Original Research Article

Critique for Organization Development

Dr. Raed Awashreh

Independent Researcher, Palestine

Corresponding Author: Dr. Raed Awashreh, E-mail: raed.raya2020@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	This critique is for the article that show a fear in disappearing the career of organization developers who think in the future that this area will decline rapidly. The fear comes from changing in environments, especially from advanced technology. By using tens of secondary data from researchers and practitioners, the author analyzes and synthesizes these data to address the focal issues in the background, argument, and findings too. One solution against the fear is to develop and enlarge the size of organizations, so it keeps the profession of organization development. But the best way for finding a solution is to think, analyze and anticipate the future. Another solution sounds more chain and organized, starts from raising the fear concerns and work collectively to find a solution for not allowing the advanced technology of smart robots to replace humans. Unlike the author believes, organizational practitioners do not respect human values, but rather they are interested in commercial and financial values. Therefore, the preservation of professions for humans must be studied in a social and moral context and not only for profit and benefit, especially with the increasing concern that smart machines will dominate life humanity.

1. Introduction

A fear has grown in the organization development (OD) field from practitioners who think in the future that this area will decline rapidly. This fear comes from changing in environments, especially from advanced technology (Gilpin-Jackson, 2018). Technology limits the need of hiring people and this effects organization as a social unit.

Many sources and researchers work have used such as Marshak (2016), Cheung-Jude (2017), Church & Burke (2017), and Kegan & Lahey (2001) to support the article across its sections. Few topics were brought up in the context and background that includes the adaptation of the industry trends such as volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguous environment. In addition to technology acceleration and big data makes the importance of organizational changes, and the information on the competing commitments important. Also, the OD article offered information on the value of practitioners and their commitment to OD. The author used previous researches to draw the map of the article problem then discuss and reflect on it. In other words, using previous researches on the future of OD in light of changing environments to draw the background to help focus on both concerns OD field and practitioners.

This article uses secondary data for analyzing and critiquing the article of *It's time to make organization development our client* (OD article), aiming to share in the ongoing discussion over the effect of advanced technology, smart machine, and future of organization development career. This critique article has many sections, begins with background information about the OD article, followed by clarifying the design, then together discuss finding and results of the OD article. The remain two sections, five and sex discuss present the organizational critiques and followed by conclusion.

2. Background information

The OD article's purpose is to encourage scholars & practitioners to think and work together collectively to find ways to keep up their mindset and skills developed to cope with the OD field change. The objective is to increase the awareness among practitioners over the OD field in order to develop new ways that lead them to stay in the development career (Gilpin-Jackson, 2018). The main question of the article is how researchers and practitioners might apply the best of OD theories and practices required to lead the change in the field and build on what is working. This main question followed by two sub questions: how OD people might overcome their own immunity to change? And how might they grow what they choose to increase?

While moving forward in the article, the author asks more specific questions to facilitate the discussion and make reflections. The focus of the study is the future of OD as a field and career. The author studied and analyzed OD from the past, present and share some reflection on expected future. The future indicates that the OD as a field is in danger due to technology changes. Also, it becomes more challenging because of the resistance of practitioners against change. In addition, OD practitioners, as the author stated, are committed to the field of development. Why the author brought here immunity for change? Practitioners are experts, so they might think they are adjusting accordingly to change as practicing. Maybe practitioners think who can judge and evaluate their capability in the field. Both of thinking could be obstacles for practitioners in developing themselves (Gilpin-Jackson, 2018).

3. Research Design

The OD article uses tens of previous researches, secondary data and survey from a combination of two OD sources, researchers and practitioners. The author analyzes and synthesizes these secondary data to address the focal issues in the background, argument, and findings too. The author supports his argument by the many reflections followed by specific questions from his side on concern issues in the creation of OD article.

4. Findings and Results

The Findings were synthesized with the discussion and results. Responding to what is working from OD theory and practice; the finding is in theory and practice OD practitioners do include changes in their mindset and dialogue, so with the more advanced change in technology, they will be able to recognize and make changes in their mindset and practice. Changing is not only in organizations, its over family, community, and society which means all social units are changed in a way making change in OD understandable. In responding to how might practitioners grow; the findings here are to focus on differentiation, on what practitioners can offer differs. This means, they need to choose what fits them more as individuals and see what they like to develop, how to lead, and set a plan for the development. It's a call for more specialization within the OD field. Ex: OD in the information technology, project management, public management ...etc. To enhance OD job, building partnership with different field of studies, governance, policy, advocacy, international studies…etc. This helps in developing OD capability, also, to open a door for specialization in case one decided (Gilpin-Jackson, 2018).

Furthermore, expand the OD work from small to a complex organization, engage with a high level of decision-making and policies. In this way practitioners can develop themselves, gain influence and expand their work. Within the findings, the author deepens the humanistic value in OD field and thinks of how the future might suggest less of human factor engagement in organization development. The support of this finding comes from references and web link named within the table that the author has developed and replaced with the OD article (Gilpin-Jackson, 2018). Moreover, the author finds that developing a portfolio of case studies and research will help practitioners know what is working in their field and what is not working. By doing this OD will overcome the challenges of using data, statistical data related to their work. Such a portfolio will help in both the mindset of the practitioner to be developed and also increase the capabilities of practitioners to move forward with their work and practice. Finally, Play the devils, advocate role in the OD field and career. Try to be disruptive in order to understand how to improve the field via recognizing where is the process and change need to take place.

5. Critique

The growing fear is reasonable and justified. Although the author has used only secondary data sources to build this article, the aim of raising awareness was a good attempt to help readers and practitioners start thinking (Kotter, 2008). The author succeeded in presenting the concern by using previous researches to inform readers about the background of the issue and encouraged them to learn more. With the purpose and aims of the article, it is possible to improve and expand the content. It will be great to have some primary data from practitioners talking about their fears for OD as a field and a job. Primary data

help readers to understand better the problems and put them in the mood of thinking about it too (Hughes, 2016). I acknowledge using tables based on secondary sources, putting the data together to build the kind of homogeneous paper. I expected the author to suggest some idea for changes on OD saying here are a few examples, let's study them collectively and see if this works. In this case, the writer will give scholars and practitioners the start to take place in the invitation for change. In addition, technology is developing, the fear could be changing on organization structure; reducing the number of employees downsizing the structure, make it flat. Merge could be on many organizations, or/ and advanced technology allows smart robots to replace humans. The author did not discuss such fear for details to make it clear. Another point, OD field may be in decline, but it will not disappear; the demand for external practitioners- consultants might decrease, but OD leaders and practitioners inside organizations will continue doing their jobs until a dramatic change occurs at organizational levels (Cheung-Judge, 2018).

Opposite to author' belief, OD practitioners do not respect humanist values. Some, maybe more, are comparing human to commercial value, i.e. able to receive benefits, rewards and dropping human values. However, practitioners should insist on protecting human values by protecting human existence. Technology pushes further human life for transforming other forms of organization in which it might become smart machines. In this, some researchers agree with the author that practitioners must engage in decision-making, policies, strategy initiatives not only to gain experience but also to have the influence to stop the machine controlling the world (Cheung-Judge, 2018). Furthermore, some fearful on OD comes from the underestimation of practitioners themselves when they criticize their job. Few in my OD network used to say when they get paid, practitioners exchanging paper with money, reflecting in my opinion how their job is not important to organizations. So, this point should take into consideration when discussing fear in the OD field and the commitment to human ethics. Maybe the commitment of human ethics is only a claim, and practitioner relationship with values does not exceed the buyer-seller rapport. The OD article agrees that the environments force organizations make changes and so is the case of OD and practitioners in changing their mindset. Also, it is in the heart of the organization change concern; it wants participants to understand why it's important for organizations to change.

Leaders in organizations and in OD field can carry changes. The first step is raising awareness for the needed change. Second step is to determine and include influential people in this change (Kotter, 2008). The author here raised the awareness and called for the change of practitioner mindset. He also shared some thoughts in developing OD as a field and a job, example, specialization in a certain topic within the OD, enhancing practitioners' abilities to move forward to more advanced topics, sophisticated and complex organizations.

The author encouraged practitioners to gain more advanced skills and power by working closely with powerful decision-making, high level of policy and plans, so they enhance both OD field and their practices. Deaner (1994) emphasis over the importance of practitioner human ethics; readers look to know about the contradiction between OD practitioner human ethics and commercial gain. Also, what if the OD practitioner does not recognize and accept the change in their mindset? What will be the consequences and how to fix it? This could be topics for future research.

6. Conclusion

The OD article has raised the awareness over OD as a field and a job and motivates practitioners to think over OD changes. It finds some strong elements that help practitioners to develop and cope with changing and stay in their career. Theory and practices that practitioners are using adopt and acknowledge changing, so this will assist the mindset. The OD article has invited practitioners to think collectively and conduct further researches and discussion over OD changes. In particular, the author encouraged practitioners to think and find answers of few related questions: what kind of research the OD practitioners want, leadership, advocacy do they need, and human domain that practitioners collectively needs to operate in. He recommends that OD scholars and practitioners do more research, come together, discuss and agree collectively on how to develop the OD field, job and how to make such movement changes on their mindset and skills. However, the expectation from the OD article is to include primary data and some idea for changes on OD saying here are a few examples, let's study them collectively and see if this works. In addition, the OD article claimed that practitioners are concerned with ethics and human values; this is not true and cannot be generalized. OD practitioner priority is maximizing their benefits, so they might stand against smart machines as it threatens their professions

References

[1] Abbas, W., & Asghar, I. (2010). *The role of leadership in organizational change* [thesis]. Retrieved from: https://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:326289/FULLTEXT01.pdf&gt

[2] Cheung-Judge, M. (2018). Future of Organizations and Implications for OD Practitioners. *OD PRACTITIONER, 49 (1*), 1-19.

[3] Deaner, C. D. (1994). A model of Organization development ethics. *Public Administration Quarterly, 17 (4*), 435-446

[4] Gilpin-Jackson, Y. (2018). It's time to make organization development our client. *Organization Development Spring*, 2018. Vol. 50 issue 2, p7-15.

[5] Glor, E. D.(2014). Building theory about evolution of organizational change patterns. doi: 10.Emergent Publications/10.17357.f9e2f64daf515a2a63f6cb21541120fe.

[6] Greiner, E. L. (1967). Patterns of Organization Change. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/1967/05/patterns-of-organization-change

[7] Hughes, M. (2016). Leading changes: why transformation explanation fails. *Leadership Vol.* 12(4), 449-469. DOI:10.1177/1742715015571393.

[8] Keley, B. (2015). *The big change management lie*. Retrieved fromhttps://disruptorleague.com/2015/12/16/the-big-change-management-lie/

[9] Kotter, J. P. (2008). *A Sense of urgency*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.

[10] Martin, B. V., Scott, C., & Brennen, B. (2018). What is grounded theory good for? *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly. 95 (1)*,11-12.