work at TI, the other well known job enrichment effort was conducted by AT&T. Lawler (1987) identified the AT&T effort as the largest program of job enrichment in the U.S., involving over 100,000 employees, including thousands of telephone operators. Robert Ford, the director of personnel at AT&T during the late 1960s and early 1970s, is the person most closely associated with this

effort. Unlike TI's job enrichment formula, Ford followed Herzberg's advice and developed a process for enrichment which completely excluded the job holders (Lawler, 1987). Ford described the "team or mini-group" (1973, p.80) as the set of all workers (not just management) who had a role in satisfying the customer, yet he excluded non-management workers from the job enrichment process which would allow the team to better satisfy the customer.

My personal recollection of job enrichment at AT&T, from having been a telephone operator there in 1972, is of being told by my supervisor that my job "had been enriched" to include not only handling customers' calls but also calculating my monthly productivity and accuracy results and posting them in a results binder. My reaction, at the time, as well as that of my sister operators was "this is the supervisor's job, not mine". It was not, as managers planned, an enriching experience.

The Application of Job Enrichment in New Plants

The management driven job enrichment efforts at AT&T and TI both took place in already established workplaces with existing employees. Job enrichment principles were also applied to the design of new jobs in new plants. One of the better known efforts, begun in the late 1960s,

occurred at a General Foods plant in Topeka, Kansas, (Walton, 1972; Grenier, 1988).

The design and implementation of the new work processes at the plant in Topeka took place over a two year period, 1968-1970, and was reported in Harvard Business Review in 1972 by R. E. Walton, the personnel manager for the plant. Walton was the designer of the participative system for the new dog food plant. The design was very similar to prior job enrichment efforts, but went a step further. Previous efforts examined existing work and improved the processes, sometimes involving workers in the problem solving efforts. The resulting enriched jobs sometimes were better done by teams of workers, but many times there was no need to increase team work; the enriched job still fit the individual worker. Walton's design created work which, from the beginning, could only be accomplished by teams of workers. The workers determined what and how work would be done in the plant from the outset. Walton's design also provided for the education and skills training of the workers, as well as building the nucleus of each of the new teams. This design maximized the participation of the worker and is an early example of what is known today as a self-managed team environment.

Resistance to Job Enrichment

On the surface, the concept of enriched jobs seemed like a good idea, but there was resistance from both management and labor. The implementation of job enrichment and work redesign was credited with reduced costs, increased production, less scrap, fewer worker complaints and improved attitudes and team efforts (Ford, 1973; Herzberg, 1974; Myers, 1970, Walton, 1972). However, when employees stepped outside the boundaries of the enriched work itself, into the traditional management areas of company policy, like compensation, work scheduling, etc., job enrichment efforts often floundered as managers asserted their control (Levinson, 1973).

Unions objected to the idea that workers take on some of the traditional work of managers, described in Every Employee a Manager and again, in the self-managed environment created by General Foods. The unions interpreted the efforts of managers to enrich jobs in this manner as manipulation of the worker to do more for less, or worse, an attempt to lessen the need for union representation (Myers, 1970; Grenier, 1988). In fact, Walton's initial 1972 article about General Foods' Topeka plant mentioned that the absence of a union at the plant

allowed the plant more flexibility with regard to work rules. But in a later article in 1982, Walton admitted that the Topeka plan was actually a response to labor problems at other General Foods plants, designed specifically to keep the union out (Walton, 1982).

Experimentation with job enrichment, work design and worker involvement generated a great deal of excitement as it became better known in the early 1970s. The early reports of improved worker satisfaction, higher productivity and reduced costs encouraged continuing experimentation in the workplace. By the mid-1970s, U.S. companies became increasingly interested in new ways of doing work and the discovery of Quality Circles began the next generation of workplace innovation.

TEAMS AND QUALITY CIRCLES

Quality Circles (QCs), more than any other workplace innovation, created unprecedented growth of teams in the workplace, as well as huge demands for training for teams. QCs differed from job enrichment and work redesign efforts in two ways. First, job enrichment efforts were directed at improving worker satisfaction and productivity. The primary goal of QCs was improved product quality. Second, people having enriched jobs often worked together in groups, but

QCs were always group efforts, and were based on the concept that the team, working together with common purpose, could create quality output which exceeded anything they, as individuals, could produce.

Quality circles existed in Japan in the early 1960s, but it was 1974 before U.S. companies borrowed the concept from Japan and formed the first QC in the U.S. (Campbell, Campbell & Associates, 1988; , 1988; Honeycutt, 1987). U.S. economist, Edward W. Deming, who went to Japan as part of the rebuilding effort following World War II to help the Japanese with statistical quality control efforts, is widely credited with the success of QCs in Japan (Deming, 1980). Deming defined QCs as "the name given to the fact that the Japanese work in groups" (p. 26).

In 1968, a group of Japanese managers who used QCs toured several U.S. manufacturing locations. In a reciprocal visit in 1973, a group of American managers from the Lockheed Missile Systems Division visited Japan to study their manufacturing methods (Ledford, Lawler, & Mohrman, 1988). Following this visit, Lockheed formed their first QC in 1974. By 1977, 5 other aerospace industry companies, including Honeywell, implemented QCs.

Unprecedented growth in QCs followed. The International

Association of Quality Circles was formed in 1977 and in 1980 had 230 companies as members (Grenier, 1988). By 1982, a New York Stock Exchange study revealed that 44% of all companies with greater than 500 employees had QCs (Lawler & Mohrman, 1985). By 1985, the International Association of QCs had grown thirtyfold to include 7000 companies and more than 200 consultants (Ledford, Lawler & Mohrman, 1988). QCs were known by a wide variety of names: Can-do teams, Production teams, and Quality teams (Grenier, 1988). They were stand alone programs at many companies with their own training material, procedures and consultants.

The rapid adoption of QCs is most often attributed to the desire to improve the competitiveness of American companies through better quality control and lower costs associated with their products (Cohen, 1991; Campbell & Campbell, 1988; Honeycutt, 1987; Sirianni, 1987; Tausky & Chelte, 1991). Following Lockheed's reported \$3 million in savings from their QC effort during 1974-1977 (Lynch, cited in Grenier, 1988) and numerous other studies reporting cost savings, U.S. executives quickly embraced the QC concept (Grenier, 1988).

Another frequently cited reason for QCs quick adoption was management's desire to allow workers more collaboration

and participation in the work process (Cohen, 1991; Honeycutt, 1987; Lawler, 1987). The results from the earlier job enrichment days led managers to believe that worker collaboration and participation yielded greater productivity and reduced costs. QCs were viewed as another vehicle to involve the worker in reaching the goals of the organization.

QCs were implemented in all kinds of companies, union organized and not. In both instances, management was able to justify the implementation of QCs. In union organized companies, management wanted the union to participate in the QC effort because the workers more easily worked in pursuit of the company goals addressed by QCs if the union was perceived as supporting them (Grenier, 1988). In plants where there was no union, management viewed the improved worker satisfaction resulting from QC involvement as one way to keep the union from organizing workers (Tausky & Chelte, 1991).

Union Opposition to Quality Circles

In contrast to management, the union perspective on QCs when they were first introduced is best captured by the opinion of G. Grenier (1988), who referred to QCs as "old wine in new bottles" (p.3.). He saw no difference in QCs

and previous attempts to exploit workers to cooperate with management by working harder to improve productivity and in pursuit of company goals with little or no additional reward.

Grenier formed his opinions while conducting his graduate research at Ethicon-Albuquerque, a Johnson & Johnson subsidiary during 1982 and 1983. As an employee of Ethicon, Grenier helped to facilitate QC team meetings, during which teams of workers, organized by production operation, met to discuss problems on a regular basis. While working with the industrial psychologist in charge of the QC project, Grenier discovered, much to his dismay, that the reason Ethicon was implementing QCs was to defeat a union organizing effort (Grenier, 1988).

There were instances where the unions did informally participate in QCs in organized companies. Their participation stemmed more from the desire to save union members' jobs by keeping the plant's costs and quality competitive so that it would remain open (Tausky & Chelte, 1991).

The formal involvement of unions in QC activity is more commonly referred to as Quality of Worklife. The major difference in QCs and the QWL concept was the extent of

union participation. In QCs, unions generally maintained their traditional role of ensuring that QC activities did not violate the bargained for rights of the workers. In QWL efforts, unions collaborated with management in the initial planning and implementation of problem solving teams and continued to participate in problem solving sessions with management to reach mutually agreed upon goals.

TEAMS IN THE QUALITY OF WORKLIFE MOVEMENT

When the Quality of Worklife (QWL) movement began in the early 1970s, it encompassed practically all of the team efforts currently underway in American business. In 1973, AT&T produced a film entitled "The Quiet Revolution" about business's new concern for the quality of human performance at work (Mills, 1975). This topic was later called the "quality of worklife phenomenon" (Mills, 1975, p. 83) by Senator Charles Percy, and simply the "Quality of Worklife" (p. 83) by United Auto Workers Union (UAW) president Leonard Woodcock. Although the initial intent of QWL was virtually the same QCs, QWL quickly became exclusively associated with QC implementation in unionized locations. In 1985, QWL was formally defined by the Department of Labor as jointly developed programs in the workplace designed "to increase worker participation in decisions which affect the job"

(U.S. Department of Labor, 1985).

Initially, most unions thought that QWL would weaken the union local. The small group activities created in QC implementation were viewed by the unions as a threat to the bargaining structure (Sirianni, 1987). In addition, unions historically opposed most worker participation programs because many of the improvements generated by the teams resulted in fewer union jobs, or in workers giving up bargained for rights to assist their companies in producing competitive advantages identified by management (Heckscher, 1988). As discussed earlier, QC kinds of activity were also viewed with suspicion by union leadership because they often were used to forestall union organizing efforts.

In 1973, the Big Three automobile manufacturers and the UAW established QWL committees in response to the need to maintain some control in the rapidly spreading team concept generated by management's interest in QCs (Mills, 1975). The activities of the teams often conflicted with the values of the union and sometimes with the union contract itself. Victor Reuther, one of the founders of UAW, summarizes the union perspective on teams in his comments on the dangers of the team concept: "What began by appealing to the worker's idealism turns some workers into informants and weakens

union solidarity. Often, when workers are reluctant to approve the team approach, they are threatened by management with plant closings....It seems to be a return to the 1920s: the team leader is just a new age straw boss, and worker flexibility is just another name for the company's right to dispose of the worker as it pleases." (Parker & Slaughter, 1988, p. v.). The UAW foresaw these potential problems in 1973 and stepped in to avoid them by formalizing the team concept through the QWL committee concept.

The QWL concept was further strengthened by the creation of QWL committees in the 1980 contract between AT&T and the Communications Workers of America (CWA). By the end of 1981, 150 joint QWL teams had already been established at AT&T. In 1985, the number of QWL committees at AT&T had grown to over 1200 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1985).

The QWL committee was another name for a team of occupational workers who worked with management to solve common problems in the workplace. There were usually 10-15 workers per team who were allowed to meet on company time to discuss and resolve problems in the workplace. The basic guidelines for the teams were that they were joint (both union and management members), they were voluntary, and they would not address issues covered under the collective

bargaining agreements (Heckscher, 1988). Most often, in their initial meetings, the teams dealt with the physical work environment. And unlike the original intent of the QWL movement, the teams exhibited little concern with improving productivity, cost effectiveness or competitive conditions in these early joint efforts (Heckscher, 1988; Martin, 1988).

Assessments of QCs and QWL

QCs and QWL were not, most agree, the long term fix for productivity and quality problems in the workplace (Grenier, 1988; Marks, Mirvis, Hackett & Grady, 1986). The participants' job satisfaction was high, but there was little evidence of improved organizational efficiency (Kochan, Katz & McKersie, 1986). Failure rates for QCs were estimated as high as 60% and often QWL programs were accompanied by deteriorating wages and layoffs, so many employees dropped out (Marks, Mirvis, Hackett & Grady). Both QCs and QWL were parallel structures which supplemented the management of the organization (Ledford, Lawler & Mohrman, 1988). The lack of integration of QWL efforts into the management system of the organization has been often offered as a primary reason for its lack of long lasting impact (Hecksher, 1988; Ledford, Lawler & Mohrman, 1988). Because

QWL was viewed by many as companies and employees alike as just another program, few formal support structures were put in place to sustain its gains.

As discouraging as the results of the QWL movement were, Charles Heckscher (1988) does note an interesting pattern which seems to hold true for most employee involvement programs, including QCs and QWL: "something would be tried, success stories would emerge, productivity would go up, then without a clear failure or dramatic problems, the effort would go away" (p. 87). The most peculiar part of this phenomenon, according to Heckscher, is that "the general enthusiasm for employee involvement never slowed" (p.87), more experimentation always followed.

TEAM BUILDING EMERGES AS A STAND ALONE TRAINING INTERVENTION

The previous chapter established that in the 1960s team building was part of a large scale OD effort, developed for and delivered to management team members. And though some of those team building sessions, in particular the Grid OD model, included problem solving sessions, a great deal of time and energy was also spent in attempts to improve the interpersonal relationships of participants with each other and the total work force.

It was during the 1970s and 1980s when a standard for

team building emerged. Job enrichment, QCs and QWL created teams which, for the first time, included front line workers, and allowed them to have direct involvement in the issues affecting them in the workplace. Team building for these teams of workers became a distinct process; with a definite audience, the intact group; and with a particular content and outcome, the solution to specific work related problems. Before then, training for front line workers consisted mainly of skills and technical training. In the 1970s and 1980s, these same workers needed to learn how to work within a group setting to address and solve common problems. Team building became the vehicle for making this change.

In Quality Circles Master Guide (1982), Ingle addressed the importance of team building for newly formed groups who need to understand the importance of team work and how to work together. Honeycutt (1987) found that in the QC effort at Honeywell in the 1980s, that member training was the best predictor of the QC's effectiveness as perceived by the members themselves.

Team building was also part of the training most QWL participants received. Glenn Watts, the president of CWA in 1982, in his speech to The Association for Workplace

Democracy, recommended that extra training in problem solving skills (or team building) be provided to QWL participants (U.S. Department of Labor, 1985).

Team Building as more than Structured Experiences

Before examining several examples of what team building was during this period, it is important to note what team building was not. There is one significant sub-set of activities included in many team building efforts that is still often confused with team building by the participants, and even by the facilitators. These are what University Associates first termed "'exercises', 'techniques' or games'" (Pheiffer, 1983, p. 1), later referred to as "structured experiences" (p. 1). University Associates, continues today to publish two of the major resources for group facilitators and consultants, the Annual Series: Developing Human Resources, begun in 1972, and A Handbook of Structures Experiences for Human Relations Training, begun in 1969. In both series, structured experiences are considered those activities designed specifically for "experienced based learning" (1983, p1).

These activities may indeed be used as supplemental activities in team building. However, as stand alone events, structured experiences are too narrowly focused on

one specific element of group functioning to achieve the larger and more difficult objective of solving work related problems through group effort (or simply team building).

One example, "Feedback: Increasing Self-Perceptions" included in Volume IX of the Handbook, is fairly typical of a structured experience, and provides a good contrast with the team building efforts described later: The purpose of this activity is threefold: "1) To facilitate the process of giving and receiving feedback in a group. 2) To help the participants to understand the feedback they receive. 3) To promote a process for exploring the participants' 'hidden' characteristics." (1983, p. 107). And although there is great value in developing team members' ability to give and receive relevant feedback to each other, the fact that no tangible, work related outcome results from the process, excludes it as team building. This differentiation is a key one to the story of team building. Structured activities, simulations, games, outdoor adventure laboratories, and other narrowly focused group activities are not team building, though they may be utilized as methods for helping teams learn about group process during team building.

COMMON ELEMENTS IN TEAM BUILDING

In response to the enormous growth in the number and

kinds of teams, many different people and organizations had a hand in what became the standard for team building during the 1970s and 1980s. According to Dyer (1977), the author of Team Building: Issues and Alternatives, "There is no one way to put together a team building program" (p.52); however, the evidence suggests that team building efforts possessed a number of common elements, as seen in the three representative models described below.

Three representative examples of team building during this time frame were selected and examined to determine characteristic elements. The basis for the selection included the expertise of the developers of the models and the perspective each provided.

Team building by Zenger and Miller

A account of the team building in 1974 developed by J. Zenger and D. Miller (1974) follows: The team, generally from 5 to 15 direct reports plus their supervisor met for 2.5 days, away from their offices. The agenda for the meeting was developed around some currently important issue at work. The leader for the session was a person external to the group, with expertise in working with groups. A five phase process was then followed over the next 2.5 days.

Phase 1 was the issue identification phase.

Participants in the session were divided into sub-groups and then asked to draw caricatures of the other groups. Phase 2 brought the sub-groups back together to display and explain their drawings to each other. This was usually a fun activity for the participants. Following the explanations, team members were asked to write down what each team member contributed to the team, what each team member did not contribute, and what each team member should continue or stop doing. These were then circulated to everyone to read. Phase 3 re-focused the group on the current situation by having each member describe their own personal motivation and ambition and if they were fulfilled or not. Phase 4 involved asking the members to identify the long term objectives for their team and define them in clear terms. The objective had to link to the larger organization. Phase 5 was where the solutions to issues around reaching the goals became evident following the discussion, and now needed to be implemented. According to Zenger and Miller this method of team building set a pattern for later work in diagnosis, problem solving and decision making as well.

Dyer's Comprehensive Model of Team Building

The second example of team building is taken from Dyer's (1987) book, Team Building: Issues and Alternatives.

He identified the major tasks of team building as building a relationship among members and creating a climate that facilitates positive change. He also describes team building as "a process, not an event" (p. 7).

Dyer described what he called the ordinary "team building cycle" (p.53) as follows: It began when someone recognized a problem existed. If managers were unfamiliar with the team building process, Dyer suggested the use of a consultant initially. Information was then gathered on the problem, either before the actual team building event or during it. Many times the information was collected through consultant interviews with the key people associated with the team or the problem area.

Before the actual team session began, Dyer recommended some type of social get together, perhaps dinner the night before, to put team members at ease. In the following two to three day meeting, the data were then provided to the team, analyzed, and placed into one of three categories: 1) things the team themselves could address in their meeting, 2) issues which must be addressed by others, 3) things which could not be changed. The first category became the remaining agenda for the meeting. The team then worked on solutions to those problems and planned the actions needed.

The manager, who was also the group leader, ensured that the plans were implemented following the meeting. Together, with the team, the manager evaluated the effectiveness of the actions taken through more data gathering, and revised them if necessary.

NTL Training for Team Builders

The third team building example is taken from an NTL training program for organization development specialists, delivered in Bethel, Maine, in 1976, during the week of June 27-July 2. The purpose of this workshop was to teach people how to be facilitators of team building. The steps outlined for the facilitators of team building included first making the right decision on whether to proceed with team building. The second step involved the facilitator in conducting preparation interviews. The next portion of team building was the actual 2.5 day session, involving data collection, team diagnosis discussions, selection of the issue to work on, discussion of the issues, and creating contracts of agreement on the decisions reached. The first part of the session was generally a warm-up, described a "low threat activities" (NTL, 1976, C98-LC/TB 6/28/76-I). The facilitator then helped the group determine their roles and what they can expect from each other. The diagnosis phase

included using very specific tools to help the participants organize and express their thoughts. The group then negotiated the action steps needed to solve the problem.

The Unique Characteristics of Team Building

The unique properties of team building that emerged during the 1970s and 1980s included: participants who were members of an intact, ongoing work group; a focus on identifying problems and deficits in work performance; a plan to resolve the problems and improve performance; the implementation of the plan; and the evaluation and revision of the plan, if necessary.

The three preceding examples of team building included each of these characteristics and demonstrate the standard problem solving approach of team building during this time. The three examples also included two other common recommendations for team building efforts. First, the size of the teams in team building sessions should be between 5 and 15 participants. Larger teams should be broken into smaller sub-groups. Much of the learning which occurred in team building resulted from the participation of most members (Dyer, 1977). Large groups tended to limit members' participation. Second, if facilitators or consultants were used for team building, their role should be clearly

established in advance as experts on the process of team building, not the content of the meeting. They should stay in that role throughout (Dyer, 1977; NTL, 1974). The ownership of the product of team building belonged to the participants.

The consistent approach to team building which developed during the 1970s and 1980s included five phases, and remains fairly descriptive of team building today (Kinlaw, 1991). The initial social interaction phase, sometimes referred to today as an icebreaker, allows participants to become better acquainted. Even with team members who are well known to each other, some period of non-threatening activity is suggested to reduce any anxiety participants may be experiencing prior to training.

The social interaction phase is followed by the problem solving segment of team building. This segment begins with data collection, usually on work related performance problems, specific to the participants' work. In some instances, the data are collected in advance of the actual team building meeting by the team leader or consultant. Other times the participants themselves collected the data during the actual session. The data are then shared openly with all participants.

Following data collection, the analysis of data begins. The participants review the data and select the issue or problem they want to resolve. In instances where it is warranted, the team leader or facilitator often provides tools to assist the team in data analysis. As a result, participants develop competencies in the logical manipulation, display and interpretation of data. The problem the team chooses to resolve can be based on any number of reasons, from what the team has the ability to change, to what is causing the most dissatisfaction among employees at the time.

Once the problem is selected, the team begins the problem solving and decision making phase of team building. This segment usually involves all participants in the session through discussion and debate. In many instances the facilitator or team leader also will provide ongoing feedback to the participants around group process activities. Participants learn how to make their ideas heard, how to defend their ideas, and how to listen and support each other. In addition, the facilitator may provide the team with decision making models. Participants learn that decisions do not always have to be unanimous, and that support for the team decision is the key to making any

change. The participants then decide on the solution to the problem and plan the steps required to solve the problem. Once the action plan is developed by the participants, responsibilities for implementation are assigned.

The final phase in the team building process, implementation and follow-up of the plan, actually sets up a cycle for continuous problem solving by the team. The action plan is implemented. Participants learn how to delegate responsibilities and document progress. Data are collected on the results of the plan and used to determine if any changes to the plan are needed. If so, the team re-enters the problem solving phase.

At the completion of the team building cycle, not only have participants gained practical knowledge that may be used going forward as they work with each other on the job, but they also have determined and implemented solutions that improved performance.

CONCLUSION

The 1970s and 1980s saw rising interest in the notion of satisfying and motivating employees to perform better. Team based work systems, first, through job enrichment activities, and then through Quality Circles and the Quality

of Worklife movement became extremely popular during these two decades in the U. S., in both manufacturing and service industries. The involvement of the front line worker was seen as the key to winning the war of competition between the U. S. and other countries. In response to this goal, the purpose of team building became directly related to improving productivity and product quality.

Team building developed a consistent form and purpose during these decades. Positive interpersonal relationships were still considered necessary for teamwork, but team building was no longer viewed as simply a tool for creating goodwill among participants. Team building became the major problem solving process used by front line workers to solve the day to day operational problems they encountered in their workplace.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

Work place education in U.S. organizations has a long and rich history. Team building, just one of the educational innovations emerging from the work place during the last thirty years, closely followed the path of management theory and practice over the same time period. As management practices became more inclusive, allowing the participation of workers in daily operational decisions, education and training became important for the front line workers as well.

The problem investigated by this study was: What was the career of team building as a discrete educational intervention and what factors influenced its emergence, evolution and development since 1900? Using the historical method, this study traced the internal and external conditions and the influential people and their ideas which acted upon the content and process of team building.

The principal sources of information for this study were books and journal articles used by managers and OD/HRD practitioners. Case studies and histories of management, HRD and OD, as well as key research on team building were

also included. Additionally, biographies of key influential people were reviewed for relevant information.

Throughout the ninety year period under study, the content and format of training and education in organizations continued to change. Team building, a major educational intervention in organizations today, was created and modified during the last third of this time period as a result of the interaction of a number of influential change agents. The findings of the study are summarized below:

The study identified three distinct periods in the history of team building. In the 1900-1950 period, the origins and antecedents of team building appeared as a result of the changing perception of the behavior and contributions of the group versus the individual worker. The second period, the decades of the 1950s and 1960s, saw the initial version of team building as part of OD efforts, focused on developing managers' interpersonal relationships to improve group functioning. During the third period, 1970 through 1989, team building matured into a stand alone educational intervention for all levels of employees focused on improving specific performance problems in the work place.

Scientific Management was the Catalyst

The 1900 to 1949 period was marked by several significant events that prepared the way for team building to emerge as a significant intervention in organizations in the post World War II period. Changes in the basic way work was done, the education and training of the workers, and the management systems all led to a period of experimentation and learning in the workplace.

Scientific management was the impetus for the discovery of the existence of groups and their impact in the workplace. In the early 1900s, Frederick Taylor began experimentation that resulted in an individualized approach to the performance of work, with each worker having a singular contribution to the total effort. Taylorism created a rigid management system where workers were expected to perform repetitive, simple tasks within the standard time determined by the time and motion studies conducted by managers.

An organized approach to training was another change resulting from scientific management. Before Taylorism, workers were the sole keepers of the knowledge and skills required to do their jobs. They taught each other. When scientific management broke the work into small tasks,

management assumed responsibility for the control of production of the whole product, and likewise, the training of the worker to perform those tasks. Foremen became instructors as well as overseers.

The experimentation in the work place that began with the practice of Taylorism in U.S. industry led to the well known Hawthorne Works studies conducted during the period 1922 to 1932. From these studies, Elton Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger confirmed that work organizations consisted of both formal and informal groups with many interrelationships. Small groups of workers were found to have informal agreements on acceptable behaviors, one of which was restricting the productivity of its members. These discoveries broadened the perspective of work. Rather than a number of individuals working independently of each other on separate tasks, work now included the ways in which workers and managers related to each other to get the job done.

Another key outcome of the Hawthorne studies was that the worker satisfaction was thought to be related to productivity. Mayo believed that eliminating conflict in the work place would free up the workers to be more productive, so much time was spent in determining exactly

what satisfied workers and how managers could respond. Positive relationships among supervisors and workers were identified as key to worker satisfaction. Known as human relations, the focus of management training shifted to incorporate these ideas.

Following the Hawthorne studies, research on group behaviors by Kurt Lewin and his colleagues resulted in the development of group dynamics theory. The discovery that groups modified the behaviors of individual members was exciting knowledge for management. From the findings and interpretations of group dynamics research, the idea arose that management could create conditions to encourage small groups to identify with the goals of management. And management, through the dynamics of the group, could enlist workers to pursue those goals more effectively.

The discovery of the training laboratory was another major outcome of Lewin's work. The training lab or T-group, was one of the most significant educational innovations to originate from the study and experimentation with groups. The predecessor of team building, this experienced based process for group learning had far reaching impact for adult education both inside and outside of the workplace.

The rudiments of a participative management ideology

were evident during this time period as well. The rationale for much of early efforts with participation of the workers stemmed from the question: what better way is there to get workers to embrace the goals of management, than to give them the opportunity to help develop those goals and how they might be accomplished?

Like scientific management, participative management was strongly resisted by organized labor at first. Participative management was viewed with suspicion by unions because it appeared that management was attempting to coerce workers into assuming greater responsibilities with no additional compensation. The fact that participative management also attempted to better satisfy workers also threatened to make the unions unnecessary. If management was able to satisfy workers with pay, benefits and improved working conditions, workers had no need for representation by a third party, the union.

Early Models of Team Building

In the 1950 to 1969 period, team building first appeared as a discrete educational intervention as part of OD efforts. By then, most large organizations were trying to harness the power of groups for improving working relationships and performance. Organization development

emerged as a process for planned organizational change which utilized the knowledge of human relations and group dynamics. OD also created many new and different opportunities for learning in the organization. Many of them, like team building, were experiential in nature instead of formal classroom instruction.

Different models for team building arose during this time period and most were focused on the social interactions of group members. Douglas McGregor's OD work at Union Carbide in 1964 provided one of the earliest examples of team building. The management team, using eight characteristics of an effective team which McGregor identified, rated itself against the ideal. Using their own self-ratings, team members determined what actions needed to be taken to improve their own functioning. The eight characteristics were descriptive of interpersonal behaviors like willingness to listen, free expression and non-dominating leadership. None were clearly related to the output or productivity of the team.

Towards the end of the 1960s, the issue of productivity improvement arose as an important component of the content of team building. The Managerial Grid, created by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton in 1964, was the first major attempt

to link and measure managers' concern for people, or interpersonal concern, with concern for productivity. The optimum interaction of these two dimensions of managerial behavior, according to Blake and Mouton, would yield the ideal climate and productivity for the organization. In the late 1960s the Grid began to be used as the instrument for teams of managers to assess their own individual performance against the ideal manager behaviors.

A New Focus for Team Building

The evolution of team building continued during the 1970s and 1980s. These decades saw team building become a stand alone educational intervention with a consistent purpose, improving performance, a consistent process, problem solving, and a new audience, teams of front line workers.

There was huge growth in the number of teams in the work place and the subsequent demand for team building. Participative management required a forum for workers to be heard, and teams of workers provided that forum. Quality circles and QWL teams became commonplace. And, for the first time, rank and file workers were regularly included in team building sessions, as teams became institutionalized in the organization.

The new format of team building appeared in response to the needs of organizations to train participants in quality circles and QWL. Quality circles and QWL teams differed from earlier teams because of their focus on improving work place quality and productivity. Team building now incorporated processes to build skills used to help team members identify and solve quality and productivity problems. Participants learned how to collect and analyze pertinent data, identify problems, discuss alternatives and make decisions on which solutions to pursue. They also learned to assess the results and make changes to improve the outcome. Not only did participants learn a logical process for problem identification, evaluation and resolution, they also learned to assess through experience and feedback what actually worked. Although interpersonal relationships were not the focus of this later team building, participants also spent time learning about effective ways to work together, through their experience in the group as well as through planned content material.

CONCLUSIONS

This study on the career of team building sought to identify the ways in which this current popular educational intervention in organizations emerged and adapted to the

environment of American business since World War II. Unlike some of the other work place innovations, the growth in teams and team building continued throughout the late 1980s.

There were many changes in the work place during the time of this study which influenced present day team building. Changes in the composition of the work force, as well as the changing expectations of the workers, created a need for new ways for people to work together in organizations. The work, itself, shifted from the closely supervised, mechanistic jobs of the 1900-1950 period to work where, by the early 1970s, the workers actively collaborated in daily operational decisions. These changes created the need for changes in the education of the worker.

By far, the most significant condition for the adaptation and widespread application of team building was the global competition the U.S. found themselves in during the early 1970s. It was only when the U.S. seemed in danger of losing the competitive battle in the automotive and electronics industries to Japan, that U.S. business was willing to more fully engage their work forces in team based systems and team building. The Japanese success with quality circles after World War II, with Deming's assistance, provided the stimulus for the acceptance of the

importance of team work to American industry. The use of QCs in Japan led to higher productivity, lower costs and better product quality. Workers were part of cohesive teams and took sole responsibility for production. Difficulties in the production process were diagnosed and corrected by the workers themselves. American managers observed QCs while visiting Japan and brought the concept back to the U.S. QCs required little modification when brought to the U.S. and early attempts with QCs in the U.S. met with similar success in productivity and product quality. Widespread deployment across most industries QCs occurred in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s.

These factors and others influenced the way in which team building emerged and developed. The conclusions of the research were drawn in response to the research questions and as a result of these influential factors.

Origins and Antecedents of Team Building

Although the impetus came from global competition and the example of Japan, Americans had already had a long history with successful experiments in using groups to promote productivity. Once managers in the U.S. understood the influence groups had on workers' performance, the journey towards better understanding and utilization of work

groups began. Experimentation in the work place taught managers the importance of engaging workers in the pursuit of common goals. This experimentation sought to find ways to manipulate the environment, the work and the worker to improve production and brought with it new educational content and methods in the workplace.

The research began in the early 1900s with scientific management, and was followed by the Hawthorne studies in the 1920s and 1930s, and the group dynamics research of the 1940s. The scientific management experiments were specifically related to finding the one best way to perform the physical tasks of work. The early Hawthorne studies were dedicated to understanding the impact of environmental factors, like illumination and rest pauses, on productivity. The later Hawthorne studies included widespread interviews, which, when interpreted by Mayo, led to findings that workers' attitudes and satisfaction in the work place led to better performance. By the time of the group dynamics research in the 1940s, researchers were interested in how management styles impacted worker attitudes and therefore, performance. As a result of this continuing experimentation, many changes in the way management and workers related in the work place were proposed.

At the core of many of the changes management proposed was some form of education or training. One well known characteristic of scientific management was its organized approach to training. The foreman became the instructor and taught workers, usually through demonstration, how to perform the specific tasks associated with their portion of the work. As a result, foremen had to become better educated and did so through membership in company sponsored clubs. The discussion groups at the Foremen's Clubs emerged as a very early example of some of the methods groups would later use in team building sessions.

The training and education for managers and supervisors that emerged from Elton Mayo's interpretations of the Hawthorne experiments revolved around the elimination of conflict in the work place through better relationships. Called human relations training, it became a major part of the management education curriculum in most organizations. Through a variety of methods, participants learned what was thought to satisfy workers and how to use this knowledge to ensure better supervisory relationships.

Laboratory training was one of the most significant educational interventions in the history of team building. It was the initial laboratory training session in 1947 in

Bethel, Maine, that the first glimpse of an educational event resembling team building was seen. The experiential approach to learning in the laboratories, where the students participated in the ongoing feedback and assessment of the learning process, became part of the early team building process. Unlike team building, however, laboratory training was focused on personal growth for the individual rather than group growth.

These antecedent training interventions were usually focused on improving social interactions among group members. Like human relations training, the earliest team building efforts, including McGregor's at Union Carbide, focused on improving relationships. The belief that productivity was a function of positive interpersonal relationships in the work place stemmed from the experimentation during the first half of the century. The resultant desire of management to eliminate conflict and to satisfy the worker greatly influenced the content of these early team building efforts. Productivity improvement was only introduced as a major objective of team building interventions with the use of the Managerial Grid in the late 1960s.

The Pedagogy of Team Building

Team building during the time period of this study was unlike any other training intervention in organizations. Rather than teaching a specific method or skill for performing work, team building was related to how people were organized and how they interacted with one another to complete tasks. It focused on the relationships of people and improving their abilities to solve problems in the work place. It was experiential in nature and was a short lived educational intervention, or temporary learning system. The content usually involved a real life situation, undertaken in real time. The outcome of the intervention was change in processes or behaviors of the participants, who continued to work together following the session. The learning from team building strengthened group functioning by allowing the team members to jointly identify and solve performance problems.

The pedagogy of team building evolved from a group learning experience focused on improving intragroup functioning to one where participants developed specific competencies in data collection, problem diagnosis and resolution. During the early team building efforts of the 1960s, the participants were provided with information about themselves and how certain behaviors and attitudes might

affect group functioning. Structured experiences, role play and feedback were all important elements of the early team building experience. The team building process that emerged during the 1970s and 1980s to meet the needs of quality circles and QWL teams, still included learning about group functioning, but shifted its focus to add a process where participants worked together to develop competencies in joint problem solving and decision making and to solve existing work place problems.

No one specific technique emerged as distinctive to team building, rather several techniques were incorporated into team building designs to achieve specific purposes. The experiential nature of team building combined with the many different approaches of consultants and facilitators resulted in the use of a wide variety of techniques. In reports of early team building efforts, an instrument was often used to diagnose the participants' performance against some ideal. McGregor used a ideally functioning team as the topic of his instrument. The Managerial Grid used the ideal manager. Following the diagnosis, the facilitator usually delivered a lecture providing the participants with an understanding of the components of the ideal state and what changes in behavior were necessary. For example, in

McGregor's version of team building, willingness to listen was a key element of a high performing management team. Participants would then role play situations where they practiced the new behavior and received feedback from the facilitator and other participants on how well they performed.

Later in the 1970s and 1980s when problem solving became the primary objective of team building, techniques like brainstorming, to generate potential solutions to problems and exercises or structured experiences were used to introduce new topics or to practice new skills. From the proliferation of resources on structured experiences during this time period, one could assume that most team building sessions included this technique as a key ingredient. Data gathering and problem diagnosis were also major components of the later team building efforts.

The Content of Team Building

During the time period this study examined, there was a decided shift in the content for team building. The content of early team building during the 1960s was focused on ways for managers to improve their interpersonal functioning. Participants in team building, usually associated with OD efforts in the 1960s, also learned the latest goals of the

organization in an effort to engage them in the support and achievement of those goals.

A major change in the content of team building occurred in the 1970s and 1980s when the organizational level of the participants and the predominance of participative management systems changed. The success Japan had with high levels of participation of teams of front line workers provided enough evidence for managers in the U.S. to readily create quality circles and QWL teams in search of the solution to global competition. Because the purpose of the new teams was to solve immediate problems associated with productivity and quality, the content of team building became focused on learning and applying techniques for problem resolution. These teams worked on problems related directly to the work process. In order to improve product quality, the team might redesign the flow of the work, change the equipment, or change the supplier.

Through the experience of team building, participants learned how to collect and analyze data to better identify problems, and how to design and implement solutions. Techniques for making decisions were also a part of the content. The problem solving process was the key ingredient of team building, but there was flexibility in what topics

could be introduced, based on the needs of the participants.

Factors Contributing to the Growth of Team Building

The evidence suggests that there were two primary factors, that when combined, contributed to the growth of the application of team building: first, the compatibility of team building with management theory; and second, the competitive environment which created the need for improvements in quality, and the subsequent increase in the number of teams.

Management theory and practice changed significantly during the period of this study, beginning with an autocratic style in the days of scientific management, moving to a more paternalistic style during the human relations movement, and finally emerging as a participative style during the era of total quality management. The shift in management practice allowed for more participation on the part of the worker, and the need for education that differed from traditional skill building.

World War II made the world seem a much smaller place, and learning from other countries became easier. It was the inability of U.S. business to successfully compete in the global marketplace after World War II, that caused U.S. managers to explore what other countries were doing. They

learned that in rebuilding Japan, the knowledge and skills of groups of workers were used to design and implement massive changes in production processes. Already experimenting with more participative management systems in their organizations, U.S. managers quickly began the implementation of team based management systems, first in high tech industries and later in the auto industry. Once these teams were established, members needed to learn how to diagnose problems and prescribe solutions to product quality issues.

The possibility exists that team building was actually a process designed by management to support the latest attempt to manipulate workers in order to achieve organizational goals. When management theory suggested that it was the group who could best influence the pursuit of common goals, management practice began organization change efforts like OD, which involved groups of management workers, from the top down, and team building emerged. When U.S. managers learned from Dr. Deming and the Japanese that workers knew how to solve productivity and quality problems, teams of workers in the U.S. were created who needed training and education in how to solve problems.

This argument is supported by the initial negative

response of organized labor to every major initiative in the history of team building. Scientific management, human relations training, job enrichment and quality circles were all viewed with suspicion by unions as veiled attempts to create conformity, or the absence of conflict, so that workers would have no need for unions. Certainly, one outcome of team building is conformity in approach to work place problems, and therefore agreement, albeit tacit at times, to the pursuit of management's goals. Factions of the major unions, as recently as the late 1980s, were still resisting the team concept as outright exploitation of the worker. However, the decline in union memberships since World War II has dulled the impact of any major opposition.

It is clear that team building was an educational intervention which changed with the changes in the work place. Other interventions such as T-groups and job enrichment no longer exist in the world of corporate training and development. The transfer of training from team building to a clear application in the work place explains much of team building's endurance over time. It was, and still is, useful to organizations.

Implications for Future Research

There are at least three areas for future research

suggested by this study. The first area is directly related to the changes in the nature of teams. Teams, today, are different from what they were as recently as the late 1980s. Many team members work from virtual offices, located around the globe. With technological advances, such as video conferencing and groupware, it is possible for teams of workers to jointly produce output, having never actually been in the same room with each other. Further research might seek to identify how team building must change to continue to meet the needs of these new teams of workers.

The second area of research involves determining the best practices for team building in organizations where most workers have already been involved in widespread team building efforts. As these educated team members move from team to team throughout their careers, does team building need to change to accommodate them? Or does team building become so fully integrated into the way work is done that it is no longer needed, except perhaps for new employees?

The impact of the team concept and team building on the decline of organized labor is suggested as a third possible topic for further study. The steady loss of union membership has occurred concurrently with the rise in participative organization designs and team centered

management systems. Knowing that organizations have intentionally implemented team centered designs to keep unions from organizing particular locations raises the question of how effective these efforts were, and what the overall impact has been on organized labor.

REFERENCES

- American Management Association. (1948). The history of AMA. Anniversary banquet: 25th year of AMA. New York.
- Appley, L. A. (1949). Emergence of a new management era. Personnel, 25(6), 428-437.
- Argyris, C. (1963). A brief description of laboratory training. Training Directors Journal, 17(8).
- Argyris, C. & Taylor, G. (1951). The member centered conference as a research method, II. Human Organization, 10(1), 22-27.
- Bales, F. (1950). Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Baritz, L. (1960). The servants of power: A history of the use of social science in American industry. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Beal, E. F. & Begin, J. P. (1982). The practice of collective bargaining. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Beckhard, R. (1969). Organization Development: Strategies and models. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Beer, M. (1976). The technology of organization development. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 937-993). Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Bell, W. L. (1982). The emergence and early history of organization development: With reference to the influences on an interaction among some of the key actors. Group and Organization Studies, 7(3), 261- 278.
- Benge, E. J. (1920). Grouping workers to get best results. Factory, 24(8).
- Benne, K. D. (1964). History of the T-group in the laboratory setting. In L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb & K. D. Benne (Eds.), T-Group Theory and the Laboratory Method, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bennis, W. G. (1966, July-August). A reply: When democracy works. Trans-action, 35-36.
- Bennis, W. G. (1969). Organization development: Its nature, origins and prospects. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Benson, T. E. (1992, April 6). Quality and teamwork. Industry Week, pp. 66-68.
- Best, F. (1985). The nature of work in a changing society. Personnel, 64(1), 37-42.
- Blake, R. R. (1960). Applied group dynamics training laboratory: Using laboratory methods for developing sensitivity in managers. Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, 14(2), 21-27.
- Blake, R. R. (1995). Memories of HRD. Training and

Development Journal, 49(3), 22-28.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid.
Houston: Gulf.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1965). A 9,9 approach for
increasing organizational productivity. In E. H.
Schein & W. G. Bennis (Eds.), Personal and
organizational change through group methods (pp.
169-183). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1969). Building a dynamic
corporation through grid organization development.
Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Blake, R. R. Mouton, J. S. & Blansfield, M. G. (1962). How
executive team training can help you. Journal of
American Society of Training Directors, 16(2), 3-11.

Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., Barnes, L. B. & Greiner, L.
(1964). Breakthrough in organization development.
Harvard Business Review, 42(6), 133-155.

Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S. & Sloma, R. L. (1965). The union
management intergroup laboratory: Strategy for
resolving intergroup conflict. Journal of Applied
Behavioral Science, 1, 25-57.

Boddewyn, J. (1961, August). Frederick Winslow Taylor
Revisited. Academy of Management Journal, 4(2), 100-

107.

- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.
- Borwick, T. (1969). Team improvement laboratory. Personnel Journal, 48(1), 18-24.
- Bradford, L. (1958). A look at management growth and development. Journal of American Society of Training Directors, 12(7), 3-10.
- Buchanan, P. C. (1969). Laboratory training and organization development. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 14(4), 448-480.
- Burke, W. W. (1987). Organization development: A normative view. Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley.
- Burke, W. W. & Hornstein, H. A. (Eds.). (1972). The social technology of organization development. La Jolla: University Associates.
- Campbell, J. P., Campbell, R. J. & Associates (1988). Productivity in organizations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Capshew, J. H. (1992). Psychologists on site: A reconnaissance of the historiography of the laboratory. American Psychologist, 42(2), 132-142.

- Carnevale, A. P. (1988). Today and tomorrow. Training and Development Journal, 42(12), 19-29.
- Cartwright, D. & Zander, (Eds). (1968). Group dynamics. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co.
- Clark, W. & Tipper, H. (1921). The foreman and his job. (vol.1) Young Men's Christian Association, The standard course of the united YMCA schools. New York.
- Clement, R. W. (1992, May-June). The changing face of organization development: Views of a manager-turned-academic. Business Horizons, pp. 6-12.
- Coch, L. & French, J.R.P. Jr. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. Human Relations, 1, 512-533.
- Cohen, S. G. (1991). Teams and teamwork: Future directions. Los Angeles: CEO Publications.
- Conversation: An Interview with Chris Argyris (1974). Organization Dynamics, 3(1), 45-62.
- Conversation with Warren Bennis (1974). Organization Dynamics, 2(3), 54-62.
- Coopey, R. (1988). Structures of control: The changing role of shop floor supervision in the U.S. automobile industry 1900-1950. Dissertation Abstracts International, 51(3), 833.
- Cothran, T. & Kaeter, M. (1992, April). Pioneering quality

- training. Training (Report Supplement), pp. 13-18.
- Crockett, W. J. (1982). Team building-one approach to organization development. In W. W. Burke & H. A. Hornstein (Eds.), The social technology of organization development (pp. 55-57). La Jolla: University Associates.
- Deming, W. E. (January, 1980). It does work. Quality, pp. 26-31.
- The developing revolution in management practices (1962). Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, 16(7), 29-52.
- Drucker, P. F. (1950). The new society: The anatomy of industrial order. New York: Harper & Row.
- Duncan, D. M. (1974). A systems view of OD. Organization Dynamics, 2(3), 15-29.
- Duncan, W. J. (1990). Great ideas in management: Lessons from the founders and foundations of managerial practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dunnette, M. D. (Ed.). (1976). Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: RandMcNally.
- Dyer, W. G. (1977). Team building: Issues and alternatives (1st ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dyer, W. G. (1987). Team Building: Issues and alternatives

- (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ehrlich, E. (1988, September 10). For American business, a new world of workers. Business Week, pp. 112-120.
- Ends, E. J. & Page, C. W. (1984). Organizational team building. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Faltermayer, E. (1992, June 1). Is this layoff necessary? Fortune, pp. 71-81.
- Ferry, T. H. (1966). Management for teamwork in shift relationships. Personnel Journal, 45(4), 229-231.
- Festinger, L. (1949). The analysis of sociograms using matrix algebra. Human Relations, 2, 153-158.
- Festinger, L. (1957). The theory of cognitive dissonance. New York: Harper & Row.
- Feuer, D. (1985, October). Where the dollars go? Training, pp. 45-53.
- Ford, R. N. (1973). Job enrichment lessons from AT&T. In Burford, V. L. (Ed.), Harvard Business Review Motivation: Part II (pp. 71-81). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- French, W. L. (1982). The emergence and early history of organization development: With references to influences and interactions among some of the key actors. Group and Organization Studies, 7(3), 261-278.

- French, W. & Bell, C. (1972). A brief history of organization development. Journal of Contemporary Business. 1(3), 1-8.
- Friedlander, F. (1972). The impact of organizational laboratories upon the effectiveness and interaction of ongoing work groups. In W. W. Burke & H. A. Hornstein (Eds.), The social technology of organization development. La Jolla: University Associates.
- Froiland, P. (1993). Who's getting trained. Training, 30(10), 53-65.
- Fullerton, H. N. (1987). Projections 2000: Labor force projections: 1986 to 2000. Monthly Labor Review, 110 (9), 19-29.
- Gest, R. (1990). The evolution of the industrial college of the Armed Forces, 1924-1988: A search for rigor (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50.
- Gillespie, R. (1991). Manufacturing knowledge: A history of the Hawthorne experiments. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilley, J. W. & Egglund, S. A. (1989). Principles of human resource development. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Gomberg, W. (1966, July-August). The trouble with democratic management. Trans-action, 30-35.
- Gomberg, W. (1966, September-October). Harwood's "press agency". Trans-action, 35-36.
- Gomberg, W. (1966, December). Democratic management: Gomberg replies. Trans-action, 48.
- Gordon, J. (1988). Who is being trained to do what? Training, 25(10), 51-60.
- Gordon, J. (Ed.). (1994). Who's learning what? Training, 31(10), 45-54.
- Graebner, W. (1987). The engineering of consent: Democracy and authority in twentieth century America. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Grenier, G. J. (1988). Inhuman relations: Quality circles and anti-unionism in American industry. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Guyon, R. (1950). Survey of the training director. The Journal of Industrial Training, 4(2), 8-15.
- Hackman, J. R. (1973). Is job enrichment just a fad? In Burford, V. L. (Ed.), Harvard Business Review Motivation: Part II (p. 20-29). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work Redesign.

- Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Haire, M. (1948). Some problems of industrial training. Journal of Social Issues, 4(3), 41-46.
- Harder, K. C. & Harms, J. (1950). Research in human relations and training. The Journal of Industrial Training, 4(4), 11-18.
- Harvard Business Review Index, 1966-1975, Ten Year Index.
(1975). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heckscher, C. C. (1988). The new unionism. New York: Basic Books.
- Hersey, R. E. & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources
Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Herzberg, F. L. (1966). Work and the nature of man.
Cleveland: World Publishing.
- Herzberg, F. L. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees. Harvard Business Review, 46(1), 54-63.
- Herzberg, F. L. (1974). The wise old Turk. In Burford, V. L. (Ed.), Harvard Business Review Motivation: Part II (97-107). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Herzberg, F. L., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: Wiley.
- Hicks, I. L. N. (1991). Forgotten voices: Women in

organizational development and human resource development. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 04A.

Hoerr, J. (1989, July 10). The payoff from teamwork: The gains in quality are substantial-So why isn't it spreading faster? Business Week, pp. 56-62.

Homans, G. C. (1941). The Western Electric researches. In The fatigue of workers. New York: Reinhold.

Homans, G. C. (1950). The human group. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Honeycutt, A. (1987). Quality circle participants' perception of three elements predicting perceived quality circle effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47.

Hoslett, S. D. (1946). Training in human relations. Personnel, 23(2), 85-97.

Huszczko, G. E. (1990). Training for teambuilding. Training and Development Journal, 44(2), 37-43.

Ingle, S. (1982). Quality Circles Master Guide. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:, Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, R. W. (1950). Human relations in modern business. In E. C. Rusk (Ed.), Human Relations for Management: The Newer Perspective (pp. 1-29). New York: Harper &

Brothers.

- Kast, F. E. & Rosenzweig, J. E. (1974). Organization and management: A systems approach. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Katz, D. (1949). Employee groups: What motivates them and how they perform. Advanced Management, 14(3), 119-124.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kinlaw, D. C. (1991). Developing superior work teams: Building quality on the competitive edge. San Diego: University Associates.
- Kleinschrod, W. A. (1970). Management and the new humanism. Administrative Management, 31(1), 24-25.
- Kochan, T. A., Katz, H. C. & McKersie, R. B. (1986). The transformation of American industrial relations. New York: Basic Books.
- Knowles, M. (1979). How I coped with fads in training. Training and Development Journal, 33(9), 36-38.
- Knowles, M. (1986). The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy. Revised and updated. New York: Cambridge.
- Landsberger, H. (1958). Hawthorne revisited. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Lawler, E. E., III, (1987). High-involvement management.
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E., III & Mohrman, S. A. (1985). Quality circles
after the fad. Harvard Business Review, 62(1), 64-71.
- Ledford, G. E., Jr., Lawler, E. E., III & Mohrman, S. A.
(1988). The quality circle and its variations. In
Campbell, J.P., Campbell, R. J. & Associates,
Productivity in Organizations (pp. 255-294). San
Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, C. (1991, October). Who gets trained in what? Training,
pp. 47-59.
- Lee, C. (1992, July). After the cuts. Training, pp. 17-23.
- Lerda, L. (1948). The new Esso training center. Journal of
Industrial Training, 2(1), 10-14.
- Levinson, H. (1973). Asinine attitudes towards motivation.
In Burford, V. L. (Ed.), Harvard Business Review
Motivation, Part II (pp. 30-36), Cambridge, MA: Harvard
University Press.
- Lewin, K. (1939). Experiments in social space. Harvard
Educational Review, 9, 21-32.
- Lewin, K. (1945). The research center for group dynamics.
Sociometry, 8, 126-136.
- Lewis, P. B. (1947). Supervisory training methods. Personnel

Journal, 25(9), 316-322.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lippitt, R. (1949). Training in community relations. New York: Harper's.

Lippitt, R. & White, R. K. (1947). An experimental study of leadership and group life. In Readings in social psychology (pp. 315-330). New York: Holt and Company.

Long, T. J., Convey, J. J. & Chwalek, A. R. (1986). Completing dissertations in the behavioral sciences and education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Luft, J. (1984). Group processes: An introduction to group dynamics (3rd ed.) Palo Alto: Mayfield.

Maier, N. R. F. (1949). Psychology of labor-management relations. In Readings in industrial and business psychology. McGraw-Hill, New York, 51-64.

Mann, R. W. & Staudenmier, J. M. (1991). Strategic shifts in executive development. Training and Development Journal 45(7), 31-40.

Margulies, N. & Wallace, J. (1973). Organizational change: Techniques and applications. Glenview, IL: Scott, Glenview IL. Scott Foresman & Co.

Marks, M., Mirvis, P., Hackett, E. & Grady, J., Jr. (1986).

- Employee participation in a quality circle program: Impact on quality of work life, productivity and absenteeism. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 61-69.
- Marrow, A. J. (1966, October). Gomberg's "fantasy". Transaction. pp.36-37, 57.
- Marrow, A. J. (1969). The practical theorist: The life and work of Kurt Lewin. New York: Basic Books.
- Marschak, J. (1955). Elements of a theory of teams. Management Science, 1(2), 127-137.
- Martin, A. (1988). Work restructuring in the 1980s: The view from PEWS. In ILR Report, Special Report Work Restructuring, (26(1), pp. 6-11), Ithaca, NY: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.
- Maugham, I. (1971). Building an effective team. Training and Development Journal, 25(1), 20-29.
- Mayer, J. (1957). Group coaching as an adjunct to role playing in human relations training. Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, 11(5), 44.
- Mayo, E. (1933). The human problems of an industrial civilization. Cambridge: The McMillan Co.
- Mayo, E. (1947). The social problems of an industrial

- civilization. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McGregor, D. (1967). The professional manager. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McNair, M. P. (1957). What price human relations? Harvard Business Review, 35(2), 15-22.
- Mech, V. A. (1984). Human resource development in the United States from 1630-1980. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 09A.
- Merriam, S. & Simpson, E. L. (1984). A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.
- Mills, T. (1975). Human resources-Why the new concern? In Burford, V. L. (Ed.), Harvard Business Review Motivation: Part II (pp. 82-96), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mohrman, S. & Cummings, T. (1982). Implementing quality of work life programs. University of Southern California, Graduate School of Business, Center for Effective organizations.
- Montgomery, O. D. (1947). Training defined. The Journal of Industrial Training, 1, 10-13.

- Morse, J. J. & Lorsch, J. W. (1970). Beyond theory Y. Harvard Business Review, 48(3), 95-102.
- Myers, M. S. (1970). Every employee a manager: More meaningful work through job enrichment (1st ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Myers, M. S. (1991). Every employee a manager (3rd ed.). San Diego: University Associates.
- Nadler, L. (Ed.). (1984). The handbook of human resource development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nadler, L. & Nadler, Z. (1989). Developing human resources (3rd ed.) San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- National Training Laboratories. (1966). What is OD? NTL Institute News and Reports, pp. 1-3.
- National Training Laboratories. (1976). NTL Institute learning community session one. June 13-July 16, 1976, Training program in laboratory education, Program for for specialists in organization development. Unpublished manuscript.
- Nelson, D. (1980). Frederick W. Taylor and the rise of scientific management. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Northrup, H. R. (1945) The foreman's association of America. Harvard Business Review, 23(2), 187-202.

- Ohmann, O. A. (1955), "Skyhooks" (With special implications for Monday through Friday), Harvard Business Review, 33(3), 33-41.
- Parker, M. & Slaughter, J. (Eds.). (1988). Choosing sides: unionism and the team concept. Boston: South End Press.
- Patten, T. H. (1981). Organization development through teambuilding. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Perrow, C. (1973). The short glorious history of organizational theory. Organizational Dynamics, 2(1).
- Perrow, C. (1979). Complex organizations: A critical essay (2nd ed.) New York: Newberry Award Records.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. (Ed.). (1983). A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training Volume IX. San Diego: University Associates.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. & Goodstein, L. D. (Eds.). (1984). The 1984 Annual: Developing human resources (The Thirteenth Annual). San Diego: University Associates.
- Pfiffner, J. M. (1949). Developing executives for business leadership. Personnel, 25(4), 250-260.
- Planty, E. G., McCord, W. S. & Emerson, C. A. (1948). Training employees and managers in production and teamwork. New York: Ronald Press.

- Radke, M. & Klisurich, D. (1947). Experiments in changing food habits. Journal of the American Dietetics Association, 23, 403-409.
- Roche, W. J. & MacKinnon, N. L. (1970). Motivating people with meaningful work. In Harvard Business Review Motivation: Part I, (pp. 79-92), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. (1951). Human relations training. Journal of Industrial Training, 5(2), 10-12, 21-24.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. (1977). The elusive phenomena: An autobiographical account of my work in the files of organizational behavior at Harvard Business School. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Roethlisberger, F. W. & Dickson, W. (1939). Management and the worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sashkin, M. (1981). An overview of ten management and organizational theorists. In J. E. Jones & J. W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), The 1981 handbook for group facilitators (pp. 206-221). San Diego: University Associates.
- Schachter, H. L. (1989). Frederick Winslow Taylor and the idea of worker participation: A brief against easy administrative dichotomies. Administration and Society. 21(1), 20-30.

- Schein, E. H. (1961). Management development as a process of influence. Industrial Management Review, 2(2), 59-77.
- Schein, E. H. (1981). Does Japanese management style have a message for American managers? Sloan Management Review, 23(1), 55-68.
- Schein, E. H. & Bennis, W. G. (Eds.). (1965). Personal and organizational change through group methods: The laboratory approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schmidt, W. H. & Posner, B. Z. (1991, February). The values of American managers, then and now. California Management Review, pp. 37-40.
- Schuster, L. J. (1969). Needed: More sensitivity, less training. Personnel Journal, 48(8), 62-65.
- Schutz, W. C. (1958). Firo: A three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Rinehart.
- Schutz, W. C. & Allen, V. (1966). The effects of T-group laboratory on interpersonal behavior. Journal of Applied Science, 2, 265-286.
- Selfe, E. M. (1948). What supervisors want. Personnel Journal, 26(8), 281-283.
- Serbein, O. N. (1961). The educational activities of business. Washington, D. C. : The American Council on Education.

- Shaffer, J. B. C. & Galinsky, M. D. (1974). Models of group therapy and sensitivity training. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sirianni, C. (Ed.). (1987). Worker participation and the politics of reform. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Smith, R. F. (1955). Management-Training-Society: Their relationships. Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, 9(3), 29-33.
- Sopp, T. J. (1982). A new model of team building that accounts for the power and politics operating in organizational settings. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 12A.
- Srivastva, S., Salipante, P. F., Cummings, T. G., Notz, W. W., Bigelow, J. D. & Waters, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction and productivity. Kent State University, Comparative Administration Research Institute.
- Strauss, G. (1968). Human relations-1968 style. Industrial Relations, 7(3), 262-276.
- Stubblefield, H. W. (1988). Towards a history of adult education in America: The search for a unifying principle. New York: Croom Helm.
- Tannenbaum, R. Weschler, I. R. & Massarik, F. (Eds). (1961).

- Leadership and organization. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Tausky, C. & Chelte, A. F. (1991). Employee involvement. A comment on Grenier and Hogler. Work and Occupations, 18(3), 334-342.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911, January). The conservation of human effort. Paper presented at the meeting of the City Club of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA.
- Taylor, F. W. (1947). The principles of scientific management (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Trends in training. (1947). Journal of Industrial Training, 1(1), 3.
- Tschirgi, H. D. (1960). The trainer's role in sensitivity training. Journal of American Society of Training Directors, 14(5), 22-29.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 384-399.
- Tuckman, B. W. & Jensen, M. A. C. (1977). Stages in small group development, revisited. Group and Organization Studies, 2, 419-427.
- Underwood, L. P. (1991). On the shoulders of giants: The evolution of management training. Dissertations Abstracts International, 51.
- U. S. Department Of Labor. (1985). Quality of work life:

AT&T and CWA examine process after three years.

Washington, D. C: U. S. Department of Labor.

Utgaard, S. B. (1970). The most frequently used training techniques. Training and Development Journal, 24(2), 40-43.

Walton, M. (1991). Deming management at work. New York: Putnam.

Walton, R. E. (1972). How to counter alienation in the plant. Harvard Business Review, 50(6), 70-81.

Walton, R. E. (1974). Ideas for action. In Burford, V. L. (Ed.), Harvard Business Review Motivation: Part II, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walton, R. E. (1975). The diffusion of new work structures: Explaining why success doesn't take. Organization Dynamics, 3(3), 2-22.

Walton, R. E. (1982). The Topeka work system: Optimistic hypothesis and reality. In Zager, R. & Rosow, M. (Eds.), The Innovative Organization, (pp. 260-287), New York: Pergamon Press.

Weisbord, M. R. (1987). Productive workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whyte, W. F. (1961). Men at work. Homewood, Il: Dorsey

Press.

- Yankelovich, D. (1981). New rules: Searching for self-fulfillment in a world turned upside down. Toronto: Bantam Books.
- Yankelovich, D. & Immerwahr, J. (1983). Putting the work ethic to work: A public agenda report on restoring America's competitive vitality. New York: The Public Agenda Foundation.
- Yin, R. K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Young, R. M. (1990). Scientism in the history of management theory. Science as Culture, 8: 118-143.
- Zenger, J. H. & Miller, D. E. (1974). Building effective teams. Personnel, 51(2), 20-29.
- Zennie, Z. A. (1991). Team building in a corporate setting. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 07A.

VITA

MARILYN SAWYER WESNER

DATE OF BIRTH: April 12, 1951

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1995-Present AT&T CONSUMER COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES
District Manager-Planning

1993-1995 AT&T CORPORATE HUMAN RESOURCES
District Manager-Workforce Development

1990-1993 AT&T ACCESSIBLE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES
Manager-Training and Development

1988-1990 AT&T OPERATOR SERVICES
Center Manager


OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

1991-1992 MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY, ARLINGTON, VA
Adjunct Faculty, Department of Psychology

EDUCATION:

1995 DOCTOR OF EDUCATION: ADULT AND CONTINUING
EDUCATION
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University, Blacksburg, VA

- 1982 MASTERS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
The George Washington University, Washington,
D.C.
- 1974 BACHELOR OF SCIENCE: PSYCHOLOGY
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA



Marilyn Sawyer Wesner