# VOLUME I

# THE MANAGEMENT OF ORGANIZATION DESIGN

## Strategies and Implementation

EDITED BY

**Ralph H. Kilmann**
University of Pittsburgh

**Louis R. Pondy**
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Dennis P. Slevin**
University of Pittsburgh

Chapter 10

# On Organization Stories:
# An Approach to the Design
# and Analysis of Organizations Through
# Myths and Stories

Ian I. Mitroff and Ralph H. Kilmann

*University of Pittsburgh*

MYTHOLOGY, n.   The body of a primitive people's beliefs concerning its origin, early history, heroes, deities and so forth, as distinguished from the true accounts which it invents later.

AMBROSE BIERCE
The Devil's Dictionary

If you wish to lower yourself in a person's favor, one good way is to tell his story over again, the way you heard it.

MARK TWAIN

Man lives by stories. He is a natural, born storyteller. In virtually every epoch and culture, he has freely invented stories to give meaning and order to his world and to his life (Campbell, 1971; Kluckhohn, 1960; Murray, 1960).

The most basic of man's stories are termed myths (Campbell, 1971; Kluckhohn, 1960; Murray, 1960). Once regarded as science in its most primitive form; that is, as primitive man's attempt to give natural explanations of the world, the study and analysis of myths has taken on a new meaning in this century. Instead of being regarded as merely primitive forms of explanations, more and more we are coming to realize that myths are some of the best and most natural materials for studying the human psyche in its purest form. In a word, myths represent man's psychology writ on the largest scale; they are among the purest and grandest of projective tests (Campbell, 1971; Kluckhohn, 1960; Murray, 1960). And finally, we have also come to realize that there are no absolute differences between science and mythology (Churchman, 1968, 1971; Kilmann and Mitroff, 1976; Mitroff and Kilmann, 1975). Science itself is a form of mythmaking and storytelling (Churchman, 1971, 1961). If there be any validity to the distinction between "hard" and "soft" sciences, perhaps its purpose is to have us understand that there is a "soft" side to every science, physical as well

189

as social (Churchman, 1968, 1971; Kilmann and Mitroff, 1976; Mitroff and Kilmann, 1975). As Churchman has put it: "The soft scientists are storytellers; they tell us stories about the world, its past, its present, and sometimes its future" (Churchman, 1968; p. 207). Indeed, it can be shown that the harder the outer shell of a science; i.e., its outward appearance to the world, the softer is its inner core, all the soft assumptions on which it depends (Kilmann and Mitroff, 1976; Mitroff and Kilmann, 1975).

Many biographies ard autobiographies attest to the power that stories have within modern large-scale organizations. These autobiographies retell in a form strikingly similar to the great epic myths of the past (Campbell, 1971; Kluckholn, 1960; Murray, 1960) the life of the organization and that of the individual within it. They describe in heroic terms more dramatic than life itself the difficult circumstances under which the organization was born, the tremendous struggle that had to be overcome to keep the organization alive in the early perilous years of its existence, how those involved made great personal sacrifices born out of intense dedication to the organization, how the organization began slowly to grow, and finally how in later years the organization achieved a success far greater than one had ever dared to dream. The story becomes the corporate myth and is the transcript that establishes and perpetuates corporate traditions. It is recounted at formal occasions and at coffee break "bull sessions" and is used to indoctrinate new employees. The corporate myth is the "spirit" of the organization and is infused into all levels of policy and decision making. Most important of all, these biographical and autobiographical sketches give credence to the notion that an organization's factual data, no matter how precise or accurate they may be, are not information unless they are integrated into one or more of the key motifs which define the symbolic nature of the organization.[1]

Why then have we not systematically studied the structure and function of organization stories and myths? Indeed, why have we systematically neglected and overlooked this valuable well-spring of information literally at our finger tips? How prevalent are organization stories? Is there a "basic set" of themes which somehow limits the number of actual stories? Do different types of organizations develop different types of stories? Are there industry-wide themes, a communality to the stories within a particular industry that transcends individual company stories? These are only some of the many questions that come easily to mind. Perhaps the most interesting question of all is

---

[1]For an elaboration of this theory of information as distinct from "data" see Churchman (1971, pp. 159–170).

the first one: why have we not systematically studied organization stories? It is our contention that one of the main factors responsible for such lack of systematic study and interest is the fact that we are largely the victim of one of our own myths; namely, what we believe constitutes the proper focus of study of the social sciences. More specifically, the problem has to do with our beliefs regarding what constitutes valid data for the "proper study" of organizations. This paper runs counter to these prevailing myths.

## THE IDEAL ORGANIZATION

In order to shed light on what the authors believe to be an important social phenomenon, we have devised a procedure for studying the kinds of words, symbols, and raw projective images that different kinds of managers use in describing their ideal organization (Mitroff, 1974). A short personality test was administered to three different groups of managers for the purpose of determining the personality type of each individual. Immediately after the completion of this test, each individual was asked to then write a short story that expressed his or her concept of an ideal organization. After the completion of this task, each individual was placed into one of four different discussion groups depending upon the individual's personality type. The particular personality test used sorted individuals into one of four personality types; each discussion group contained those and only those individuals whose type was the same. Each group was asked to organize itself in any manner it desired, to discuss the stories of each individual, and then to come up with a single group story that best expressed the entire group's concept of an ideal organization.

Prior to the completion of all the exercises, neither the personality test, the purpose of the stories, nor the fact that the individuals were placed into the various groups on the basis of the similarity of their personality profiles was explained to the individuals. Since the exercises were naturally part of a class of a workshop session, the individuals were informed that their responses would form the basis of an extensive discussion on the nature of different personalities and organization behavior. Explicit feedback was later given to each individual and to each discussion group as to what their personality scores and stories meant. As a general rule, interest was high for all the exercises and the rapport between the authors and the individuals was good.

The individuals and the groups were asked to express their concepts of their ideal organization in the form of stories for the deliberate reason that we wanted to tap their raw, unconscious, projective images of

what the *concept* of an organization meant to them. For this same reason the individuals and discussion groups were also asked to describe their concept of their *ideal* (as opposed to *real*) organization, although one of the three groups of managers, after having first described their ideal organization, was asked to describe how their real organization differed from their ideal.

Each group of managers was tested separately. The first group of managers was composed of twenty-five middle to high-level business executives, a number of them presidents of their own medium to large-sized companies in the Pittsburgh area. Each was currently enrolled in an executive MBA program at the University of Pittsburgh. The second and third groups of managers were also composed of about twenty-five members each. These last two groups, however, were composed of middle-level supervisors in the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Assistance. Whereas there was only one woman in the first group of twenty-five executives, the ratio of women to men was about three to two for the last two groups.

The personality typology used to classify individuals was that of C. G. Jung (1968) (see Marshall, 1967; Mogar, 1969; Myers, 1962). The Jungian typology was chosen for two main reasons: the dimensions of the Jungian typology relate directly to different managerial and organization styles and hence make for an appropriate basis of comparison between different personality and organization types; and the Jungian typology does not prescribe one of the four major personality types as superior or better than any of the others but instead points out that each type has major strenghts as well as weaknesses.

For the purposes of our study, two particular dimensions of the Jungian typology were of special importance. The first dimension corresponds to the kind of "input-data" an individual characteristically prefers to take in from the outside world. The second dimension corresponds to an individual's preference for the kind of "decision-making process" the individual characteristically brings to bear upon his preferred kind of input-data.

According to Jung, individuals can take in data from the outside world by either *sensation* or *intuition* but not by both simultaneously. As a result, individuals tend to develop a preference for one mode of input or the other. Sensation refers to those individuals who typically take in information via the senses, who are most comfortable when attending to the details of any situation, and who prefer hard impersonal facts. In contrast, intuition refers to those individuals who typically take in information by means of their imagination, by seeing the whole—the gestalt—of any situation. These individuals typically prefer the hypothetical possibilities in any situation to the "actual" facts. It

should be stressed that all individuals perceive with both of these functions at different times. But as Jung argues, individuals tend to develop a preferred way of perceiving, and in fact, cannot apply both types of perception or data-input at the same time.

According to Jung, there are two basic ways of reaching a decision: *thinking* and *feeling*. Thinking is the process of reaching a decision based on impersonal analytical modes of reasoning. Feeling, on the other hand, is the process of a reaching of a decision that is based on personalistic value judgments that may be highly unique to the particular individual. Thus however one takes in data (either by intuition or sensation), an individual may come to some conclusion about the data either by a logical impersonal analysis (thinking) or by a subjective personal process (feeling).

Combining the two data input modes (sensation and intuition) with the two decision-making modes (feeling and thinking) in all possible ways results in the following four Jungian personality types: sensation-thinking (ST), sensation-feeling (SF), intuition-thinking (NT), and intuition-feeling (NF).[2]

Two findings in particular are immediately apparent and striking from a content analysis of the individual stories and the stories of the four Jungian discussion groups: there is a remarkable and very strong *similarity* between the stories of those individuals who have the same personality type (e.g., ST), and there is a remarkable and very strong *difference* between the stories of the four personality types (see Appendix). That is, individuals of the same personality type tend to tell the same kind of story or have the same image of their ideal organization, whereas different personality types tend to have very different images. Indeed, the differences between the stories of different types are so strong that one is tempted to say that the ideal of one type is the absolute hell of the other, and vice-versa.

The stories of ST individuals are characterized by an extreme emphasis and concentration on specifics, on factual details. ST types are extremely sensitive to the physical features of their work environment. For example, the stories of ST types display an extreme preoccupation with environments that are neither "too hot" or "too cold" but "just right." The ideal organization of ST's is one characterized by complete control, certainty, and specificity. In their ideal organization, everybody knows exactly what his or her job is. There is no uncertainty as to

[2]The symbol N is used to signify intuition since it is customary in Jungian personality theory to reserve the symbol I for the function introversion (Myers, 1962). We shall adhere to this customary notation even though there is no possibility of confusion since for reasons of convenience we have not treated the additional Jungian dimension, introversion (I)—extroversion (E).

what is expected in all circumstances. Further, ST organizations are impersonal. The emphasis is on work and work roles, not on the particular individuals who fill the roles. It thus comes as no surprise that the ideal organization of ST's is authoritarian. There is a single leader at the top and a well-defined hierarchical line of authority that extends from the very top down to all of the lower rungs of the organization. In an ST organization, the individuals exist to serve the goals of the organization, not the organization to serve the goals of the individuals. Finally, the goals of an ST organization are realistic, down-to-earth, limited, and more often than not, narrowly economic.

The stories of NT's are marked by an extreme emphasis on broad global issues. In describing their ideal organization, NT's do not specify the detailed work rules, roles, or lines of authority but instead focus on general concepts and issues. To put it somewhat differently, if the organization goals of ST's are concerned with well-defined, precise *micro* economic issues, then the goals of NT's are concerned with fuzzy, ill-defined *macro* economic issues like "an equitable wage for all workers." NT organizations are also impersonal like ST organizations. However, where ST's focus on the details of a specific impersonal organization, NT's focus on impersonal concepts and theories of organization. For example, they are concerned with concepts of efficiency in the abstract. Likewise, whereas in an ST organization individuals exist to serve the particular organization, in an NT organization individuals exist to serve the intellectual and theoretical concept of the organization in general. In a word, if ST organizations are impersonally realistic, then NT organizations are impersonally idealistic.

The stories of NF's are also marked by an extreme preoccupation with broad global themes and issues. NF's also show an extreme disdain toward getting down to specifics. NF's are similar to NT's in that both take a broad view of organizations. However, NF's differ from NT's in that where the emphasis of NT's is on the general *theory* or *theoretical* aspects of organizations, the emphasis of NF's is on the most general *personal* and *human* goals of organizations. Thus, NF organizations are concerned with "serving humanity;" e.g., "with making a contribution to mankind." NF's differ from both ST's and NT's in that for both ST's and NT's the individual exists to serve the organization, where for NF's the organization exists to serve the personal and social needs of people. Since in Jungian personality theory the NF type is the extreme opposite of the ST type (as the SF type is the extreme opposite of the NT), it is not surprising to find that the ideal organization of NF's is the exact opposite of ST's. Thus, if an ST organization is authoritarian with well-defined rules of behavior, then an NF organization is

completely decentralized with no clear lines of authority, with no central leader, and with no fixed prescribed rules of behavior. The stories of NF's incessantly talk about "flexibility" and "decentralization." As a matter of fact, many of the stories of NF's contain diagrams of their ideal organization, which show them to be circular or wheel-like in structure rather than hierarchical. NF organizations are also idealistic as opposed to realistic. In essence, NF organizations are the epitome of organic adaptive institutions.

If the ideal organizations of ST's and NF's are extreme opposites, then the organizations of NT's and SF's are also extreme opposites. If NT's are concerned with the general theory of all organizations but not with the details of any particular organization, then SF's don't care about theory at all or issues in general. SF's are instead concerned with the detailed human relations in their particular organization. SF's are like ST's in that both are concerned with details and facts. However, SF's differ from ST's in that the latter are concerned with detailed *work rules* and *roles* whereas the former are concerned with the *human qualities of the specific people* who fill the roles. SF's are in this sense similar to NF's. Both SF's and NF's are concerned with the people in the organization. SF's differ from NF's in the sense that where NF's are concerned with people in general, SF's are concerned with individuals in particular. SF organizations are also realistic as opposed to idealistic. Like ST's, SF's are also concerned with the detailed work environment although where for ST's the environment of concern is physical, for SF's it is the interpersonal environment that is of concern.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATION ANALYSIS: DESIGNING FOR PROBLEM SOLVING

The foregoing has presented a conceptual framework for studying important organization phenomena in a manner that capitalizes on man's inherent ability to create stories, emphasizing that these stories derive from basic psychological processes. We want to turn now to the issue of how our approach provides an alternative basis for studying some of the emerging issues of organization design.

Some of the most important series of empirical investigations on organization design are those which are provided by the contingency theorists, for example, Lawrence and Lorsch (1967a, b) and Lorsch and Lawrence (1970). In contradistinction to the "one best" approach to organization design as advocated by Weber (1947) (i.e., bureaucracy), and Likert (1961) (System 4), the contingency theorists provide considera-

ble evidence that there is no "single best" organization design. Depending on the nature of the organization's task environment (stable or dynamic), the personality characteristics of the organization's members (Theory X or Theory Y), a particular design is suggested (bureaucratic or System 4) (Kilmann, 1974; Kilmann and Taylor, 1974). Also, the extent to which the various subunits of the organization are differently designed to address different task environments requires special "integrative" mechanisms to coordinate the subunits' activities into a functioning whole (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967b). Thus if one subunit of the organization faces a stable environment and is staffed by Theory X individuals, then a bureaucratic design is expected to result in the most effective subunit behavior. Another subunit of the organization, however, may face a dynamic environment with members of the Theory Y type. This latter subunit would be expected to be most effective if designed in an organic-adaptive or System 4 manner. Finally, for the organization as a whole to be effective would require particular coordination mechanisms to help the bureaucratic subunit operate effectively with the System 4 subunit, realizing that each subunit needs to maintain its unique stance to its own task environment.

One of the major shortcomings of the contingency theorists is that they have not provided a general conceptual framework for the explicit definition of different organization designs. Instead, they have merely introduced and explored a great variety of different designs. For example, Bennis (1966) differentiates between the bureaucratic and the organic-adaptive design; Burns and Stalker (1969) distinguish the mechanistic from the organic design; Katz and Kahn (1966) discuss the differences between hierarchical and democratic types of organization designs; Parsons (1960) differentiates the typical bureaucratic from the professional; and Stinchcombe (1959) describes the bureaucratic versus the craft. In each case, the design mentioned first seems to imply a fixed hierarchy of authority, a highly specified set of rules and procedures, and rigid control over behavior, whereas the second design apparently represents just the opposite; i.e., a design that is somewhat fluid (organic), changing (adaptive), and conducive to the unique development of each individual (professional).

It is our contention that the Jungian framework introduced earlier provides a set of underlying dimensions, and hence a systematic rationale, for defining the basic characteristics of these different organization designs. In particular, the first design in each of the above cases represents an ST organization, whereas the second portrays an NF organization. Recalling the stories of ST's and NF's of their ideal organizations illustrates well the primary distinctions between the two basic organization designs studied, if not conceptualized, by contingency

theorists. Thus, the bureaucratic design emphasizes specific rules, procedures, and data (sensation) and the formal logical ordering of the organization's hierarchy (thinking). In contrast, the organic design explores the global, long-term goal orientation of the organization (intuition), and the informal, social, human resource potential of the organization's members (feeling).

To reiterate an earlier point: our general conceptual framework for defining different organization designs is based on two different *information systems* (sensation and intuition) and two different *decision-making systems* (thinking and feeling). A diverse and abundant literature attests to the validity of these two types of system concepts as central to investigating organization behavior (Mason and Mitroff, 1973; Mitroff, *et al.*, 1974; Simon, 1957). Furthermore, the adoption of this framework provides some additional benefits as well. It permits the specification of two additional types of organization designs: the NT and the SF. These latter designs have been overlooked in the design literature, which has described only the ST and the NF designs. While the NT and the SF designs have not received explicit research attention, the stories by NT's and SF's provide a tentative basis for defining the nature of these two designs. The NT design emphasizes the global, long-term goal orientation of the organization while maintaining a loosely structured set of roles in order to accomplish these goals. Thus, the members have some discretion in defining their function in the organization. On the other hand, the SF design specifies the hierarchy and role set of organization members while emphasizing that these roles and management hierarchies are for the benefit of the members, i.e., to promote their needs, and their desires to communicate openly with one another.

The use of the Jungian framework also permits a more systematic conception of contingency issues. For example, instead of referring to the organization's or subunit's task environment as simply dynamic or stable, we can conceptualize and study different environments with different information and decision-making requirements. A task environment can impose an ST problem (specific, stable, well-defined, short time horizon, fitting an existing model or technology, etc.), an NF problem (diffuse, unstable, ill-defined, long-term, complex, undifferentiated, requiring appreciation, etc.), or an NT or SF problem (abstract and analytical versus a unique value-laden issue). Likewise, an alternative to referring to individuals as either Theory X or Theory Y (McGregor, 1960) is to assess each individual's psychological type by means of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1962). We then can speak of an ST individual, an NT, etc.

Contingency issues *à la* Lawrence and Lorsch become translated

thusly: design an ST subunit to address ST problems (task environments) staffed in turn by ST individuals, or, design an SF subunit to address SF problems staffed by SF individuals, and so on, and finally, design various mechanisms to coordinate the subunit efforts of these different subunit designs into an overall organization effectiveness. Such contingency design objectives, however, mask the nature of the real kinds of conflicts evidenced in any real situation. For example, a typical intrarole conflict issue is: how does an NF individual adapt to an ST design? Or more generally, how is an individual to be integrated into the organization when his psychological type is different than the design (or type) of the organization? At the subunit level, the issue can be stated as: how can an NF subunit be integrated with other ST subunits? The issue here is one of resolving intergroup conflict (Seiler, 1963).

Not only can these issues be approached more explicitly via the Jungian framework than with more traditional frameworks but they can also be explicitly approached as *value* issues. To recall an earlier point: the Jungian framework does not refer to one type as generally better, more relevant, or more mature, than the other types. There is no connotation that an ST or NT is "better" than an SF or NF. The traditional design literature on the other hand does imply that one type is better than another. For example, Argyris (1957) refers to the individuals who function in bureaucratic organizations (ST) as passive, dependent, subordinate, and who work under conditions leading to psychological failure. As another case in point, the contingency theorists mentioned earlier implicitly value the NF design. Indeed, their very labels for the different kinds of organizations give them away. NF organizations are labeled "democratic" or "professional" versus the labels "bureaucratic" and "hierarchical" for ST organizations. As a result of our studies with the Jungian typology, we are tempted to say that those researchers who implicitly value NF designs are NF's themselves. Likewise, we are tempted to assert that those who were instrumental in formulating and promoting ST approaches—Weber (1947), and Taylor (1911)—had strong components of ST within their own personalities. In other words, our visions, our stories if you will, as social scientists are as much a description of us, of our psychological type, as they are of the things we study.

Another advantage to the Jungian framework is that it helps to make clear that conflicts between ST's and NF's (or NT's and SF's) or between ST and NF subunits will probably be biased in favor of the more socially accepted or desirable perspective. Since our data indicate that the majority of organizations are designed in an ST format and tend to attract ST individuals, this means that it will be most difficult for NF subunits and individuals to be integrated with the status quo of ST.

Consequently, a framework such as the Jungian one is needed in order to confront explicitly these value issues and to provide support for those individuals and subunit designs that run counter to the prevailing mood of ST (Kilmann and Taylor, 1974). Unless this is done, NF individuals and NF designs will be both underrepresented and undermined.

At the same time, it should also be said that we see a growing trend toward the legitimization of SF and NF individuals and organizations. The need, if you will, for SF and NF attitudes is growing stronger. During the past few decades, task environments (or problems) as a whole have become more dynamic, turbulent, and more rapidly changing than ever before. Alvin Toffler (1970), for one, has described the rapidity with which new ideas and knowledge are translated into new technologies, services, and products. Also, our federal government has a much greater control over economic and political factors which can be altered much more quickly than before, assuming that the "problem" can be defined. In addition, child-rearing experiences such as the "open" classroom are encouraging more individuals to develop the SF and NF sides of their personalities, not to mention the growing phenomenon of T-group experiences, which have a similar objective (Kilmann and Taylor, 1974). Furthermore, there is also the evidence to suggest that the higher one goes in an organization the more that what we have called SF and NF skills are called for (Mintzberg, 1971, 1973) in order to confront problems that cannot be easily defined and that traditional methodologies such as those which Operation Research and Management Science supply are simply not applicable (Grayson, 1973).

Thus, if there is a need for more NF and SF individuals and designs to be integrated with ST and NT ones, and if the Jungian framework is effective in explicating these conflicts and value issues (as we have suggested), then the essential question for organization design is: how can we utilize the Jungian framework for designing procedures or mechanisms to institutionalize integrated problem solving at the organization level (realizing that there are different problems, different people, and alternative organization designs)?

From several applications of the Jungian framework to organization problem solving, we can suggest a design procedure to move toward the objective stated above. In particular, we have developed a management workshop model to help individuals and subunits critically examine their underlying values, assumptions, and problem perspectives in a manner that encourages the open confrontation of their differences and that provides a nonthreatening atmosphere conducive to the resolution and synthesis of some problem area. This workshop model can

then be internalized as an organization process, as a matter of organization policy.

Specifically, one or more subunits in the organization are identified as experiencing some conflict or problem. Our first step is to bring together all the individuals concerned with the problem, or their representatives (if there is a large number of individuals). Each individual is asked to write out his view of the problem: what he sees as the objectives, the issues, the values, etc. Alternatively, we ask each individual to write a story describing how the problem arose, the individuals who were involved, what got them to see the problem in a particular manner, how they approached the problem, and how the problem would be *ideally* resolved. The individuals are then formed into a Jungian group (an ST, NT, SF, and NF group) and are asked to develop a group statement by combining or integrating their individual statements or stories. When the group statements have been prepared, each group shares with the others their view of the problem as indicated by their group discussions. This typically results in four very different perspectives.

The next stage in the process explicitly examines the four *differentiated* group products and attempts to *integrate* them in some new form or synthesis of the four separate statements. The process involves having two or more individuals from each of the four Jungian groups meet as an *integrated* group. This group then is asked to discuss their different perspectives, their assumptions, values, stories. In essence, a lively debate develops in which the different perspectives are exaggerated, challenged, examined, denied, and projected. During this process, as much as possible, each individual is encouraged and pushed to critically question and address the strengths and weaknesses of his own perspective. Once each individual in the integrated group has achieved this objective, the process moves toward the synthesis stage. The atmosphere changes, and each member of the group attempts to provide innovative solutions, capitalizing on the strengths of each position while hopefully minimizing or subduing the weaknesses. Finally, this group proposes some integrated solution which addresses the issues developed by the different perspectives.

*The essential point to be emphasized is that the above problem-solving process can be designed and applied to any organization problem*—whether the problem is one of macro organization design (i.e., how to organize to address the variety of task environments that the organization faces) or if the problem arises within a given organization (i.e., how to integrate the ST and the NF subunits). This is suggested by our continuously consistent results of applying the Jungian framework to a wide variety of concepts and issues. It seems to us

that the variety of organization phenomena has its roots in the basic differences between Jungian types; that is, in the different information and decision-making functions. Consequently, regardless of the substantive issue at hand, the methodology is useful in addressing itself to the underlying dimensions of the issue.

This kind of problem-solving process, it should be emphasized, needs to be a recurring component of any management system; it needs to be institutionalized in a manner similar to the form we have described. In other words, we are suggesting that a major issue for organization design is that *organizations need to design a problem-solving system* in order to adapt successfully to different problems and different task environments. Such a system has to have the objective of *continually* addressing itself to the different sources of conflicts and value issues in the organization (i.e., different people, different problems, different designs) and of providing a design mechanism to coordinate and integrate the different perspectives necessary if innovative solutions are to arise. In fact, we see that the ability of an organization to *confront* needed changes and different problems is heavily based on the organization's ability to design itself for the possibility of taking advantage of such confrontations—that these various confrontations do not occur by chance, by the dictates of a few individuals, or via a reactive as opposed to a proactive stance. Rather, this confrontation is explicitly approached as an organization design problem—one which requires the organization to allocate resources to implement such a system.

## CONCLUSIONS

We have argued that not only do we need a more comprehensive and more systematic approach to organization design, but perhaps even more fundamentally, that we need to confront and to examine consciously our value positions as organization theorists. This dictum applies no less to the authors of this paper than it does to others. We realize only too well the strong components of NT and NF in our own thinking. In part this helps to account for why we have been so stridently critical of the conceptualizations of others. In a word, in our role as social scientists we all need to develop a much greater awareness of the kinds of stories that we prefer to tell (Argyris, 1968). Gouldner has put it well. His words make a fitting epilogue:

> The sociologists' task today is not only to see people as they see themselves, nor to see themselves as others see them; it is also to see *themselves* as they see other people. What is needed is a new and heightened

self-awareness among sociologists, which would lead them to ask the same kinds of questions about themselves as they do about taxicab drivers or doctors, and to answer them in the same ways. Above all, this means that we must acquire the ingrained habit of viewing our own beliefs as we would those held by others. It means, for example, that when we are asked why it is that some sociologists believe sociology must be a "value-free discipline," we do not simply reply with the logical arguments on its behalf. Sociologists must surrender the human but elitist assumption that *others* believe out of need whereas *they* believe because of the dictates of logic and reason.

It will be relatively easy for sociologists to adopt such a standpoint with respect to their *professional* beliefs; it will be far harder, however, for them to do so with respect to their *scientific* beliefs and behavior. It will be difficult for them to feel in their bones, for example, that "scientific method" is not simply a logic but also a morality; that it is, moreover, the ideology of a small-scale social movement whose object is the reform—a very singular and distinctive kind of reform—of sociology itself, and whose social character is not much different from that of any other social movement (Gouldner, 1970, pp. 25–26).

# APPENDIX

## An ST Ideal Organization

My ideal work organization is one in which the structure is such that one person ultimately sets up the rules and regulations. He should have knowledgeable persons advising him. The information should flow downward and upward with all the persons involved being asked their opinion. The employees should all be judged on the basis of their ability to do their job and if they are not suited for their job then they should either be transferred to a more appropriate job or let go. The building should be such that it is conducive to good work. The equipment should be the best for each job and kept in repair. Each person should receive adequate training for the job. There must be rules and regulations that apply. There should be uniformity in their application. Yet we should be aware of the rare situation where we have to take the individual's side. Suggestions for improvement should always be encouraged and given serious consideration.

## An NF Ideal Organization

My idea of an ideal organization is one that has unlimited funds, rules and regulations that are flexible, and one that would encompass all the problems people could have.

This organization would take the place of all other social agencies, private and public. It would have sufficient staff to offer whatever help is necessary to the client including help with money management, hospital and other medical bills, social services, employment counseling, and emotional problems. It would have to be a large staff but hopefully it would eliminate all the duplicating of services that is now in effect. It should be free of political pressures.

It would be a tremendous cost but it should benefit the entire United States. I guess what I'm trying to say is we should have some form of socialized medicine. The term medicine would not be strictly related to medical problems. If we could start helping people at the point they have problems and not shift them from one phase to another we would eliminate or contain most of the problems we are faced with today.

For instance a man who is unemployed, whose wife is pregnant, no way to pay doctor bills, other children in the home who come home crying because they don't have what other children have, this man is likely to go out and do something dishonest to try to get what his family needs. In short everyone should get what help they need when they need it.

## An SF Story

"Utopia in the Business World"

The day had been a particularly harrowing one at the office with more than the normal amount of frustrations with the administration, the workers and even the public. I went home and fell exhausted into bed.

Suddenly I awoke and looked around. Where was I? What was this strange place? Who were these people? At that moment I was approached by a smiling person with hand extended who said "welcome to our organization. We are glad to have you with us. My name is_____. I will take you around to meet the rest of the staff."

Everyone I met was very friendly and in the days to come proved to be most helpful. My duties were explained to me quite clearly and thoroughly. The procedure with which I had to work was written in such a way that there was very little chance of misinterpretation.

All the staff worked quite well with each other with a minimum of disagreements. The separate department heads would meet once a week with the Administrator who would keep them informed of new developments. The department heads would then keep the workers informed. Once a month the Administrator would address the entire staff. There was a free and easy exchange of ideas. There was no CIA atmos-

phere nor were there always a lot of rumors floating around. No one ever said "I hear by the grapevine". There was no need to "hear by the grapevine". Everyone was fully informed as to the opportunities available to them.

A door slammed and suddenly I was transported from the Ideal Organization back to the world from which I came.

## An NT Ideal Organization

The ideal organization is one in which the goals are developed in response to the interrelation between environmental and member-generated factors. In other words, the goals would be a reaction to a need of the environment as well as a need by the members to satisfy the environmental need. The structure itself will provide its own goals, controls, divisions of labor, motivation, and reward structure. Also, free entry and exit by members should be present, providing constant feedback and fresh perceptions of environmental needs. Thus, if environmental needs and/or organization needs change, the structure will naturally change with these changes.

## REFERENCES

**Argyris, C.**

1957   *Personality and Organization.* New York: Harper.

1968   "Some unintended consequences of rigorous research." *Psychological Bulletin,* **70:** 185–197.

**Bennis, W. G.**

1966   *Changing Organizations.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

**Bradford, L. P., J. R. Gibb, and K. D. Benne**

1964   *T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method.* New York: Wiley.

**Burns, T., and G. M. Stalker**

1969   "On mechanistic and organic systems." In *Organizations II.* J. A. Litterer (ed.). New York: Wiley (2nd ed.), pp. 345–348.

**Campbell, J.**

1971   *The Hero With a Thousand Faces.* New York: Meridan.

**Churchman, C. W.**

1968   *Challenge to Reason.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

1971   *The Design of Inquiring Systems.* New York: Basic Books.

**de Santillana, G.**

1961   *The Origins of Scientific Thought.* New York: New American Library.

**Gouldner, A. W.**

1970   *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology.* New York: Equinox.

**Grayson, C. J.**

1973   "Management science and business practice." *Harvard Business Review,* pp. 41–48.

**Jung, C. G.**

1968   *Analytical Psychology, Its Theory and Practice.* New York: Vintage.

**Katz, D., and R. L. Kahn**

1966   *The Social Psychology of Organizations.* New York: Wiley.

**Kilmann, R. H.**

1974   "An effective organic-adaptive organization: The MAPS method." *Personnel,* **51**: 35–47.

**Kilmann, R. H., and I. I. Mitroff**

1976   "Qualitative versus quantitative analysis for management science: Different forms for different psychological types." *Management Science,* **6.**

**Kilmann, R. H., and V. Taylor**

1974   "A contingency approach to laboratory learning: Psychological types versus experiental norms." *Human Relations,* **27**: 891–909.

**Kluckholn, C.**

1960   "Recurrent themes in myth and mythmaking." In *Myth and Mythmaking.* H. A. Murray (ed.). New York: Braziller, pp. 268–279.

**Lawrence, P. R., and J. W. Lorsch**

1967a   "Differentiation and integration in complex organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* **12:** 1–47.

1967b   *Organization and Environment.* Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey.

**Likert, R.**

1961   *New Patterns of Management.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

**Lorsch, J. W., and P. R. Lawrence**

1970   *Studies in Organization Design.* Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey.

**McGregor, D.**

1960   *The Human Side of Enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

**Marshall, I. N.**

1967   "The four functions: A conceptual analysis." *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* **12**: 1–31.

**Mason, R. O., and I. I. Mitroff**

1973   "A program for research on management information systems." *Management Science,* **19**: 475–487.

**Mintzberg, H.**

1971   "Managerial work: Analysis from observation." *Management Science,* **19**: 475–487.

1973   *The Nature of Managerial Work.* New York: Harper.

**Mitroff, I. I.**

1974   *The Subjective Side of Science: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Psychology of the Apollo Moon Scientists.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

1974   "Norms and counter-norms in a select group of the Apollo moon scientists: a case study of the ambivalence of scientists." *American Sociological Review,* **39**: 579–595.

**Mitroff, I. I., J. Nelson, and R. O. Mason**

1974   "On management myth-information systems." *Management Science,* **21**: 371–382.

**Mogar, R. E.**

1969   "Toward a psychological theory of education." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology,* **9**: 17–52.

**Murray, H. A.**

1960   *Myth and Mythmaking.* New York: Braziller.

**Myers, I. B.**

1962   *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Survey.

**Parsons, T.**

1960   *Structure and Process in Modern Societies.* New York: Free Press.

**Seiler, J. A.**

1963   "Diagnosing interdepartmental conflict." *Harvard Business Review,* **41**: 121–132.

**Simon, H. A.**

1957   *Administrative Behavior.* New York: Free Press.

**Stinchcombe, A. L.**

1959    "Bureaucratic and craft administration of production: A comparative study." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **4**: 168–187.

**Taylor, F. W.**

1911    *The Principles of Scientific Management.* New York: Harper.

**Thomas, J. M., and W. G. Bennis**

1973    *Management of Change and Conflict.* Maryland: Penguin.

**Toffler, A.**

1970    *Future Shock.* New York: Bantam.

**Weber, M.**

1947    *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization.* New York: Free Press.