THE MILITARY, WAR, AND ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT: THE EVOLUTION OF ORGANIZATION DESIGN IN THE MILITARY

Robert REINHARD
Benedictine University
(United States of America)

Peter F. SORENSEN Jr.
Benedictine University
(United States of America)

Therese YAEGER
Benedictine University
(United States of America)

ABSTRACT

This paper presents and discusses the transition in design of one of the largest and most complex organizations in the world, the U.S. military. Extending the work of Umstot, accomplished four decades earlier, this paper traces the U.S. Military's transition from a classic mechanistic structure that embraces a command and control culture to the application of Organization Development that eventually consents to the precepts of an organic structure. The paper also describes the use of Large Group Interventions through the application of Appreciative Inquiry in the U.S. Navy and posits that the U.S. Military, through the use of OD, is moving toward Agility in the organization.

Keywords: Military - Organization Development - Organization Design Appreciative Inquiry - Agility

INTRODUCTION

United States General Stanley McChrystal stated, "there's likely a place in paradise for people who tried hard, but what really matters is succeeding. If that requires you to change, that's your mission." This sentiment is never so relevant as when it is applied to the U.S. military's response to the need for change and the application of Organization Development (OD). This paper presents and discusses the transition in design of one of the largest and most complex organizations in the world, the U.S. military. It traces the transition from a classic mechanistic/bureaucratic structure that embraces a command and control culture to the application of OD that eventually consents to precepts of organic structure (flexible, mission driven). The paper draws on the early period of OD and its influence on the U.S. military as well as traditional organization theory demonstrated through the early work of Burns and Stalker, Joanne Woodward and the classic change literature of Lewin, Likert, and McGregor. A discussion is provided that demonstrates the U.S. military's incorporation of progressive trends in organization design including the work of Cooperrider (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) and his approach to large group interventions

through its application of Appreciative Inquiry in the U.S. Navy. Additionally, the social constructionist paradigm that underpins Appreciative Inquiry (AI) depicts a buttress for the notions of Agility as conceptualized by Worley and his colleagues (Worley, Williams, & Lawler, 2014; Worley, Zardet, Bonnet, & Savall, 2015). As a point of emphasis, OD is demonstrated as being a vehicle that moves the U.S. military toward Agility in the organization as necessitated by the context of its environment.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

In general, the field of Organization Development can be summarized in the following periods (Anderson, 2019). As Table 1 indicates, the 1940s to 1960s included laboratory training and T-groups, action research, survey feedback and sociotechnical systems and participative management; the 1970s and 1980s included total quality, self-directed team and organization culture; the 1990s to 2000 involved large-scale organization change; in the 1990s it included positive organization change, Appreciative Inquiry and more recently the concept of organizational agility.

Classical organization theory frequently used the church and the military as examples of bureaucratic organizations with the characteristics of hierarchical structure, authoritarian leadership, and formal structure. The literature of organization design began to transition with the emergence of the field of OD. For clarity, the term organization design denotes consistency between the organization's strategy, goals, and structure (Galbraith, 1977). Although there is not an agreed upon formal definition of OD, we simply choose to define it as "the process of increasing organizational effectiveness and facilitating personal and organizational change through the use of interventions driven by social and behavioral science knowledge" (Anderson, 2019, p. 2) The advent of what would later be named Organization Development emerged in the 1940s along with the National Training Laboratories (NTL) at Bethel, Maine in1946. These programs evolved out of the work of Kurt Lewin who is also responsible for one of the classic leadership studies, the Boy's Club experiment (Marrow, 1969), which demonstrated the effect of leader behavior on group behavior and performance. These studies introduced concepts (autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic) underpinning the terms mechanistic and organic (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Woodward, 1965).

	1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s
U.S. Military Environmental Context	World War II (1939-1945), U.S. involvement (1941-1945) Cold War Begins (1947), Women's Armed Services Integration Act (1948)	Korean War (1950-1953), Desegregation in Military (1948-1953)	Vietnam (1955-1975) Cuban Missile Crisis (1961)	U.S. Involvement in Vietnam Ends (1973), Conscription Ends - All Volunteer Force (1973), Women Admitted to Service Academies (1976)	First Women Graduate West Point (1980), Grenada (1983)	Gulf War (1990-1991) Cold War Ends (1991) Kosovo (1998-1999)	9/11 Terrorist Attacks (2001), War on Terrorism, Afghanistan (2001-present) Iraq (2003-2011)	War on Terrorism Continues Osama bin Laden Dead (2011), Women in Combat Roles (2013), Syria Bombing (2016)
U.S. Environmental Context	Globalization Declines during WWII, Technology Surges Due to War (Jet Engine, Transistor, Radar, Nuclear Fission), Human Relations Movement	Globalization Increases, Post-War Booming Economy, Corporate Hegemony, Racial Segregation Unconstitutional, Rise of Television, Highway Act (1956)	Civil Rights (1960), Man on the Moon (1969), 3rd Industrial Revolution (1969), Rise of Conglomerates, IBM 360	Women's Movement, Programmable Microprocessor, Pocket Calculator, Jumbo Jets (Boeing 747), Microsoft & Apple Founded	Fist PC (1981), Mobile Phones, Bell Telephone Broken Up, Stock Market Crash (1987)	Information Revolution (1999) Internet, Rise of Technology, e-commerce, email, Text Messages, Social Media	Globalization Soars, Corporate Fraud (Enron-2001), Stock Market Crash (2002), iPhone Released (2007) Housing Bubble Burst (2008), Stock Market Crash (2008) Over a Billion PC Sales (2002)	Big Data/Big Tech, Age of Smartphones Virtual Assistants Drones Self Driving Cars Airbnb and Uber (2013) Retail Apocalypse
Organization Development Epochs	Laboratory Training, T-Groups (Human Process, Small group, Leadership Styles, Team Building)	Action Research, Survey feedback, Sociotechnical Systems (Employee Surveys, Sociotechnical Systems Theory and Design)	Management Practices (Participative Management, Leadership Training, Mackegor's Theory X and Theory Y, Likert's Four systems, Blake and Mouton's managerial grid, Herzberg's worker motivation)	Quality, Employee Involvement, Process Consulting (Technostructural and Quality Programs, TQM, QWL, Self Managed and Employeee Directed Teams)	Organizational Culture, Change Management, Strategic Change, and Reengineering (Culture work, Systems Theory, large scale / whole-organization interventions)	Self-Managed Teams, Large Group Interventions, Organizational Learning (Appreciative Inquiry)	Organizational Effectiveness, Employee Engagement	Agility and Collaboration (Dialogic OD)
U.S. Army	Scientific Management (Leadership Training)	Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Management Practices, Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Action Research, Survey feedback, and Sociotechnical Systems, Consulting (Human Process Interventions) Organizational Effectiveness Program	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)	Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)
U.S. Navy	Scientific Management (Leadership Training)	Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Management Practices, Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Action Research, Survey feedback, and Sociotechnical Systems, Consulting (Human Process Interventions) Human Resource Management Program	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)	Dialogic, Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Appreciative Inquiry, Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)
U.S. Air Force	Scientific Management (Leadership Training)	Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Management Practices, Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Action Research, Survey feedback, and Sociotechnical Systems, Consulting (Technostructural and Human Process Interventions) Leadership & Management Development Program	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)	Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)
U.S. Marines	Scientific Management (Leadership Training)	Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Management Practices, Survey Feedback (Employee Surveys, Leadership Training)	Action Research, Survey feedback, and Sociotechnical Systems, Consulting (Human Process Interventions) Leadership & Evaluation Analysis Program	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality Programs, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, TQM, Employee Surveys)	Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)	Quality and Employee Involvement, Survey Feedback (Technostructural, lean, Six Sigma)

Table 1. Organization Development Epochs and the U.S. Military

Mechanistic organizations are a management system appropriate to stable environments. It is characterized by specialized differentiation of functional tasks governed by instructions and decisions issued by superiors and a vertical hierarchical structure of control, authority, and communication (Burns & Stalker, 1961). Similarly, *bureaucratic* organizations, a term often used interchangeably with mechanistic organizations, are a management system appropriate for stable conditions. Bureaucracies are characterized as having formal hierarchical structure, management by clear rules and regulations, specialization and division of labor, achievement-focused advancement, efficient organization, and rational impersonality (Weber, 1947). The term *Command and Control* refers to a traditional leadership/management style typically associated with a decidedly hierarchical organizational structure where the ones on the top of the hierarchy hold the highest positions and have the most legitimate power and the ones on the bottom have the lowest positions and hold very little legitimate power (French & Raven, 1959). In the same vein as mechanistic and bureaucratic systems, command and control focuses on stability with a top-down strategy, standardization, and efficiency, obtaining results according to plan and keeping programs and systems on track (Simmons, 1994). Many management theorists and researchers contend that management styles are culturally determined and therefore vary significantly from culture to culture (Aram & Piriano,1978; Burger & Bass, 1979; Kras, 1989; Wright, 1981). To expand on the definition of culture, we turn to Schein's (2004) definition recognized as

> a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valued and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 17)

Through this definition, one can recognize the impact of culture on management styles and correlate the manner in which command and control is also represented as a cultural approach to the organization that is commonly found in mechanistic and bureaucratic organizations—such as the U.S. military.

Conversely, *organic organizations* are a management system most appropriate to changing conditions. It is characterized by a contributive nature of special knowledge and experience with adjustments and continual re-definition of individual tasks through interaction with others (Burns & Stalker 1961). This system uses a lateral rather than a vertical direction of communication through the organization. Organic organizations have a network structure of control, authority, and communication and resemble consultation rather than command. Thus, it emphasizes loose coupling of groups with a flattened hierarchy in their structure which contributes to innovation (Burns & Stalker 1961; Kohli & Jaworski 1990; McGinnis & Ackelsberg 1983). Flexibility complements the organic organization management system. It is best explained by Evans (1991) when he describes it as "the contemporary term for a classical principle of strategy [as] it enables a course of action to be modified in accordance with an encountered situation which may capriciously deviate from prior anticipations." (Hart, 1937, p. 69) The capability and capacity of flexibility in the organization allows it to continuously adapt to variation in the environment. Thus, the

concepts of organic and flexible organizations were the model for contemporary Agile organizations which also integrate the characteristic of speed.

The implementation of OD began with a period which saw a replication of Lewin's study of children at an organizational level at Harvard (Litwin & Stringer, 1968), a study which clearly demonstrated the advantages of organic organizations over mechanistic (bureaucratic) organizations. This was an epoch of survey feedback and Likert's (1967) four systems of management (System 1: Exploitative Authoritative; System 2: Benevolent Authoritative, System 3: Consultative; System 4: Participative) followed with the work of McGregor (1960) and the concept of Theory X (authoritarian) and Theory Y (participative), along with the work at Tavistock on sociotechnical systems (Trist & Bamforth, 1951), which acknowledges the interaction between people and technology in workplaces (see Table 1).

This early period was then followed by organization change theory including total quality management and large systems interventions, such as the work of Marvin Weisbord (1987). More recently the field of OD has been characterized by positive organization change; for example, Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) and the concept of Organization Agility, including the work of Worley et al. (2014) at the University of Southern California, and the SEAM work again with Worley et al. (2015) at the Institute of Business Administration (IAE) Lyon and Institute of Socio-Economics of Enterprises and Organizations (ISEOR).

Each of these epochs had a major influence on organization design and on organization transition in the military. Each, in a way, served to create the foundation for both corporate and military organization design. For example, the early Lewin study demonstrated the advantages of collaborative leadership over authoritarian leadership, which the extended work of McGregor proposed that organizations based on delegation and decentralization as well as job enlargement tended to be more democratic. Probably one of the earliest major roles in the evolution of design was the work of Likert and his studies, supported by the Office of Naval Research, which evolved into Likert's Four Systems (1967) and proposed a management system range from authoritative to participative.

ORGANIZATION DESIGN IN THE MILITARY–THE EARLY PERIOD

Research concerning the U.S. military's choice to use formal OD interventions within its organizations overwhelming points to a few distinct contributors that elicited the use of the behavioral sciences to affect change in the programs, processes, strategies and training utilized in the Department of Defense (DoD). The late 1960s and early 1970s in the U.S. military was a time of recognized racial discrimination, the widespread use of drugs, and the transition to an all-volunteer force (West, 1990; Umstot, 1980; Getty & Maxwell, 1981; Barrett, 1986; Young, 2014). All of these contextual factors contributed to a new focus—one that could elicit change of behavior while improving impartiality and facilitate accord in the service branches. One of the most related environmental contributors to the contextual factors of concern for the DoD was the Vietnam War (see Table 1). The U.S. military was in the midst of much needed change in order to resolve these concerns and others like them

as they were detracting from the effective execution of the U.S. military's mission.

Probably the best-known influence of the early period in OD and its implications for Organization Design consisted of applications in each of the major military branches of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. Central to the application of OD in the Army was the Organizational Effectiveness (OE) program in 1973 (Adams & Sherwood, 1979). The Army's OE program used a voluntary and decentralized approach and benefited from strong top leadership support, participation, and understanding (Umstot, 1980). The OE consultants were permanently assigned to units or installations throughout the world and typically served on the staff of the highest-level commander at the installation. Consultants had a wide variety of interventions at their disposal and they were encouraged to fit the intervention to the situation and the client. (Jones, 1979). In addition to the Organizational Effectiveness program was the Parish Development program (Lewis, 1981). On a separate, but parallel track with the OE program, the use of behavior sciences in the form of OD evolved out of discussions with the NTL and senior Army chaplains representing the Office of the Chief of Chaplains. In the early 1970s, civilian NTL consultants trained Army chaplains in the discipline of OD specifically to address the issues of improving communications between the races, drugs, and dealing with the young 'protest' generation. Over time, "an increasing number of chaplains questioned the relationship between OD and the chaplain's ministry." (Lewis, 1981, p. 12) Thus, OD was combined with an application of theologically and in 1976, the final design for the Parish Development program was finalized within the Army Chaplaincy.

The application of OD in the Navy was particularly interesting. In 1971, a pilot group presented a series of options for the implementation of OD programs. These options included Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid, the use of surveys and survey feedback based on the work at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan and the work of Rensis Likert. In 1973, the Navy formally established a dedicated OD program which they entitled Human Resource Management (HRM) (Umstot, 1980). The HRM program in the Navy was mandatory. They chose to use a centralized consultant approach and established five centers with detachments throughout the world. Beside surveys, other data gathering techniques included interviewing, observation, and questionnaires (Ferrier, 1981a).

The U.S. Air Force also initiated a number of classic OD intervention during this early period (1971 to 1975). One of the true giants in the field, Herb Shepard, played a key role in the implementation of human process interventions. Other major interventions included technostructural intervention and job redesign. Job redesign employed one of the most influential approaches to motivation, job enrichment based on the work of Richard Hackman. Some of the most successful OD applications were with job enrichment and the use of the Job Diagnostic Survey. The Air Force also employed survey feedback and extensive socio-technical interventions. In 1975, the Air Force formally established its own OD management consulting program as a subdivision under the Leadership and Management Development Center (LMDC) (Mahon, 1977; Kapinos, 1983: Aitken, 1986). The program in the Air Force, like the Army was voluntary. However, similar to the Navy, they chose to use a centralized

consultant approach and utilized one central location as a repository for consultants at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama (Huse, 1980; Ferrier, 1981b; Zadalis & Shrader, 2003). In the beginning, consultants assigned to the LMDC utilized surveys and specialized in certain types of interventions such as job enrichment or team building. However, the Air Force eventually moved toward using more generalized consultants capable of delivering a full range of OD technologies (Ferrier, 1981b).

The Marine Corps also employed Organization Development, but OD for the Marines tended to be more limited in scope with the major emphasis on leadership. In 1975, the Marine Corps chose to use a voluntary, decentralized, self-applied survey diagnosis tool (Jones, 1979). The Marines "contracted with a private research institute to study their human relations training program (primarily a race-relations program)." (Jones, 1979, p. 139) The outgrowth of that research was an instrument that measured the attitudes of the Marine Corps members on such items as communications, morale, efficiency, leadership, cohesion, equality, justice, and discrimination (Affourtit, 1977). They named this instrument the Leadership and Evaluation Analysis Program (LEAP). The LEAP was conducted by the company, battery, and squadron commander. It was designed to provide commanders with the techniques, and procedure by which they can assess leadership concerns, determine the level of unit combat readiness, and evaluate the effectiveness of the decision-making process (Affourtit, 1979).

The formal OD programs established by the Army, Navy, Air Force and Maine Corps were considered priorities due to the humanistic issues facing the DoD in the early 1970s. Dissimilar emphasis was placed on the level of resources and methodologies. Nonetheless, within a decade the U.S. military had resolved most of its "people problems" and established a functioning all-volunteer force. The calls for reform were considered to have been addressed and although the military was by no means the exemplar for an idealistic organic organization, many of the looming concerns with racial discrimination and widespread use of drugs were considered to be remedied to an acceptable level. As this collective perception became a consensus within the military departments, the decision to reallocate spending to other emerging priorities seemed rational.

Nonetheless, this early application of OD in the U.S. military was eventually extended to accommodate the perceived mechanistic and command and control culture characterized by the organization design of the DoD. The human process interventions of the 1970's and early 1980's was followed in the late 1980s with technostructural interventions that came in the form of Total Quality Management (TQM) (McDaniel & Doherty, 1990). The precepts of W. Edwards Deming were initially tested by the U.S. Navy in 1984 and officially adopted by the service in 1985 (Houston & Dockstader, 1997). From the Navy's efforts, TQM spread throughout the U.S. Federal Government. Thus, the bureaucratic public sector began to place a greater focus on technostructural interventions in organization design. In March 1988, the Secretary of Defense mandated its use by all services branches (Blackburn, 1992). The institutionalization of quality ensured prevalent use until the late 1990s when it was replaced by more vogue approaches such as ISO 9000, Lean, and Six Sigma which the latter two remain in wide use throughout the military departments

today. However, at the beginning of the new millennium, the application of OD in the form of Appreciative Inquiry and large group interventions was accomplished in the U.S. Navy.

APPLICATIONS OF AI AND ORGANIZATION DESIGN—AI SUMMITS

From an OD perspective, attempts to become more agile were attempted by the U.S. Navy. The dynamic operating environment of the modern Navy necessitated a need to employ a change-intervention technique that would achieve rapid change while engaging multiple stakeholders at once. Traditional approaches of change intervention focused on top-down methods and generally were limited to small groups at a time (Bunker & Alban, 1997). Given the fast pace of environmental change, traditional and technostructural methods were perceived as inadequate to generate change fast enough to keep up; nor could they engage the multiple interests of many stakeholders (Nystrom, 2001). Naval organizations could not afford to wait patiently for traditional interventions to work. Thus, the implemented interventions had to be designed to change whole systems, as rapidly as possible.

Therefore, the Navy chose to utilize a more contemporary approach identified as Large Group Interventions (LGI). Fundamentally, the purpose behind introducing large-scale change to an organization is to help it adapt to its changing environment (Senge, 1990). Considering the realities of globalization, where the pace of change is increasingly dynamic, required the Navy to take an approach with a wider variety of innovations (Filipczak, 1995). The Navy chose to implement the LGI under a framework called Appreciative Inquiry (AI). Unlike traditional top-down and bottom-up strategies that seek to identify and analyze problems in systems, AI evaluates what gives life to organizations at their best moments by using the power of positive questioning. When combined with a Large Group Intervention, AI could be a powerful tool to effect rapid organizational change (Tripp & Zipsie, 2002), which became identified as an Appreciative Inquiry Summit (Nystrom, 2001). Later, Powley et al. defined, the AI Summit as "a large system change intervention that uses deliberate and dialogic democratic processes to ignite rapid organizational change." (Powley, Fry, Barrett & Bright, 2004, p. 68).

Appreciative Inquiry

Appreciative Inquiry, David Cooperrider and the team at Case Western Reserve have made probably the best-known applications in the military with their work with the U.S. Navy. A Naval Postgraduate School thesis that addressed the use of AI in the U.S. Navy states,

> unlike traditional top down and bottom up strategies that seek to identify and analyze problems in systems AI evaluates what give life to organizations at their best moments by using the power of positive questioning. When combined with a Large Group Intervention, AI is a powerful tool to affect rapid organizational change …. describes using AI-LGIs within the strategic management process as a tool for facilitating rapid and collaborative organization change. (Tripp, 2002).

Cooperrider is best known as the co-creator and creative thought leader of AI describes the AI summit as

> a large-scale meeting process that focuses on discovering and developing the organization's positive change core and designing it into the organization's strategic business processes, systems, and culture. Participation is diverse by design and includes all of the organization's stakeholders. The duration is generally three to four days and involves 50 to 2,000 participants or more … The AI Summit is designed to flow through the AI 4-D Cycle of Discovery, Dream, Design, and Destiny in real time. (Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2008, p. 135)

Recently, McQuaid & Cooperrider identified the impact of the AI Summit, stating,

> The AI Summit is underpinned by the social constructionist premise that human systems move in the direction of what they most deeply, rigorously and persistently ask questions about, and by the strengths-management philosophy that people learn little about excellence by studying failure. (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2018, p. 21)

McQuaid and Cooperrider (2018) further explain that the AI Summit is a generative process that unites a whole system in a macro-management approach that ignites self-organization to deliver agreed actions with speed, dexterity and collaboration rarely seen in most systems.

The AI Summit has been used to produce positive results in many organizations in both the private, non-profit and public arenas (Tripp & Zipsie, 2002; McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2018). In late 2001, the U.S. Navy chose to focus their initial “Leadership Summit” to create enlightened leadership at every level of the Navy (Tripp & Zipsie, 2002; Cooperrider et al., 2008). The steering committee for the summit “determined that four types of people must be present at the summit: people with expertise and experience in the topic; people with power to empower; people with formal and informal authority; and people that bring or can build commitment.” (Tripp & Zipsie, 2002, p. 20). Therefore, the Navy brought together admirals and sailors at all levels for an AI Summit that included more than 250 people. Over the course of four days, the summit created 30 projects to support the vision of creating enlightened leadership in the U.S. Navy. Afterwards, AI Summits have occurred throughout the Navy, such as the newly formed Information Professional Community which held several submits to meet and successfully attain the strategic goal of developing “the U.S. Navy's capacity for using its information network as an integral, systematic, strategic war-fighting capability and advantage.” (Powley et al., 2004) and the entire Pacific Fleet, which used the summits to build leadership at every level (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

As an addendum to the topic of AI in the U.S. military, the U.S. Air Force has recently utilized the AI consulting in relatively smaller organizational settings than the U.S. Navy. The Management Department at the U.S. Air Force Academy has consulted with Air Force organizations and found success using the AI techniques that moved the organization in a positive direction (Levy, Heflin, Prosper & Lane, 2016). However, the consultants, all scholar-practitioners within the discipline of OD, found that “some of the unique characteristics of the military context intensified or exacerbated the

interventions." (p. 76) They encountered typical challenges, such as resistance to change, excessive deference to authority and self-serving biases. Therefore, these military practitioners determined that the use AI in military environments can be successful, but "find a fundamental understanding of the cultural foundations in a military setting to be a requisite ingredient" for said success. (Levy, et al., 2016, p.76) Similarly, the U.S. Army's contracted training organization, the LandWarNet School utilized aspects of AI to implement the new Army Learning Model which seeks to balance centralization with decentralization in the training environment (Stamper, 2015). Finally, the AI was used to determine implantation strategies using AI-LGIs within the strategic management process as a tool for facilitating rapid and collaborative organizational change within Marine Corps Logistics (Tripp & Zipsie, 2002).

AGILE ORGANIZATIONS

Most recently, the concept of Agility has been addressed by David Gillespie (2017) in his article, "What the Military can teach organization about Agility." Basically, in his description of Agility, Gillespie cites three practices. These three practices consist of decentralized decision making, clarity of the end goal, and helping leaders find a 'directed telescope.'

For the first practice – decentralized decision making, Gillespie states that leaders should focus on decisions only they can make. In essence, leaders should be absolutely clear about what decisions only they can make and push all other decisions as far down the organization as possible.

For the second practice – clarity of end goal, Gillespie builds off the first practice of decentralized decision making and claims that leaders should establish commander's intent, meaning that leaders should focus on the 'why' and 'what', while leaving the 'how' to those closer to the front line. It means not micromanaging. Gillespie provides a quote by General George S. Patton: "Never tell people how to do things. Tell them what to do, and they will surprise you with their ingenuity."

For the third practice –assist leaders to find a "directed telescope", Gillespie explains that using a small number of trusted officers as the leader's eyes and ear in the field can provide environmental dexterity, which is a concept critical for leaders.

According to Gillespie, U.S. armed services are experimenting with ways to make faster and smarter decisions, and business should take note. Gillespie claims, "While companies often look to technology companies for inspiration on how to adjust, large organizations might consider using the U.S. military as an example. Once bastions of command-and-control management style, modern military institutions such as the U.S. Marine Corps are at the forefront of thinking about organizational and leadership agility, mastering how to evolve at 'clock speed'."

Overcoming the military's traditional hierarchical model has been essential in an era of digitally enabled terrorism. Today's military thinking now emphasizes the kind of innovation necessary to move its leadership efficiently through the four decision cycles of what military scholars and war planners commonly refer to as the OODA Loop (observe, orient, decide and act) (McIntosh, 2011) in order to effectively respond to sudden external threats.

DISCUSSION

In the review of the history of OD in the Military it is clear that as the field of Organization Development evolved so did the application of OD in the military and this contributed to changing organization design first established in the 1950s and 1960s. It appears that the impact of organization design in the military did not employ the terminology of early theory; namely, organic and mechanistic organization design. However, the military was significantly influenced indirectly by these early concepts in that these concepts set the foundation for the work in OD. The extensive application of OD in the U.S. Navy is particularly interesting in terms of the later Agile design. Although all of the work in OD—sensitivity training, process consultation, etc.—is designed to increase organization agility, the work at the University of Michigan, specifically Likert Four Systems of Management, and survey feedback is particularly interesting in terms of the concept of agility. In brief, Likert's systems measured organizational characteristics from System 1 (highly rigid) and authoritarian, to System 4 (participatory and collaborative)—System 4 having characteristics consistent with organic organization theory and consequently more adaptive and responsive to environmental change; in other words, more agile. However, there is another component to Likert's Four Systems theory which in a way adds to the agile dimension of his work and that is that the data measured by the Four Systems Questionnaire referred to an intervening variable which were defined as Leading Variables. Leading variables (employee attitudes as reflected in the Systems Questionnaire) were predictive variables; in other words, movement toward a lower level or higher-level systems were predictive of whether the organization was becoming more or less adaptive.

The application of OD continued in the military with more recent applications of Appreciative Inquiry, an approach strongly influenced by the early period of OD, particularly the work of McGregor and his precepts that differentiate management styles from authoritarian to participative with AI embracing the latter.

The most recent approach in OD having implications for organization design is the concept of Agility. Although limited literature and information on the application of Agility to the U.S. Military, the concept has major implications and application to all service branches of the U.S. military. Nevertheless, the current work at the University of Southern California by Lawler and Worley, and Worley, et.al., in France provides an additional perspective on agile. In their book, *Becoming Agile* (2015), Worley et al, presents supportive and consistent theoretical foundations including references to the work of Pettigrew and colleagues (Whittington, Pettigrew, Peck, Fenton, & Conyon, 1999) which reports higher performance in organizations which have adopted structures that include, among other characteristics, flatter structures and decentralized decision making, increased horizontal communication and empowered HR practices, all practices consistent with early work on organic and mechanistic organizations introduced by Joanne Woodward and Burns and Stalker over 60 years ago, and the early work in OD based on Lewin and McGregor. Worley et al. (2014) further developed the concept of agility through the presentation of "The Routines of Agility" which include the routines of strategizing, perceiving, testing, and implementing. All routines are consistent with and expand on the foundational work of both early organization theory and early principles of the

field of OD. Although the change in design in the military provides excellent examples of the capability of identifying changes in the environment and adopting OD strategies to respond to these programs, OD in the military also identifies some of the programs associated with the use of OD, not only in the military but in corporations. These problems include lack of adequate assessment and reliance on testimonials, and the employment of OD consultants who were perceived to be counterculture. Both the lack of evaluation data and the behavior and appearance of the OD consultants emphasizes the importance of, and the role of, organizational culture.

One additional note on the importance of culture. Recent studies (Hurtado, 2009; Herve, 2011) on scenario planning again confirms the central role of culture in agility. Scenario planning advocates the telling of multiple stories that cover a variety of plausible future occurrences (Shoemaker, 1995). It is one of the most sophisticated current approaches to monitoring the environment which is a critical role in organizational agility. Scenario planning offers a culture that permits organizational members to collaborate and explore—with that permission comes innovation, engagement, and agility. Interestingly, it is also a practice used extensively by all branches of the U.S. military in war planning efforts. In the end, the ability to act on information provided in scenario planning is dependent upon an organic organization culture.

Thanks to the comprehensive work of Umstot (1980), much is known about the early history of OD and the military and consequently the implications for organization design. This paper attempts to extend the early work of Umstot accomplished four decades ago. The history and continuing application of OD in the military is particularly important in that the U.S. military represents one of the largest and most complex organizations in existence. Although the early history is well documented, much more needs to be understood concerning the more recent development of Appreciative Inquiry and the concept of Agility. Nonetheless, this paper's exploration posits that the U.S. Military, through the use of OD, is moving toward Agility in the organization.

REFERENCES

Adams, J., & Sherwood, J. (1979). An Evaluation of Organizational Effectiveness: An Appraisal of How Army Internal Consultants Use Survey Feedback in a Military Setting. *Group & Organization Studies*, 4(2), pp. 170–182.

Affourtit, T. D., (1977). LEAP at organizational efficiency. *Marine Corps Gazette*. Volume 61 Number 1. pp. 25-26

Affourtit, T. D., (1979). The Leadership Evaluation and Analysis Program (LEAP): Economic Feasibility Report. Prepared for: U.S. Department of the Navy Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps (Code: MPH) Washington, D.C., Technical Report. pp. 79-8

Aitken, G. (1986). *Air Force Noncommissioned Officer Professional Military Education: A Blueprint for The Future.* Research Report for Air War College, Air University. No. AU-AWC-86-006

Anderson, D. (2019). *Organization development: The process of leading organizational change*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Aram, J, & Piraino, T. (1978). The hierarchy of needs theory: An evaluation in Chile. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 12: pp.179-88

Blackburn, T. (1992). *An assessment of one Department of Defense Organization's Implementation of Total Quality Management*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale).

Bunker, B. & Alban, B. (1997) Large Group Interventions, Engaging the Whole System for Rapid Change. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.

Burger, P. & Bass B. (1979). *Assessment of managers: An international comparison*. New York: Free Press

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. London. Tavistock Publishing. Cited in Hurley, RF and Hult, GTM (1998). Innovation, Market Orientation, and Organisational Learning: An Integration and Empirical Examination. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, pp. 42-54.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. A. Pasmore & R. W. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 1, pp. 129–169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cooperrider, D., Whitney, D., Stavros, J. (2008). *The Appreciative Inquiry Handbook for Leaders of Change* (2nd ed). Crown Custom Publishing, Inc. Brunswick, OH.

Ferrier, S. (1981a). Army Organizational Effectiveness and Navy Organizational Development: A Comparison and Contrast. *OE Communique*. Vol. 5(1). pp. 15-20.

Ferrier, S. (1981b). The U.S. Air Force Management Consulting Program: Implications for Army OE. *OE Communique*. Vol. 5(3). pp. 29-35.

Filipczak, B. (1995) "Critical Mass: Putting Whole-Systems Thinking into Practice." Training. (September).

French, J.P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. *Studies in Social Power*, pp. 150-67

Galbraith, J. R. (1977). *Organization design*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gillespie, D. (2017). What the military can teach organizations about agility. *Staying Agile*, p.29.

Herve, B. (2011). Scenario planning: managing uncertain futures. British Journal of Healthcare Management, 17(11), pp. 516–521.

Hurtado, P. (2009). A Critical Analysis of Scenario Planning as a Cultural Intervention. *Competition Forum*, 7(1), pp. 221–227.

Houston, A. & Dockstader, S. (1997), *Total Quality Leadership: A Primer*. Washington, D.C.: United States Navy, pp. 10–11.

Huse, E. F. (1980). *Organization Development and Change*. (2nd ed) The West Series in Management. West Publishing Company. New York

Jones, J. (1979). OD in Military Organizations. *Group & Organization Studies*, 4(2), pp.135–142.

Kapinos, V. (1983). *Enhanced Management Consulting*. LMDC Training Report-83-2. Leadership and Management Development Center, Air Training Command. Maxwell Air Force Basse, Alabama. July 1983.

Kohli, A. & Jaworski B. (1990), "Market Orientation: The (Construct. Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications," Journal of Marketing, 54 (April), 1-18.

Kras, E. (1989). *Management in two cultures*. Yarmouth, Me.: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Levy, D., Heflin, P., Prosper P. & Lane, C. (2016). Lessons Learned from Applying Appreciative Inquiry in a Military Setting. AI Practioner. Vol. 18(4). pp. 66-76.

Lewis, C. (1981). A History of Parish Development in the Army Chaplaincy. *Military Chaplains' Review*. Headquarters Department of the Army. DA Pam, pp. 165-131.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Litwin, G. & Stringer, R. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*.

Mahon, G. (Chairman). (1977). *Department of Defense Appropriations for 1977.* Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Appropriations: House of Representatives, Ninety-Fourth Congress. Second Session.

Marrow, A. (1969) *The Practical Theorist: The Life and Work of Kurt Lewin.* New York. Basic Books, Inc., 10. pp. 156-165.

McDaniel, D. & Doherty, L. (1990). *Total Quality Management Case Study in a Navy Headquarters Organization*. San Diego, California: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, p. 1.

McGinnis, M. & Ackelsberg, M. (1983), "Effective Innovation Management: Missing Link in Strategic Planning?" *Journal of Business Strategy*, 4 (Winter). pp. 59-66.

McGregor, D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McIntosh, S. (2011) The Wingman Philosopher of MiG Alley: John Boyd and the Ooda Loop. *Air Power History*, 2011. 58(4). pp. 24–33.

McQuaid, M. & Cooperrider, D. (2018). Your Change Blueprint: How to Design and Deliver an AI Summit. Michelle McQuaid Pty Ltd; 1st edition.

Nystrom, D. (2001). 360-Degree Feedback: A Powerful Tool for Leadership Development and Performance Appraisal. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

Powley, E., Fry, R., Barrett, F. & Bright, D. (2004). Dialogic Democracy Meets Command and Control: Transformation Through the Appreciative Inquiry Summit. *Academy of Management Executive*. Vol. 18(3).

Schein, E. (2004). Organizational culture and leadership (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*; Doubleday, New York.

Shoemaker, P. (1995). Scenario Planning: A Tool for Strategic Thinking. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. Vol. 36(2).

Simons, R. (1995). *Levers of control*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press

Stamper, J. (2015). *The LandWarNet School, The Army Learning Model, and Appreciative Inquiry: How is a Centralized Training Organization Improved by Introducing Decentralization?* Dissertation, Doctor of Education. Georgia Southern University

Tripp, P. & Zipsie, M. (2002). *The Introduction of Appreciative Inquiry to the U.S. Navy Using Appreciative Inquiry Interviews and the Large Group Intervention with Applications to U.S. Marine Corps Logistics Strategic Management*. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

Trist, E., & Bamforth, W. (1951), Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Long Wall Method of Coal-Getting. Human Relations, Vol. 4, pp. 3-38.

Umstot, D. (1980). Organization Development Technology and the Military: A Surprising Merger? *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 5, No.2.

Weber, M., Henderson, A. M., & In Parsons, T. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization. New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Whittington, R., Pettigrew, A., Peck, S., Fenton, E., & Conyon, M. (1999). Change and complementarities in the new competitive landscape: A European panel study, 1992–1996. *Organization science*, 10(5), pp. 583-600.

Woodward, J. (1965). *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press, London.

Worley, C. G., Zardet, V., Bonnet, M., & Savall, A. (2015). *Becoming agile: How the SEAM approach to management builds adaptability*. John Wiley & Sons.

Worley, C. G., Williams, T. D., & Lawler III, E. E. (2014). *The agility factor: Building adaptable organizations for superior performance*. John Wiley & Sons.

Wright, P. (1981). Doing business in Islamic markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 59. pp. 34-41.

Zadalis, T. & Shrader, B. (2003). Building Better Leaders: Developing Air Force Squadron Leadership for the Next Century. National Security Program Discussion Paper Series 03-001. Harvard University. John F. Kennedy School of Government. National Security Program. *Air University Press*. Maxwell AFB, AL