

Forthcoming: Journal of Applied Behavioral Science

The Role of Alfred J Marrow and the Harwood Manufacturing Corporation in the Advancement of OD

Bernard Burnes

Chair of Organisational Change
Stirling Management School
University of Stirling
Stirling
FK9 4LA
Scotland, UK

Telephone: +44 (0)1786 467366

Fax: +44 (0)1786 467400

E-mail: bernard.burnes@stir.ac.uk

Abstract

The Harwood Manufacturing Corporation began its life in the garment-trade sweatshops of New York at the end of the 19th century, and ended its independent existence in the sweatshops of Honduras and Costa Rica at the end of the 20th century. Inbetween, under the influence of Kurt Lewin and Alfred Marrow, it became seen as a beacon of progressive management: the place where the values, tools and philosophy of the Organization Development (OD) movement were trialled, extended and established. Harwood laid the foundations of the group-orientated OD which emerged in the 1950s and shaped the more system-wide and integrated approach to OD that came to the fore in the 1970s. As such it left a lasting legacy which has been institutionalised in current OD practices and values.

Keywords: Alfred J Marrow, Harwood Manufacturing Corporation, Institute for Social Research, Kurt Lewin, Organization Development, Weldon Manufacturing Company.

The Role of Alfred J Marrow and the Harwood Manufacturing Corporation in the Advancement of OD

Introduction

Organization development (OD) has been, and arguably still is, the major approach to organisational change across the Western world, and increasingly globally (Boje *et al*, 2011; Burnes, 2017b; Cummings and Worley, 2015; Piotrowski and Armstrong, 2005; Ramos and Rees, 2008; Wirtenberg *et al*, 2004 & 2007). Historians of OD tend to regale the reader with the names and theories of respected academics who have contributed to its creation and advancement (Dent, 2002; Gallos, 2006; Freedman 1996 & 1999). This ignores or only gives a passive role to the organisations and their managers where OD was trialled and proved effective (see French, 1982; French and Bell, 1973). The most notable exception is the Harwood Manufacturing Corporation and Alfred J Marrow, who led it for nearly 40 years, which is acknowledged as having played a vital role alongside Kurt Lewin in laying the foundations of OD between 1939 and Lewin's death in 1947 (Burnes, 2007). However, though significant, Harwood's contribution to OD is usually only mentioned in passing, seen as being limited to its work with Lewin and often as an addendum to Lewin's pioneering work on organisation and social change. In truth the history of Harwood as a company and its post-Lewin contribution to OD has been largely forgotten or misunderstood (e.g. Alderfer, 1977; Beer and Walton, 1987; Burke, 1976; Cooper, 1977; Cummings and Worley, 2015; French and Bell, 1995; Gallos, 2006; Porras and Berg, 1978; Weick and Quinn, 1999).

Similarly, though Marrow¹ played a significant role in the creation and advancement of OD, he is now chiefly remembered as Lewin's biographer (Marrow, 1969), even by many of those active in the OD field in the 1960s and 1970s². This paper sets out to rectify this omission by reviewing the history of Harwood and its contribution to OD, especially its work in the early 1960s when it purchased and revitalised the Weldon Manufacturing Company and demonstrated how OD's constituent practices could be brought together to form an

organisation-wide approach to change, which later became seen as 'classic' or 'classical' OD (Bushe, 2011; Marshak and Grant, 2008; Oswick, 2009).

As will be shown, Harwood began life in the garment-trade sweatshops of New York at the end of the 19th century, and ended its independent existence in the sweatshops of Honduras and Costa Rica at the end of the 20th century. However, inbetween, it became seen as a beacon of progressive management: the place where participative management was born and where the values, tools and philosophy of today's OD movement were established.

Harwood's history is entwined with that of two remarkable men: Kurt Lewin and Alfred Marrow. Lewin is seen as the founder of OD and one of the major figures in 20th century psychology (Burnes, 2017a, Schein, 1988; Tolman, 1948). Alfred Marrow, whose father and grandfather founded Harwood, was not just a successful businessman who pioneered progressive management, but also an academic, management consultant, public servant, social campaigner, prolific public speaker and friend of leading figures in public life, such as the US Vice President Hubert Humphrey (French, 1979; Highhouse, 2007). Above all, as his obituary stated:

... although Marrow appreciated the significance of Lewin's theory, he clearly identified more strongly with Lewin's passion for using psychology to improve the quality of life. He was first and foremost a man of action who was most successful in applying the Lewinian methods of action research to problems of managing organizations and reducing prejudices (French, 1979: 1109).

Though this focus on action can be seen in all his activities, it was most clearly demonstrated in his work with Harwood, the company he headed for over three decades and whose pioneering programme of experiments he led during this period (Marrow, 1972b). As

Dent (2002: 272) commented:

Although this comprehensive effort is much less well-known than the Hawthorne studies, the research which came out of it has perhaps had a greater impact on group decision-making processes, self-management, leadership development, meeting management, stereotyping and resistance to change, among others.

This paper has two aims:

1. To show that not only did Harwood play a key role in laying the foundations of OD in the 1940s, but it also helped to create a more system-wide and integrated OD in the 1960s.
2. To set this within a wider history of Harwood from its birth in 1899 to the closure of its US plants in 1992 and the sale of its overseas plants in 1996.

The paper begins by examining Harwood's origins and its move to Marion, Virginia in 1939. There follows a brief examination of Harwood's involvement with Kurt Lewin between 1939 and 1947, which shows that the main elements of Lewin's planned approach to change were developed and tested at Harwood in this period. The paper then discusses how, after Lewin's death, Harwood continued to develop his participative approach to management. This leads on to the main part of the paper, which examines Harwood's purchase and transformation of the Weldon Manufacturing Company. This presents how Marrow brought together and integrated key OD tools and techniques and in so doing created the template for the 'classical' form of OD that came to the fore in the 1970s. The next section discusses how, through the work of Marrow and the involvement of the Institute for Social Research (ISR) at the University of Michigan, the integrated form of OD used at Weldon became institutionalised within the OD movement. The paper then charts the retirement of Marrow and the subsequent decline of Harwood as a US-based manufacturer and exemplar of participative management. The paper concludes that Marrow was a remarkable man and Harwood was a remarkable company, which made a significant contribution to the development and advancement of OD over nearly 40 years.

In compiling the history of the Harwood Manufacturing Corporation, this paper draws on four main sources:

1. Published articles and books, many of which were authored or edited by Alfred Marrow and others connected with the Harwood studies.

2. Archival material, especially the Lewin and Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
3. Interviews carried out with former employees of Harwood's plants in Marion, Virginia, during annual visits to Marion between 2006 and 2014, timed to coincide with the ex-Harwood workers' annual reunion.
4. Correspondence with leading figures in the OD field from the 1960s and 1970s.

Harwood: The Early Years

Harwood was a family concern founded in 1899 with a capital of \$1000, partly saved and partly borrowed (Marrow, 1967b). The founders were Alfred's father, Isidor, and his grandfather, Simon, who had emigrated from Germany in 1884. Isidor was 'a self-made entrepreneur ... a personable man and benevolent manager, he had limited technical knowledge and survived on a marginal basis in a highly competitive line of business' (Marrow, 1967b: 24).

Harwood began life in New York, where its Head Office remained until the 1980s. New York was the centre of the US garment trade, an industry built on cheap, immigrant labour employed in a multitude of small factories. These were the epitome of the sweatshop: a place where employees, including children, worked for long hours in harsh and often dangerous conditions for very low wages (Bender and Greenwald, 2003; Chin, 2005; Zinn, 1980). Given the highly competitive nature of the garment industry and Harwood's 'marginal' existence, it seems likely that it started out as a sweatshop.

By the 1920s, Harwood had relocated its factory to New Bedford, Massachusetts, the location of some of the largest textile mills in the world and, as such, a plentiful and cheap source of the materials necessary for garment production (Rivard, 2002). The New Bedford industry was just as 'sweated' as that of New York, which led to a number of large and bitter

labour disputes in the 1920s; it also suffered severely from the Great Depression of the 1930s, which saw the industry rapidly decline (Filippelli, 1990; Georgianna and Aaronson, 1993; Zinn, 1980).

Nevertheless, Harwood was doing well enough in the early 1930s for Isidor to send his sons Alfred and Seymour to university and to build a mansion in New York. When he died in 1947, his obituary described him as a businessman, Director of the Israel Zion Hospital and someone who had long been involved in philanthropic and educational work (New York Times, 1947).

Like many such companies, in order to reduce costs, Harwood decided to move south, in its case to Marion, Virginia where in 1939 it opened a new plant. One long-serving manager³ suggested that it moved to get away from trade unions, which - given the past history of industrial conflicts in New Bedford - could well have been the situation. It was also the case that many progressive employers and also industrial psychologists, both of which included Marrow, saw trade unions as an obstacle to good employee relations rather than a necessary protector of labour (Desmond and Wilson, 2018; Zickar, 2004). Nevertheless, correspondence between Harwood and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (ACWA) shows that their relationship was friendly, as the following extract from a letter to the Union from Isidor testifies⁴:

... we sincerely appreciate the kind and helpful cooperation we have received from Mr Herman and Mr Lavelle ... It is just cooperation such as this kind that makes for a better and more sympathetic feeling between employers and employees ...

The move to Marion⁵ coincided with the growing friendship between Marrow and Kurt Lewin (Burnes, 2004). Marrow met Lewin in 1934 when he consulted Lewin about his PhD topic. By 1937, when Marrow received his doctorate, they were firm friends. Marrow was torn between a career in the family business or in academia; Lewin convinced him he could do

both, pointing out that Marrow's role at Harwood would allow him a unique position to conduct research (Marrow, 1969). As Marrow (1972a: 84) commented:

I decided to follow Lewin's advice. I realized that with the power of chief executive, I could set up research programs that would provide insights into the management of people in organizations and thereby discover new ways to get people to attain their potential and work at their best.

This also suited Lewin. He was beginning to move his research from the laboratory into the real world. Though he was applying his theories to social problems, Harwood offered him the opportunity to apply them to the world of work (Burnes, 2007). In effect, Harwood would provide the evidence for his famous dictum 'There is nothing so practical as a good theory' (Lewin, 1943/4: 169).

Harwood: The Lewin Years

Lewin's collaboration with Harwood is widely known, if not always well-understood (Cartwright and Zander, 1953; Coch and French, 1948; French, 1979; Dent, 2002; Highhouse, 2007). Burnes (2007) and Marrow (1969) have provided thorough accounts of this work and showed how it laid the foundation of OD. Therefore, we will summarise this period rather than covering it in detail. Lewin's involvement with Harwood began in 1939, when he was asked to assist the company in overcoming the twin problems of low productivity and high labour turnover, which threatened to bankrupt the company. This emphasises that Lewin's theoretical rigour needed to deliver practical outcomes.

Lewin recruited first Alex Bavelas and later John French to assist him with this work. Both were psychologists who had worked for Lewin and both later had distinguished academic careers (House, 1993). A host of studies were undertaken between 1939 and Lewin's death in 1947 (Marrow, 1957; 1967b; 1972c). There is no systematic record of all the studies, but the key ones concerned group decision-making, self-management, leadership training, changing stereotypes and overcoming resistance to change (Burnes, 2007). Though initiated to address particular issues as they arose, they were underpinned by and helped

demonstrate the efficacy of the key elements of Lewin's planned approach to change: field theory, action research, group dynamics and his democratic-participative change philosophy (Burnes, 2004; Dent, 2002; Highhouse, 2007; Lewin, 1946a, 1947a & b; Marrow, 1969; Mirvis, 2006).

Though the collaboration between Harwood and Lewin ended with his untimely death in 1947, it did not end Harwood's commitment to his participative approach to managing and changing organisations. This had brought significant benefits to the company: sales had increased by 300%; productivity by 20%; there was a 50% reduction in quality problems; a 45% reduction in absenteeism; a 65% reduction in labour turnover; and workers' participation in decision-making was the norm (New York Times, 1948). In Marrow's (1969: 145) words, Lewin's 'experimentation at Harwood' had a very positive effect on 'practical factory needs'. It also provided strong evidence for the efficacy of Lewin's participative approach to change, something which Marrow continued to stress for the rest of his life (French, 1979).

In looking at the period 1939 -1947, it can be seen that the main elements of Lewin's planned approach to change were developed and tested at Harwood (Burnes, 2004 & 2007; French, 1979). Secondly, these self-same tools and their accompanying values went on to form the basis of the fledgling OD movement (Burnes and Cooke, 2012). The mechanisms for achieving this were threefold:

- Marrow's tireless promotion of Lewin's legacy and Harwood as its living symbol (French, 1979; MacKinnon, 1964; Marrow, 1969).
- The National Training Laboratories (NTL) and T-groups. The Harwood work provided the basis of the approach used in the 1946 New Britain workshops, from which T-groups and the NTL emerged and which formed the spearhead of OD in the 1950s and 1960s (Burnes and Cooke, 2012; Freedman, 1999; Marrow, 1964, 1967a & 1969).

- Marrow's collaboration with Lewin led to the establishment in 1946 of the Research Center for Group Dynamics (RCGD), which was staffed with their close associates, including Ronald Lippitt, a co-founder of the NTL (Dent and Goldberg, 1999; French, 1982; French and Bell, 1995; Highhouse, 2002; Marrow, 1969). In 1949 this merged with the Survey Research Centre (SRC), run by Lewin's close friend Rensis Likert, to form the leading, largest and oldest organisation still promoting OD intervention, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) at the University of Michigan (Dent and Goldberg, 1999; French, 1982; French and Bell, 1995; Highhouse, 2002; Marrow, 1969). It also brought together key elements of Lewin's work: group dynamics, field theory, participative management and survey research (a form of action research) (Cartwright and Zander, 1953; Frantilla, 1998; Jackson, 1956).

Harwood after Lewin

Lewin's death did not lessen Harwood's commitment to participative management. Though based in New York, Marrow received weekly reports of experiments at the Marion plant and directed their progress⁶. Based on Marrow's talent for publicity, the company was regularly portrayed in the press as a forward-thinking, humane and successful company (Fortune, 1946), attracting headlines such as: *Human Relations Raises Sales by 300%* (New York Times, 1948: 31).

John French left after Lewin's death, but he was replaced as plant psychologist by Dr Gilbert David. His remit was to continue developing participative management. For example, David conducted an experiment aimed at reducing labour turnover and absenteeism amongst new recruits in their first 13 weeks of employment. The result was that turnover was 6% amongst the experimental group, but remained around 55% for the control group, and the corresponding figures for absenteeism were 3% and 10% (Marrow, 1957). French continued to work with Harwood as a consultant and 'informal member of the management team' for several decades and played a leading role in many of the subsequent change initiatives

(House, 1993; Marrow, 1972b: 92). For example, in 1958 French led a major participative reorganisation of Harwood's Marion plants involving all 1000 employees, which significantly improved its competitiveness and profitability.

As Harwood's approach to participative management developed, its business flourished. In 1940 it had 200 employees; by 1950, it had 600 and by 1960, it employed around 1000. It was also making considerable profits and using these to develop and expand its business. In 1957, it opened its first overseas plant in Puerto Rico and also took over two other businesses (Marrow, 1972b).

As for Alfred Marrow, it might be considered that he would be busy enough running a successful business. However, he also became a faculty member of the New School for Social Research, New York City Commissioner for Intergroup Relations and an active management consultant. In the 1960s, whilst still running Harwood, he became President of the National Academy of Professional Psychologists, a trustee of the New School for Social Research, Antioch College, Gonzaga University and the NTL Institute, as well as many other posts. He also received many honours, such as the Department of State Citation of Distinguished Service and the Kurt Lewin Memorial Award (French, 1979; MacKinnon, 1964).

The 1960s: Harwood Acquires Weldon

By the beginning of the 1960s, Harwood was very profitable and able to purchase a major competitor - the Weldon Manufacturing Company, which like Harwood had its head office in New York. Weldon made similar products, especially pyjamas, and offered Harwood the opportunity to increase its market share significantly, especially in the 'higher-priced "quality" market to which Weldon sold in depth' and where profit margins were higher (SA Marrow, 1967: 5). Nevertheless, by the time of the takeover, Weldon was in deep trouble. In the 1950s, it had employed 3500 manufacturing staff in five plants. Owing to disastrous forays

into new markets, by 1961 it only employed 1000 staff in just one factory located in Williamsport, Pennsylvania (SA Marrow, 1967).

Weldon was run by two owner-directors who had started the business in the 1940s. Each had their own 'empire', which they guarded jealously – one running the merchandising (design, sales and marketing) operation based in New York, and the other the manufacturing side, based in Pennsylvania. Merchandising employed some 100 clerks and administrators in New York plus a sales force which covered the country. Harwood took over the company on 1 January 1962 and intended to operate it as an independent business with the same staff and managed by the two former owner-directors, who became salaried employees (SA Marrow, 1967; Marrow *et al*, 1972). Harwood knew that Weldon was in poor financial shape, but assumed that some updating of Weldon's manufacturing facilities and practices would overcome that. However, Harwood soon realised that the situation was far more serious than it had thought. For example, in 1962 it had a labour turnover of around 120%, which as John Nelson, Harwood's Vice President of Manufacturing, commented:

[Was] one to stagger the imagination. The paperwork alone on hiring 743 people and terminating 964 others is quite a task without the consideration of the impact on training facilities, training time, supervisory and management time, quality and cost⁷.

As Table 1 shows, in comparison with Harwood, Weldon was also in serious trouble on other key measures, especially return on investment and productivity. Morale was also much lower (Seashore and Bowers, 1970) and it was 'hard to overstate the [employee] dissatisfaction at Weldon' (Marrow *et al*, 1972: 105).

Insert Table 1 here

Harwood concluded that the main problem was the management style of the two founders, which had created a dysfunctional culture (SA Marrow, 1967). They did not trust anyone, especially each other. They took sole responsibility for all decisions and planning: even minor items of expenditure, such as the maintenance and repair of equipment, needed their

approval, which often resulted in delays to production. Their centralised-dictatorial approach had worked in the early years of Weldon, but as it grew and became more complex, their approach proved counterproductive, which is why the business rapidly contracted in the latter half of the 1950s (SA Marrow, 1967). There was little coordination between merchandising and production. Often, the plant did not know what orders were coming, nor did the sales staff know what problems existed within the plant. Production schedules were unreliable, workflow fluctuated wildly and workers sometimes went from overtime to layoff in the same week. In addition, a climate of fear existed in both the New York and Pennsylvania sides of the company. If someone did something well, nothing would be said, but any mistake would bring a torrent of criticism (Smith, 1967). Predictably, most managers and staff felt that the safest course was to 'do nothing at all on your own; to work only as directed; to refer all uncertainties upwards for decisions' (Smith, 1967: 134). The situation at Weldon was summed up by a local taxi driver who commented that, 'It's a sweat shop. They work you like crazy for a couple of weeks and then throw you out' (Pearse, 1967: 114).

Marrow commissioned the ISR to conduct a survey of the Weldon workforce and, arising from this, to implement a major action research initiative in the company (French, 1979)⁸. Given their close links, employing the ISR was an obvious choice for Marrow (Cartwright and Zander, 1953; Marrow, 1969). Though Marrow oversaw the change programme, it was implemented by the ISR's Stanley E Seashore and David G Bowers⁹, who were pioneers in the field of organisational behaviour (Dent and Goldberg, 1999). Bowers was Study Director of the ISR's Survey Research Center and Seashore was the ISR's Assistant Director. Seashore had worked as a consultant before moving into academia and went on to become a leading figure in the field of industrial and organisational psychology (Kahn and Tannenbaum, 2005). Seashore was also the cousin of Edie and Charlie Seashore, both leading members of the NTL and the OD Network, and close associates of Ronald Lippitt, who had supervised Charlie's PhD at Michigan¹⁰ (Alderferer, 1992; Helgesen, 2006).

The Weldon action research programme brought together four key elements of OD, which had previously tended to be used separately: survey feedback, a form of action research that focuses on data collection, feedback and problem identification and solution (Nadler, 1977); Likert's (1961) System Four classification of management styles; the participative, group dynamics approach to management and change developed at Harwood (French, 1982) and T-groups. All these emerged from Lewin's work in the 1940s, especially his work with Marrow (Ashkanasy, 2008; Burnes and Cooke, 2012; Crosby, 2015; French, 1982; Likert, 1947).

Also, as Bowers and Seashore (1967a) observe, the sequence in which these elements were used and the changes that took place at Weldon followed Lewin's (1947a & b) Three Step Model of change:

... an "unfreezing" or disruption of the initial steady state, then a period of disturbance with the trial of various adaptive possibilities, and finally a period of consolidation of change with "refreezing" in a new steady state. (Bowers and Seashore, 1967a: 232)

In turn, the foundations of the Three Step Model are based on Lewin's (1946a) field theory, which argues that behaviour is derived from the totality of coexisting and interdependent forces that impinge on a person or group and form a quasi-stationary equilibrium that holds this behaviour in place.

Therefore, the first step that was taken was to identify the forces that were maintaining the initial steady state and unfreeze them. Using System Four, Bowers and Seashore rated Weldon as System 1 – Exploitative-Authoritative and Harwood as System 4 – Participative. The difference is very much akin to that between McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y. This showed that the current state was held in place by Weldon's management style, which created an 'ineffective and rigid "pattern" or "system" of relationships' that permeated all its activities (Pearse, 1967: 111-2). If this was to be replaced by the democratic-participative style of management which had served Harwood so well in Marion, there would need to be

widespread changes in attitudes and behaviour; in effect, Weldon's culture would have to change. This is why Harwood took a systems approach to the change: one which recognised that 'all parts of a system are interdependent. A change in any one part or subsystem requires adaptive changes in other parts' (Bowers and Seashore, 1967a: 226). This is, of course, also consistent with Lewin's Gestalt-based, field theory approach to change (Lewin, 1947a & b).

For Weldon's managers and supervisors, this meant that they needed to change the way they interacted with each other and the rest of the workforce in order 'to spread responsibility and influence downward in the organization so that each worker could have some significant part in the management of their own work and in the work of those associated with him' (Marrow *et al*, 1972: 109). There would also have to be complementary changes to structures and technology to encourage and reinforce (refreeze) behavioural change.

As Bowers and Seashore (1967b: 146) noted, Harwood's aims in adopting this approach to running Weldon were not altruistic; it was seen as the most effective way of achieving the following:

1. Attainment of a reasonably good profit return, instead of a loss, on invested capital.
2. Improvement in operator production efficiency.
3. More economical use of manpower skill resources by avoiding their loss through absence and [labour] turnover.

In addition to the ISR team, three other groups of consultants were involved. One was a team of behavioural scientists whose role was to:

...guide the change in leadership style, strive to increase managerial competence, improve interpersonal relations, train supervisors and executives in the principles of participative management, and serve as instructors in human relations for the entire staff (Marrow *et al*, 1972: 104).

The other teams comprised two groups of engineers whose role was to modernise the manufacturing process at Weldon. All three teams worked closely together to transform Weldon. Initially, most visible progress was made with the organisational and technical changes. Work on the shop floor was re-organised into semi-autonomous production departments, operator training was improved and a training centre established. Off the shop floor, the engineering function was strengthened and a personnel manager was appointed (Bowers and seashore, 1967c).

However, the main improvements were expected from the move to plant-wide participative management, which was the responsibility of the ISR and the behavioural scientists. Their approach was based on the OD philosophy, tools and techniques that had grown out of Lewin's work at Harwood in the 1940s (Burnes, 2004): action research, joint problem-solving groups, group dynamics, teambuilding and a series of extended T-group 'confrontation meetings' (Marrow *et al*, 1972:). The purpose of such meetings is to 'sensitise' individuals and groups to their own behaviour and emotions and how these affect the behaviour and emotions of others (Highhouse, 2002). Though the indiscriminate use of the T-group approach led to its fall from grace in the 1970s, the 'in-company' or 'family' manifestation used at Weldon was seen to be effective and is still used today (Burnes and Cooke, 2012; Crosby, 2013 & 2015).

The behaviour change programme was conducted in three overlapping phases, beginning with managers, moving on to supervisors and finishing with shop floor workers. The 'family' groups comprised people who normally worked together and whose behaviour had a significant impact on each other's performance. The change programme began by putting these family groups through a series of two- to four-day 'confrontation meetings'. Before these commenced, there were extensive staff briefings and the members of the family groups were individually interviewed before and after each session.

At the Weldon plant, the first 'family' group comprised the six top managers. These top managers, whose relationships with each other had previously been fractious, described their family group meetings as 'deeply moving' and as allowing them to reassess a 'lifetime of values and beliefs' and giving them a 'new feeling of confidence in dealing with each other, and greater awareness of their impact on each other' (Marrow *et al*, 1972: 113).

Encouraged by the visible changes in managers' behaviour, the consultants then turned their attention to supervisors and workers.

Supervisors were not particularly effective. There were serious difficulties in all parts of the plant with many unresolved work problems, especially in terms of employee motivation.

Supervisors were seen as having a key role to play in addressing these issues by creating the same sort of a participative ethos that was being developed with managers. This was to be driven by two central ideas. The first was that supervisors needed to see their role as different from the past; in particular, they would have to reconsider their work relationships.

Secondly, changes to shop floor working practices and organisation would have to be initiated, or at least endorsed, by the supervisors and their teams through joint problem-solving efforts (Pearse, 1967).

The main changes for managers and supervisors revolved around the development of their interpersonal skills, but for shop floor workers, the changes were more extensive. As well as enabling their involvement in decision-making and developing their interpersonal skills, the workers' job skills and motivation needed to be improved (Bowers and Seashore, 1967c).

Involving them in joint problem-solving groups with supervisors appeared to have the most positive effect on shop floor workers' productivity, morale and their relations with supervisors (Pearse, 1967).

The OD approach was much less successful in the New York office. Several of the more able managers had already left before the takeover. The former owner responsible for

merchandising left after attending just one T-group session. His son and son-in-law followed shortly afterwards. This left merchandising without any real leadership or technical ability and Harwood had no alternative but to rebuild it from scratch (Bowers and Seashore, 1967a; Marrow *et al*, 1972).

Given the scale of the changes at Weldon, the improvement process was slow. By the middle of 1962, productivity was actually falling. This put the managers under an enormous strain, especially as they saw subordinates struggling with delegated tasks, which they could have done much more easily themselves (Bowers and Seashore, 1967c). It was 1963 before progress began to be made, but by the end of that year, Weldon's performance was approaching that of the Marion plants¹¹. In 1964, the ISR reported that managers, supervisors and workers were operating on a much more participative basis: Weldon had moved from a System 1 - Exploitative-Authoritative form of management to a System 3 – Consultative form (Seashore and Bowers, 1970). As Table 2 shows, there had also been a remarkable improvement in Weldon's profit and productivity rates. In addition, product defects were reduced by 37% and customer returns by 57% (Marrow *et al*, 1972).

For Marrow (1964: 20), Weldon demonstrated that it was possible to 'please the profit conscious executive without neglecting the humanization of managerial skills or employee satisfaction'. Symbolic of the new relationship between workers and management, the company amicably agreed to union recognition, something the old management had bitterly resisted for over two decades (Bowers and Seashore, 1967b; Kornbluh, 1967).

Insert Table 2 here

By 1964, the Lewinian process of unfreezing and moving at Weldon had create a very different organisation, but this had taken two years and an enormous level of support, which once removed could have led to a return to old ways. However, this did not happen and a

refreezing of the new behaviour seemed to have occurred. A comparison of the performance of all the Harwood companies against a similar group of companies carried out in late 1965 showed that Harwood's profit after tax was 125% greater than the comparator group¹². In 1969, Seashore and Bowers returned to 'bring the Weldon story up-to-date'¹³. They found that workers' satisfaction with the company and their own jobs had continued to increase, as had profitability, and the organisation was more participative than in 1964 (Seashore and Bowers, 1970).

Likert (1967: ix) described the events at Weldon as 'an extraordinarily successful improvement of a failing organization'. Harwood's attempt to export its participative culture to Weldon had worked remarkably well. Bowers and Seashore (1967a: 233) put this down to the 'unusual scope and coherence in the program of change', which embraced both technical-structural and behavioural-participative elements. The 'scope and coherence' of the Weldon initiative stands in sharp contrast with Harwood's more piecemeal approach in the 1940s. Though there was a commitment to developing a participative approach, there was no overall understanding or plan of what would be required or existing tools, techniques or experienced change agents. These all had to be developed. Indeed, it was 1944 before Marrow proposed that there was a need 'to involve everyone in the plant, not just a small experimental group'¹⁴. Only in retrospect is it possible to see that as well as creating a participative culture at Harwood, Lewin and Marrow were also testing and establishing the key elements of what would become OD (Burnes, 2007).

At Weldon, from the start, there was an understanding of what was required, a plan for achieving it, a set of developed tools and techniques to draw on and experienced practitioners to utilise them. This was a time when T-groups were dominating OD, and Lewin's wider and more coherent, Three Step approach to change was in danger of being lost (Burnes and Cooke, 2012; Porras and Bradford, 2004). Marrow demonstrated the range of OD tools and techniques, including T-groups, and how these could be used in a coherent

fashion to transform an organisation by, to quote the title of one of his books, 'Making Management Human' (Marrow, 1957). Perhaps not surprisingly, Marrow *et al's* (1967c) Weldon book was described as 'the best report of action research in organizational psychology to appear up to that time' (French, 1979: 1110).

Weldon's Contribution to OD

Harwood's Weldon initiative showed how the separate elements of OD could be integrated into a coherent approach for improving organisational effectiveness. There were a number of other major OD initiatives in the 1950s and 1960s, but these tended to be led by ad hoc groups or small consultancies and did not have Weldon's influence on the future trajectory of OD (Burke, 2011a & b; French, 1982). Weldon's influence arose from four factors. The first was Marrow's evangelical zeal in promoting the practical benefits of Lewinian participative management as exemplified by Harwood and Weldon. Marrow moved seamlessly though the worlds of business, academia and public service, and in each of these he wore his practitioner clothes with pride, continually trumpeting the benefits of the Harwood approach (French, 1979; MacKinnon, 1964; Marrow, 1964). He was a leading figure in practitioner organisations, such as the National Academy of Professional Psychologists, a high-profile management consultant (Marrow, 1974) and a business leader ready to show other managers what Harwood had achieved¹⁵. The publication of Marrow's (1969) biography of Lewin further enhanced his standing. This all meant that the benefits of the Harwood-Weldon approach were widely disseminated amongst managers and OD consultants (Burke, 2011b; French, 1979; MacKinnon, 1964). As Professor Jack Sherwood, a leading OD academic and consultant in the 1960s stated, 'Marrow's work was well-known and well-regarded. I remember it as the first real world evidence for meaningful organizational change'¹⁶.

The second influential factor was the publications that arose from the Weldon experience. Foremost amongst these was '*Management by Participation*' (Marrow *et al*, 1967), which was aimed at influencing practice and practitioners. This can be seen from its '*Preface*':

... this book is written, first, for an alert and literate management, men who seek to broaden their understanding of the problems created by technical and social change, and who need to get some ideas about what one can do – concretely – about planned change (Marrow *et al*, 1967: xvi).

The third factor which ensured that the Weldon approach was promoted and replicated was the work of Stanley Seashore, who was a prominent organisational psychologist¹⁷. He was President of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP), where he played a leading role in the transition of industrial psychology from its focus on individual behaviour to a more 'system-oriented' approach (Kahn and Tannenbaum, 2005). Seashore attached great importance to his collaboration with Marrow¹⁸, one indication of which is that he devoted his 1969 SIOP Presidential address to the Weldon initiative (Seashore and Bowers, 1970). Weldon created the template for his own OD practice, which he inculcated in the ISR¹⁹. For example, the Michigan Doctoral Program in Organizational Psychology, which he ran, was built upon the Weldon work²⁰, and many of its graduates went on to become OD practitioners²¹. In the 1960s and 1970s, he conducted over 30 major change programmes (Seashore, 1978), including in Esso Europe in the mid-1960s where, as the eminent social scientist Lisl Klein noted, he practised 'classic' OD, which was a decade before it became common in the rest of the OD community (Klein, 2005). His links to the wider OD field were also facilitated by his close connections with Edie and Charlie Seashore, his cousins and themselves leading figures in OD (Alderferer, 1992; Helgesen, 2006).

The last factor was the ISR itself. The various groups and individuals that made up the ISR were from its outset infused with Lewinian values and practices developed at Harwood and elsewhere, which formed the basis of OD (French, 1982; Marrow, 1969). What the Weldon experience demonstrated was how these could be brought together, rather than used separately. In turn, what the ISR did was to formalise, further develop and promote the

integrated approach used at Weldon so that it could be replicated and passed on to current and future generations of students, staff and practitioners, and through them to the wider OD movement.

These four factors came together in the late 1960s just at the point when OD was going through a major crisis brought about by the growing disenchantment with the ability of T-groups to improve organisational effectiveness (Burke, 1976; Campbell & Dunnette, 1968; Highhouse, 2002; Joure *et al*, 1971; Kleiner, 1996). At the time, OD was split into three groupings: the West Coast T-groupers driven by 'utopian aspirations' to improve people rather than developing organisations; the East Coast T-groupers led by the NTL, which also had a wider social agenda based on democratising society, but who were more organisation-orientated; and a smaller, more fragmented third group of consultants and academics, including the ISR, who focused on improving organisational effectiveness through action research, group dynamics and survey feedback²² (Freedman, 1999; French, 1982; Mirvis, 2006; Schein, 1995).

With the collapse of T-groups, the West Coast group disappeared and the East Coast group fragmented, with many of its members moving into team-building activities based on group dynamics²³. The third group, whose livelihood depended on selling OD services to organisations, became the dominant force in OD, and the ISR was its biggest and most well-respected member (Burke, 1976; Burnes and Cooke, 2012; Greiner, 1972). OD had originated with and tended to be dominated by academics, but in the late 1960s this began to change (Burnes and Cooke, 2012). The increasing influence on OD of clients and practitioners can be judged by the growth of the OD Network, which is now the leading international body for OD professionals. It was founded in the US in 1964 as the Industrial Trainers Network with 28 members. By 1967, there were just under 50 members, but by 1975, this rose to 1,400 (Coruzzi, 1995). The membership comprised a mix of external and

internal consultants, the latter reflecting the drive by HR departments in the early 1970s to become the centre of change expertise in their organisations²⁴.

Therefore, when the T-group wing of OD collapsed and clients and practitioners were looking for a more reliable method of improving organisational effectiveness, it is not surprising that they should look to the ISR, which offered a proven approach to change based on the Weldon experience²⁵.

Nevertheless, as this broader approach to OD began to take root, there was a clash of philosophies between those who still sought to promote the democratic-humanist ideals espoused by Lewin and embodied in the T-group movement, and the more managerial, results-orientated form of OD promoted by the rapidly-expanding number of practitioners and demanded by their clients (Mirvis, 1988 & 1990). Also, as US businesses faced increasing foreign competition in the 1970s and 1980s, there were increasing calls for more rapid and organisation-wide approaches to change (Peters and Waterman, 1982).

Though the tensions between the academic wing of OD and the practitioner wing had always been present, the balance of forces moved decisively, in the 1970s and 1980s, in favour of the latter (Burnes and Cooke, 2012; Woodman, 2014). As the number of OD practitioners increased and the demand for standardised products grew, especially ones aimed at transformational change, some of the key elements of classic OD began to be watered down, especially field theory and OD's democratic-humanist values (Burnes and Cooke, 2013; French and Bell, 1995; Mirvis, 1988 & 1990). Though some of the newer OD approaches, such as Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987) and Future Search (Weisbord and Janoff, 2010), emphasised participation, the lack of understanding and use of field theory led many to question the utility and sophistication Lewin's Three Step Model, associating it mainly with action research (Bartunek and Woodman, 2015; Burnes, 2004).

In part, this led some in the OD field to experience a crisis of confidence and question whether or not it could or should continue, given the changing nature and demands of organisations (Bradford and Burke, 2004; Greiner and Cummings, 2004; Worley and Feyerherm, 2003). One of the curious things about the debate over the future of OD was how little it considered or seemed to understand OD's past (Burnes and Cooke, 2012). A better appreciation of the origins and purpose of Lewin's Three Step Model, especially its basis in child psychology and its application to resolving social conflict, might have indicated its continuing utility (Lewin, G, 1948; Lewin, 1936, 1946a, 1947a &b; Marrow, 1969). Just as importantly, an understanding of the Weldon experience would have demonstrated how applying the Three Step Model as Lewin intended, i.e. an action research methodology based on field theory and utilising a genuinely participative approach, could lead to enduring transformational change (Marrow *et al*, 1967). Marrow was not a philanthropist when it came to business. His aim at Weldon was to turn around a failing organisation and make it profitable. However, in so doing, he showed that when applied knowledgeably and diligently, Lewin's methods could transform an organisation not only in terms of its performance and management-worker relations, but also its very culture. Given that this is what US organisations were calling for in the 1980s and 1990s, and OD practitioners were struggling to offer, it can be seen that OD's forgetfulness regarding its own history was a significant missed opportunity.

What does this mean for today and the challenges faced not just by organisations, but also society at large? Field theory was Lewin's metatheory, i.e. the theory on which all his work is built, especially his Three Step Model (Adelman, 1993; Allport, 1948; Bargal, 2006; Deutsch, 1968). Even in leading OD textbooks, field theory now appears only in a diluted form (see Cummings and Worley, 2015; French and Bell, 1999). In effect, what we now have is an impoverished version of Lewin's Three Step Model, which mainly focuses on action research (Bartunek and Woodman, 2015). Yet action research, without the underpinnings of field

theory, has a reduced ability to identify, unfreeze and refreeze the forces that bring about and can resolve conflict. Social and organisational conflict has not gone away since Lewin's death. Indeed, given the environmental crisis facing the world, we now have significant conflict between People, Planet and Profit (Cowley *et al*, 2017; Stachowicz-Stanusch, 2017; United Nations, 2015). Lewin's original purpose in developing his change methodologies was to resolve social conflict; at Harwood, Marrow showed how they could also be used to address industrial conflict. As Burnes and Cooke (2012 & 13) argue, used as Lewin originally intended, i.e. as Three Step approach based on field theory, it may well have an important role to play in resolving environmental conflicts between society and organisations.

Harwood: The Decline and Fall

By 1970, Harwood was one of the biggest and most profitable garment producers in the US, employing over 3000 staff and operating in seven plants, three in Marion, the Weldon plant in Pennsylvania and three in Puerto Rico; it would later also open factories in Nicaragua, Honduras and Costa Rica (Marrow, 1972a). Business was booming and it was producing some nine million pairs of pyjamas a year, along with its other products such as underwear and casual clothing (Smyth County News, 1987: 4). The company which in 1937 had opened a small textile factory in rural Virginia had become a major player in the US garment industry, becoming a key supplier to companies such as JC Penney, which in 1971 had over 2000 stores and a turnover of \$5bn (FundingUniverse, 2014).

The US recession of 1973-5 began to change all this. The rise in oil prices, inflation and unemployment, allied to new technologies and increasing global competition, had a dramatic and detrimental effect on the US economy, especially its manufacturing base (Katz, *et al*, 1987; Revenga, 1992). It was most severe in low-skill, low-wage industries such as garment production where prices were being undercut by companies manufacturing in countries with far lower labour costs (Bernard *et al*, 2006; Sachs *et al*, 1994). Harwood was caught in the double bind of falling demand, which increased their costs, and increased foreign

competition from lower-cost producers. Its main customers reduced the size of their orders and demanded Harwood cut its prices. As Wendell Watkins, a Harwood vice-president, later commented:

We have always manufactured private-label goods for big firms (department stores) who can shop the world and get the best price they can. ... Our major customers always insist on having the lowest price. They tell us 'We'll bring it in from the Orient if you can't do something to match the cost' (quoted in Bartlett and Steele, 1996: 3).

Nevertheless, Harwood made near \$1m annual profits for much of the 1970s, but this was on a turnover of \$60m to \$70m²⁶. Thus its profitability, which had been over 5% after tax in the 1960s, fell to around 1% to 2% in the 1970s²⁷. Even worse, by the end of the decade it was in serious financial trouble, losing over \$2m in 1979 and \$5m in 1980. This led to the restructuring of the company, which involved the sale of its women's wear and knitwear divisions for a combined total of just over \$7m. This cut turnover by half, but did eliminate its losses²⁸. The cutbacks also involved the closure of the Weldon plant (Pittsburg Post-Gazette, 1979).

The 1970s also saw the gradual withdrawal of the Marrows from the business. In 1976, at the age of 71, Marrow stepped down as President of Harwood and his brother Seymour, who was then 63, took over the role. In March 1978, Alfred died. In 1981, Michael Rothbaum took over from Seymour as President of the company and in 1983 he bought it from the Marrow family for approximately \$2m, thus ending their involvement (Sloan, 1981)²⁹. Rothbaum had joined Harwood in 1967 as financial vice president and became executive vice president in 1976, when Alfred stepped down from the company. Seymour died in 1986.

Under Rothbaum, Harwood expanded its overseas production activities in order to reduce its costs, especially its wage bill. For example, in 1980, it was one of the first US companies to build a plant in Honduras, the attraction being its low wages, lax labour laws and zero-tax regime (Bartlett and Steele, 1996). As Wendell Watkins, a Harwood executive, commented,

it was the cheap labour that attracted Harwood: 'It's the only benefit. And you do it only so you can compete, not because you want to' (quoted in Bartlett and Steele, 1996: 3).

The company did not give up on US manufacturing, but it did bring in new managers with a more authoritarian style, and existing managers were 'rooted out'. As two ex-workers commented:

Well everybody hated [the new manager], I tell you that right now, they had no use for him, he was awful ... He was a terrible manager so he just rooted out [an existing Harwood Manager] and we didn't like that, you know, then he had this horrible woman up there in Pennsylvania and she just rooted out [a manager who had worked at Marion]³⁰.

[Another existing manager who had worked at Harwood since 1953] was a good man too but they, the people they put in over him, he come in here and they really done him dirty, they done everyone dirty³¹.

Under the new management, the worker participation championed by Marrow died out. One ex-supervisor, who had been at Harwood since 1948, stated that in the 1980s, production methods and times were determined by her through time and motion studies and without consulting the workers concerned³².

Harwood concentrated US production in Marion and acquired new customers, such as Nike, Reebok and Hang Ten (Sloan, 1981), but it could not hold on to these without moving the work to its lower-cost overseas factories, which meant less work for Marion. The plight of these plants was epitomised by pyjama production, which had been the mainstay of the Marion factories since Harwood first moved there in 1937. From the nine million pairs Marion was making per year in the early 1970s, production fell to 360,000 pairs by 1986 (Smyth County News, 1987). With no replacement business for the Marion plants, their days were numbered.

Harwood tried to automate some production processes to cut costs (Mullins, 1986), but as Evelyn Dempsey, a machinist who joined the company in 1948, commented, 'The automated

system was the last thing they did. They said they'd try it and if it didn't work, they'd go out [of business]. I reckon it didn't work' (Simmons, 1997: A1-A3).

In 1986 and 1987, two of its three Marion plants (Holston and Abingdon) were closed, with a combined loss of 350 jobs. This just left Harwood with one Marion factory, which had a much diminished order book (Smyth County News, 1987). On 31 October 1992, this plant also closed, with the company's products now being made in Honduras and Costa Rica. At its height, Harwood had 3000 US-based staff; by the end, it only employed 120 in Marion. Most of the work had been moved offshore, where labour costs were 48 cents per hour as averse to the \$9 paid to the Marion workers (Bartlett and Steele, 1996). As Bob Nelson, a former Harwood vice president for manufacturing commented, 'If J.C.Penney [Harwood's biggest customer] can buy the same garment with the same quality for cheaper, they will – just like you and me' (Simmons, 1997: A3).

The closure of the last Marion plant saw the end of what one long-serving manager called:

... a unique company ... and I was always proud of that and I didn't want to lose, never did want to lose it ... we wanted to leave a better company than we came to work for and I swear we would have done that. We ended up closing, you don't know how hard that is, but ... we had a dang good company going, we did, and it was from the top to the bottom³³.

The first of its overseas plants, opened in the 1950s, adopted Harwood's enlightened management philosophy and the 'manager there had actively encouraged employees to participate' (Marrow *et al*, 1972: 109)³⁴. However, in the changed competitive environment of the 1980s, and under Rothbaum's management, Harwood appeared to become a typical 'maquila'³⁵ company, operating in the Caribbean and Central American Free Trade Zones where wages were very low (as little as 30 cents per hour), taxes zero, labour laws weak and unions aggressively discouraged: something of a throwback to the US sweatshops of the 19th century (Emmelhainz and Adams, 1999; Moure–Eraso *et al*, 1997; Over, 1999; Sklair, 1989). In addition, as Over (1999) observed, Harwood and other companies would

not expect to be subject to local labour laws, such as those governing minimum wages, social security and medical insurance, health and safety and trade union rights.

By moving its manufacturing overseas, Harwood managed to retain its position as one of the US's leading garment manufacturers. Indeed, when it was sold to the Sara Lee Corporation in 1996, it had a turnover of \$55m and was said to be the largest manufacturer of men's underwear in the world³⁶. Though this marked the end of Harwood, its role as the exemplar of Alfred Marrow and Kurt Lewin's approach to industrial democracy had ended much earlier, when the Marrow family sold the company to Rothbaum.

With very little published or archive material about Harwood in this period, one is left with the recollection of ex-workers. As one might expect, there was some bitterness towards the company, with workers feeling 'betrayed' when it moved jobs off-shore³⁷. However, former Marion workers seemed very positive about their time at Harwood under the Marrows:

... the Marrows were good folk³⁸.

Everyone got along well - managers and workers³⁹.

Well it was just a good place to work and good management. They'd treat you nice, be good to you⁴⁰.

[Alfred] walked through the plant and looked at everything and talked to people if they had questions. He was a good person. Everybody liked him. [Seymour] was just one of us more. He was in and out a lot. But they both came and their wives both came [to the Christmas parties]. [I] was treated fairly and it was a good company to work for⁴¹.

Conclusion: A Lasting Contribution

As we have shown, Harwood and its President Alfred Marrow played a crucial role in the creation and advancement of OD. For over three decades, Harwood embodied and promoted the participative values and approaches on which OD was built (Burnes 2004 & 2007; Burnes and Cooke, 2012). This work was led by Marrow, who was a prominent figure in the OD movement in the 1950s and 1960s⁴² (French, 1979). He was the driving force and embodiment of the participative spirit with which he and Lewin imbued Harwood. After

Lewin's death, Marrow continued his work in Harwood and promoted and developed it outside.

When Marrow left the company, it changed dramatically and not for the better as far as the workforce were concerned, which is not unusual when dominant figures depart an organisation (Collins, 2009; Witzel, 2003). Nor should one see Harwood under Marrow as some sort of workers' paradise or Marrow as an altruist. Indeed, as Marrow (1969: 145) commented, 'Experimentation at Harwood had to be subordinate to practical factory needs'. The company had to make a profit to survive, which is why Lewin was originally brought in. The high labour turnover and the consequent need to change its management style to address this indicated that life at Harwood, at least in the early 1940s, was not an unalloyed pleasure for workers (Marrow, 1969). In addition, despite its good relations with trade union officials before its move to Marion, and despite its later acceptance of unionisation at Weldon, Harwood resisted the unionisation of its Marion plant until it appears to have been forced to accept it in 1946 (Desmond and Wilson, 2018; Gomberg, 1966; Marrow, 1966).

Nevertheless, Harwood under Marrow was a remarkable company, which in the 1940s and again in the 1960s made very important contributions to the creation and advancement of OD. In the 1940s, Harwood was the real world 'laboratory' in which Lewin developed and tested his democratic-humanistic approach to managing and changing organisations (Burnes, 2007). Along with Marrow, Bavelas and French, Lewin created change tools which addressed 'practical factory needs' (Marrow, 1969: 145) and demonstrated, in the words of his famous dictum, that: 'There is nothing so practical as a good theory' (Lewin, 1943/4: 169).

In the 1960s, Harwood's Weldon initiative showed how the methods, techniques and approaches of the emerging OD movement could be brought together to effect organisation-

wide behavioural/cultural change and performance improvement. This was particularly important for the future of OD for three main reasons:

1. The fall in the popularity of T-groups left OD with a gaping hole in its toolkit and many OD practitioners facing unemployment (Beckhard, 1969; Harrison, 1995). Weldon showed that there was a range of tried and tested OD interventions, such as survey feedback, participative management, group dynamics, action research, etc., which - used in an appropriate and integrated fashion, and underpinned by field theory - could fill the gap and provide OD practitioners, and the organisations they served, with a coherent and effective approach to change (Burnes and Cooke, 2012).
2. One growing criticism of OD in the 1960s was that it was only suitable for individual and small group change (Greiner, 1972). The Weldon experience showed that OD could be used in a concerted fashion to transform an entire organisation.
3. Marrow combined tools and techniques that had grown out of the Harwood studies to bring significant benefits to Weldon's business (Seashore and Bowers, 1970). In so doing, just as Harwood in the 1940s became a symbol of the potential of the fledgling OD movement, so Weldon in the 1960s demonstrated that OD was coming of age and was much more than just a bunch of 'white-collar hippies' fixated by T-groups (Highhouse, 2002: 287). This is perhaps why French (1979: 1110) described Marrow *et al's* book detailing the Weldon change programme as '... the best report of action research to appear up to that time'.

The influence of the Harwood work can be judged by the fact that by the late 1970s, the tools, values and system-wide approach developed there in the 1940s and 1960s had become accepted as the norm by OD practitioners (Burnes and Cooke, 2012; Bushe, 2011; Gallos, 2006). Nevertheless, though Marrow was a talented publicist for OD in general and Lewin's work in particular, it is difficult to see how he alone could have brought about this institutionalisation of what was created and practised at Harwood. Though catalysts like Marrow can highlight and exemplify new ideas and values, a wider range of actors is

required to adopt, develop, legitimise and pass them on (Austin and Bartunek, 2006; Furusten (2013).

After Lewin's death, these actors included those who had worked with Lewin at Harwood, such as Bavelas and French, but also many others who were associated with him, such as Kenneth Benne, Leland Bradford and Ronald Lippitt, who with Lewin founded the NTL and led the T-group explosion of the 1950 and 1960s (Bradford, 1967 & 1974; Freedman, 1996 & 1999). Lippitt also played a key role in the development of group dynamics at the ISR where other key friends and associates of Lewin, especially Rensis Likert, the ISR's first Director, and Dorwin Cartwright, the RCGD's first Director at Michigan, were based (Marrow, 1969). Nor must it be forgotten that Marrow had helped to establish and fund the RCGD and that John French, one of its senior figures, was a long-standing Harwood collaborator (Marrow, 1972b).

In the 1970s, clients and practitioners were demanding a more results-orientated OD, which is what the ISR offered. Its growing international reputation, commitment to finding practical solutions to the problems of both industry and society, its extensive resources and experience and its links with Marrow and Harwood made it the most prominent body in OD⁴³ (Frantilla, 1998; Marrow, 1969). It is not, therefore, surprising that in the 1970s, with the decline of the NTL, it was the ISR which took over as de facto leaders of the OD movement⁴⁴ (Dale, 1970; Frantilla, 1998). Unfortunately, such was the expansion of OD practitioner numbers and the demand for OD services, that some key elements of Lewin's work were lost or misunderstood, especially field theory. Yet, that was not the case outside the industrial sphere (Burnes, 2017a). Indeed, such has been the wider influence of Lewin's work that the Nobel prize winner Daniel Kahneman (2013: ix), a leading figure in the field of behavioural economics, commented that:

The recognition of the huge power of situation, context, priming, and construal is common ground. We are all Lewinians now, and in the context of policy behavioural economists are Lewinian as well.

Marrow and Harwood played an important role in developing and promoting Lewin's work in the organisational sphere. Marrow was instrumental in funding and establishing the ISR and involving it in Harwood and Weldon. By these and other actions, he ensured that the fundamentals of OD that were developed in Harwood and Weldon did not die with him or the company he led. Instead, the knowledge became institutionalised in and through the ISR and its staff and students, and made available through them to the wider OD movement, even if the importance elements has been forgotten. Therefore, what we can see is that that Marrow was a remarkable man, that Harwood was a remarkable company, and that their contribution to OD was significant and should be recognised as such.

References

- Adelman, C (1993). Kurt Lewin and the Origins of Action Research. *Educational Action Research*, 1 (1), 7-24.
- Alderfer CP (1977) Organization development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 28, 197–223.
- Alderfer, CP (1992) A Biography of Edith Whitfield Seashore. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28, (1), 7-8.
- Allport, GW (1948) Foreword. In Lewin, GW (Ed.), *Resolving Social Conflicts*. London: Harper & Row. pp vii-xivi.
- Ashkanasy, NM (2008) Organizational Climate. In SR Clegg and JR Bailey (Eds): *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*, Vol 3. SAGE:Thousand Oaks, CA, pp1028-1030.
- Association of Research Librarians (1970) Minutes of the Seventy-Fifth Meeting, January 17 and 18, Chicago, Ill.
- Austin, JR and Bartunek, JM (2006) Theories and Practices of Organizational Development. In JV Gallos (Ed): *Organization Development: A Jossey-Bass Reader*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, pp89-128.
- Bargal, D (2006) Personal and intellectual influences leading to Lewin`s paradigm of action research. *Action Research*, 4 (4), 367-388.
- Bartlett, DL and Steele, JB (1996) *America: Whole Stole the Dream? The Have-Mores and Have-Lesses* (Part 1). Available at <http://www.barlettandsteele.com/journalism/philainq.php>. Accessed 14 November, 2018.
- Beckhard R (1969) *Organization Development: Strategies and Models*. Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA.
- Beer M and Walton RE. (1987) Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 339–368.
- Bender, DE and Greenwald, RA (Eds) (2003) *Sweatshop USA: The American Sweatshop in Historical and Global Perspective*. Routledge: London.
- Bernard, AB; Jensen, JB; and Schott, PK (2006) Survival of the best fit: Exposure to low-wage countries and the (uneven) growth of U.S. manufacturing plants. *Journal of International Economics*, 68 (1), 219-237.
- Boje D, Burnes B and Hassard J (Eds) (2011) *The Routledge Companion to Organizational Change*. Routledge: London.
- Bowers, DG and Seashore, SE. (1967a) Implications for Managing Organizational Change. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY, pp225-245.
- Bowers, DG and Seashore, SE (1967b) Operator Performance. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY, pp151-184.

- Bowers, DG and Seashore, SE (1967c) Organizational Performance. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY, pp145-150.
- Bradford LP (1967) Biography of an institution. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 3 (2), 127–143.
- Bradford LP (1974) *National Training Laboratories: Its History 1947–1970*. NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science: Bethel, ME.
- Bradford, DL and Burke, WW (2004) Introduction: Is OD in crisis? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(4), 369–73.
- Burke, WW (1976) Organization development in transition. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 12, 22-43.
- Burke, WW (1995) Organization Development: Then, Now and Tomorrow. *OD Practitioner*, 27 (2 & 3), 5-13.
- Burke, WW (2006) Where Did OD Come From? In JV Gallos (Ed): *Organization Development: A Jossey-Bass Reader*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, pp13-38.
- Burke WW (2011a) A perspective on the field of organization development and change: The Zeigarnik Effect. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47 (2), 143–167.
- Burke WW (2011b) On the legacy of Theory Y. *Journal of Management History*, 17 (2), 193-201.
- Burnes, B (2004) Kurt Lewin and the Planned Approach to Change: A Re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41 (6), 977–1002.
- Burnes, B (2007) Kurt Lewin and the Harwood studies: the foundations of OD. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43 (2), 213–31.
- Burnes (2017a) Kurt Lewin (1890-1947): The Practical Theorist. In DB Szabla, WA Pasmore, MA Barnes and AN Gipson (Eds): *The Palgrave Handbook of Organizational Change Thinkers*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York, NY, Chapter 9. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49820-1_13-1. Accessed 14 November, 2018.
- Burnes, B (2017b) *Managing Change* (7th Edition). Pearson: Harlow.
- Burnes, B and Cooke, B (2012) Review Article: The Past, Present and Future of Organization Development: Taking the Long View. *Human Relations*, 65 (11), 1395-1429.
- Bushe G (2011) Appreciative inquiry: Theory and critique. In D Boje, B Burnes and J Hassard (Eds): *The Routledge Companion to Organizational Change*. Routledge: London, pp87-103.
- Campbell JP and Dunnette MD (1968) Effectiveness of T-group experiences in managerial training and development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 70, 73–104.
- Cartwright D and Zander A (1953) *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. Row, Peterson and Co: White Plains, NY.

- Chin, MM (2005) *Sewing Women: Immigrants and the New York City Garment Industry*. Columbia University Press: New York, NY.
- Coch, L and French, JRP, Jr (1948) Overcoming Resistance to Change. *Human Relations*, 1 (4), 512-532.
- Collins, J (2009) *How the Mighty Fall*. Random House: London.
- Cooper CL (Ed) (1977) *Organizational Development in the UK and USA: A Joint Evaluation*. Macmillan Press: London.
- Cooperrider D and Srivastva S (1987) Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In: Woodman R and Pasmore W (Eds) *Organization Change and Development*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Coruzzi, CA (1995) About This Issue. *OD Practitioner*, 27 (2 & 3), 3-4.
- Cowley, P, McLaughlin, E and Servey, AD (2017) Justice Matters: Integrating the Triple Bottom Line for Business Students, People, Planet, and Profit. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, 4 (3), 13-17.
- Crosby, RP (2013) T-group as Cutting Edge: Today? Really? *OD Practitioner*, 45 (4), 55-60.
- Crosby, RP (2015) *T-Group-that Marvelous Moment - And Interventions Emerging From It*. CrosbyOD Publishing: Seattle, WA.
- Cummings TG and Worley CG (2015) *Organization Development and Change* (10th edition). Cengage Learning: Stamford, CT.
- Dale, MG (1970) *Participative Decision Making; An Analysis and Review*. Monograph Series No. 15, Iowa University, Center for Labor and Management: Iowa City, IA.
- Dent, EB (2002) The messy history of OB&D: How three strands came to be seen as one rope. *Management Decision*, 40 (3), 266-280.
- Dent, EB and Goldberg, SG (1999) Challenging 'Resistance to Change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 25-41.
- Desmond, J and Wilson, F (2018) Democracy and worker representation in the management of change: Lessons from Kurt Lewin and the Harwood studies. *Human Relations*, published online 18 Dec 2018, DOI: 10.1177/00187267188121.
- Deutsch, M (1968). Field theory in social psychology. In Lindzey, G and Aronson, E (Eds): *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 1 (2nd Edn). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Pp 412-487.
- Emmelhainz, MA and Adams, RJ (1999) The Apparel Industry Response to "Sweatshop" Concerns: A Review and Analysis of Codes of Conduct. *The Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 35 (2), 51-57.
- Filippelli, RL (1990) *Labor conflict in the United States: an encyclopedia*. Garland Publishing Co: New York, NY.
- Fortune (1946) Pajamas and the ego. *Fortune*, 34, August, 140.

- Frantilla, A (1998) *ISR: Celebrating 50 Years of Social Science in the Public Interest*. Bentley Historical Library, Bulletin No. 45, September. University of Michigan: Ann Arbor, MI.
- Freedman, A (1996) The Values and Legacy of the founders of NTL: An Interview with Ken Benne. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32 (3), 332-344.
- Freedman A (1999) The history of organization development and the NTL Institute: What we have learned, forgotten and rewritten. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 3 (2), 125–141.
- French, JRP, Jr (1950) Field experiments: Changing group productivity. In J. G. Miller (Ed): *Experiments in Social Process*. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, pp81-96.
- French, JRP, Jr (1979) Obituary: Alfred J. Marrow (1905-1978). *American Psychologist*, 34, 1109-1110.
- French WL (1982) The emergence and early history of organization development: With reference to influences on and interaction among some of the key actors. *Group & Organization Studies*, 7 (3), 261–278.
- French WL and Bell CH (1973) *Organization Development*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
- French, WL and Bell, CH (1995) *Organization Development* (5th edition). Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- FundingUniverse (2014) “J.C. Penney Company, Inc. History.” *FundingUniverse*, available at <http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/j-c-penney-company-inc-history/>. Accessed 14 November 2018.
- Furusten, S (2013) *Institutional Theory and Organizational Change*. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.
- Gallos JV (Ed) (2006) *Organization Development: A Jossey-Bass Reader*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.
- Georgianna, D and Aaronson, RH (1993) *The Strike of '28*. Spinner Publishing: New Bedford, MA.
- Greiner LE (1972) Red flags in organization development *Business Horizons*, June, 17–24.
- Greiner, LE and Cummings, TG (2004) Wanted: OD more alive than dead! *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(4), 374–91.
- Gomberg, W (1966) Harwood's 'Press Agency'. *Trans-Action*, September/October, 35-36.
- Harrison R (1995) *The Collected Papers of Roger Harrison*. McGraw-Hill Developing Organizations Series: London.
- Helgesen, S (2006) “Masters of the Breakthrough Moment.” *Strategy+Business*, 45. Available at <http://www.strategy-business.com/article/06499?gko=ee2a3>. Accessed 14 November, 2018.
- Highhouse, S (2002) A history of the T-group and its early applications in management development. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice* 6 (4), 277–290.

- Highhouse S (2007) Applications of organizational psychology: Learning through failure or failure to learn? In LL Koppes (Ed): *Historical Perspectives in Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ, pp331-352.
- House, JS (1993) John R. P. French, Jr.: A Lewinian's Lewinian. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49 (4), 221-226.
- Jackson, JM (1956) *Current Trends in Group Dynamics Research and Theory*. Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Joure SA, Frye RL, Green PC and Cassens FP (1971) Examples of the over-use of sensitivity training. *Training and Development Journal*, 25, 24-26.
- Kahn, R L and Tannenbaum, A (2005) A Tribute to Stanley E. Seashore. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 43 (2), 29-30.
- Kahneman, D (2013) Foreword. In E Shafir (Ed): *The Behavioral Foundations of Public Policy*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ. (ppvii-ix)
- Katz, HC; Kochan, TA; and Keefe, JH (1987) Industrial Relations and Productivity in the U.S. Automobile Industry. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 3, 685-727.
- Klein, L (2005) *Working Across the Gap: The Practice of Social Science in Organizations*. Karnac: London.
- Kleiner A (1996) *The Age of Heretics: Heroes, Outlaws, and the Forerunners of Corporate Change*. Doubleday: New York, NY.
- Kornbluh, H (1967) Weldon vs. the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY, pp34-44.
- Lewin, GW (1948b) Preface. In GW Lewin (Ed): *Resolving Social Conflict*. Harper & Row: London. pp xv-xviii.
- Lewin, K (1936a) *Principles of Topological Psychology*. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY.
- Lewin, K (1943/4) Problems of research in social psychology. In D Cartwright (Ed) (1952): *Field Theory in Social Science*. Social Science Paperbacks: London, pp155-169.
- Lewin K (1946a) Action research and minority problems. In GW Lewin (Ed) (1948): *Resolving Social Conflict*. Harper & Row: London, pp201-216.
- Lewin, K. (1946b). Behaviour and Development as Function of the Total Situation. In Cartwright, D. (ed.), (1952) *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers by Kurt Lewin*. London: Social Science Paperbacks, pp. 238-305.
- Lewin, K (1947a) Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibria and Social Change. *Human Relations*, 1 (1), 5-41.
- Lewin, K (1947b) Frontiers in Group Dynamics II: Channels of Group Life; Social Planning and Action Research. *Human Relations*, 1 (2), 143-153.
- Likert, R (1947) Kurt Lewin: A Pioneer in Human Relations Research. *Human Relations*, 1 (1), 131-140.

- Likert, R (1961) *New Patterns of Management*. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY.
- Likert, R (1967) Foreword. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY, ppix-xi.
- Lippitt, R and White, R (1960) *Autocracy and democracy: An experimental inquiry*. Harper & Row: New York, NY.
- MacKinnon, DW (1964) The Kurt Lewin Memorial Award: Presentation to Alfred J Marrow. *Journal of Social Issues*, 20 (3), 1-3.
- McGregor, D (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY.
- Marrow, AJ (1957) *Making Management Human*. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY.
- Marrow, AJ (1964) Risks and Uncertainties in Action research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 20 (3), 5-20.
- Marrow, AJ (1966) Gomberg's Fantasy. *Trans-Action*, September/October, 36-37.
- Marrow, AJ (1967a) Events Leading to the Establishment of the National Training Laboratories. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 3 (2), 144-150.
- Marrow, AJ (1967b) The Harwood Organization. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*, Harper & Row: New York, NY, pp23-33.
- Marrow, AJ (1969) *The Practical Theorist: The Life and Work of Kurt Lewin*. Teachers College Press: New York, NY.
- Marrow, AJ; Bowers, DG; and Seashore, SE (Eds) (1967) *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY.
- Marrow, AJ (1972a) Participation: How it Works. In AJ Marrow (Ed): *The Failure of Success*, Amacon: New York, NY, pp83-89.
- Marrow, AJ (1972b) The Effects of Participation on Performance. In AJ Marrow (Ed): *The Failure of Success*. Amacon: New York, NY, pp90-102.
- Marrow, AJ (Ed) (1972c) *The Failure of Success*. Amacon: New York, NY.
- Marrow, AJ (1974) *Making waves in foggy bottom*. NTL Institute: Washington, DC.
- Marrow, AJ; Bowers, DG and Seashore, SE (Eds) (1967) *Management by Participation*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Marrow, AJ; Seashore, SE and Bowers, DG (1972) Managing Major Change. In AJ Marrow (Ed): *The Failure of Success*. Amacon: New York, NY, pp103-119.
- Marrow, SA (1967) Harwood Buys Weldon. In by AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row, New York, NY, pp5-16.
- Marshak RJ and Grant D (2008) Organizational discourse and new organization development practices. *British Journal of Management* 19 (S7): S8–S19.

- Mirvis PH (2006) Revolutions in OD: The new and the new, new things. In JV Gallos (Ed): *Organization Development: A Jossey-Bass Reader*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA,, pp39-88.
- Moure–Eraso, R; Wilcox, M; Punnett, L; MacDonald, L; and Levenstein, C (1997) Back to the Future: Sweatshop Conditions on the Mexico–U.S. Border. II. Occupational Health Impact of Maquiladora Industrial Activity. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 31, 587–599.
- Mullins, S (1986) Shutdown no surprise. *Smyth County News*, 9 December, 1.
- Nadler, D (1977) *Feedback and Organizational Development: Using Data Based Methods*. Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA.
- New York Times (1947) Isidor L Marrow. *New York Times*, 28 November, 27.
- New York Times (1948) Human Relations Raises Sales 300%. *New York Times*, 16 February, 31.
- Oswick C (2009) Revisioning or re-versioning?: A commentary on diagnostic and dialogic forms of organization development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 45 (3), 369–374.
- Over, W (1999) *Human Rights in the International Sphere: Civic Discourse for the 21st Century*. Ablex: Stamford, CT.
- Pearse, RF (1967) Work Relations on the Shop Floor. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY, pp110-128.
- Piotrowski C and Armstrong TR (2005) Major research areas in organization development. *Organization Development Journal* 23 (4): 86–91.
- Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (1979) Pajama Fame. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 5 November, 8.
- Porras JI and Berg PO (1978) The impact of organization development. *The Academy of Management Review*, 3 (2), 249–266.
- Porras JI and Bradford DL (2004) A historical view of the future of OD: An interview with Jerry Porras. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 40 (4), 392–402.
- PR Newswire (1996) Sara Lee Corporation to Acquire Leading Men’s Boxer-Short Maker. *PR Newswire*, 22 July. Available at <https://www.nexis.com/search/newssubmitForm.do> Accessed 15 November 2018.
- Ramos, CVQ and Rees, CJ (2008) The current state of organization development: Organization perspectives from Western Europe. *Organization Development Journal*, 26 (4), 67-80.
- Revenge, AL (1992) Exporting Jobs? The Impact of Import Competition on Employment and Wages in U. S. Manufacturing. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107 (1), 255-284.
- Rivard, PE (2002) *A New Order of Things: How the Textile Industry Transformed New England*. University Press of New England: Hanover, NH.
- Sachs, JD; Shatz, HJ; Deardorff, A; and Hall, RE (1994) Trade and Jobs in U.S. Manufacturing. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1994 No 1, 1-84.

Sashkin, M and Burke, W (1987) Organization development in the nineteen-eighties. *Journal of Management*, 13, 393–417.

Seashore, SE (1978) Stanley E. Seashore, SIOP President 1968-1969. *SIOP (Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology)*, May. Available at <http://www.siop.org/presidents/Seashore.aspx>. Accessed 14 November, 2018.

Seashore, SE and Bowers, DG (1970) Durability of Organizational Change. *American Psychologist*, 25 (3), 227-233.

Schein, EH (1988) *Organizational Psychology* (3rd Edition). Prentice Hall: London.

Schein EH (1995) Foreword. In R Harrison: *The Collected Papers of Roger Harrison*. McGraw-Hill Developing Organizations Series: London, ppix-xi.

Simmons, D, Jr (1997) Harwood Follows Cheap Labor. *Smyth County News*, 13 August: A1-A3.

Sklair, L (1989) *Assembling for Development: The Maquila Industry in Mexico and the United States*. Routledge: London.

Sloan, L (1981) Business People: Executive Changes at Harwood Companies. *The New York Times*, 22 December. Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1981/12/22/business/business-people-executive-changes-set-at-harwood-companies.html>. Accessed 14 November, 2018.

Smith, JF (1967) Managers and Supervisors in a Changing Environment. In AJ Marrow, DG Bowers and SE Seashore (Eds): *Management by Participation*. Harper & Row: New York, NY, pp129-139.

Smyth County News (1987) Harwood has it rough. *Smyth County News*, 28 July, 4.

Stachowicz-Stanusch, A (Ed) (2017) *Corporate Social Performance: Reflecting on the Past and Investing in the future*. Information Age: Charlotte, NC.

Tolman, EC (1948) Kurt Lewin 1890-1947. *The Psychological Review*, 55 (1), 1-4.

United Nation's (2015b) *Sustainable Development Goals: 17 Goals to Transform our World*. United Nations: New York, NY. Available at <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

Weick KE and Quinn RE (1999) Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361–386.

Weisbord, M and Janoff, S (2010) *Future Search* (3rd Edition). Berrett-Koehler: San Francisco, CA.

Wirtenberg, J; Abrams, L and Ott, C (2004) Assessing the field of organization development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40 (4), 465-479.

Wirtenberg J, Lipsky D, Abrams L, Conway M and Slepian J (2007) The future of organization development: Enabling sustainable business performance through people. *Organization Development Journal* 25 (2): 7–22.

Witzel, M (2003) *Fifty Key Figures in Management*. Routledge: London.

Woodman, R. W. (2014) The Science of Organizational Change and the Art of Changing Organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 50 (4), 463-477.

Worley, CG and Feyerherm, AE (2003) Reflections on the future of organisation development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(1), 97–115.

Zickar, MJ (2004) An analysis of industrial-organizational psychology's indifference to labor unions in the United States. *Human Relations*, 57 (2): 145–167

Zinn, H (1980) *A People's History of the United States*. Longman: London.

Table 1: Comparison of Weldon v Harwood Performance 1962
 (Adapted from Marrow *et al*, 1972: 107)

Performance	Weldon	Harwood
Return on Investment	-15%	17%
Production Efficiency	-11%	6%
Average Earnings Above Minimum	None	17%
Make-up Pay to Reach Minimum	12%	2%
Average Monthly Absenteeism	6%	3%
Average Monthly Labour Turnover	10%	0.75%

Table 2: Comparison of Weldon v Harwood Performance 1964
 (Adapted from Marrow *et al*, 1972: 116)

Performance	Weldon	Harwood
Return on Investment	17%	21%
Production Efficiency	14%	16%
Average Earnings Above Minimum	14%	16%
Make-up Pay to Reach Minimum	4%	2%
Average Monthly Absenteeism	3%	3%
Average Monthly Labour Turnover	4%	0.75%

Notes

- ¹ When we refer just to 'Marrow' in this article, we are referring to Alfred. If we mention other members of his family, such as his father, Isidor, or his brother, Seymour, we will refer to them by their full names to avoid confusion.
- ² From personal correspondence with Professor Cary Cooper, Manchester Business School, Robert P Crosby, Founder, Crosby & Associates, Seattle, Marvin Weisbord, Co-Director of the Future Search Network, and Dr Jean Neumann, Tavistock Institute, London.
- ³ Interview with Bill Greenwood, 24 May 2012.
- ⁴ This correspondence can be found in the AGWA archives covering the period 1936-7 located at the Kheel Center for Labor Management Documentation & Archives, Cornell University. The records are in Box 124, Folder 19 of collection 5619.
- ⁵ Harwood started out with one small plant in Marion, but by the 1970s they had three factories in and around the town, the main ones being Holston and Abingdon.
- ⁶ See copies of the correspondence between Marrow and French in the Alfred J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ⁷ The figures and comments on Weldon's labour turnover are taken from the 'Audit of 1963 Manufacturing Performance' in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ⁸ In December 1962, it was agreed to extend this work to Harwood's two Puerto Rican plants (ISR Memorandum from Bowers and Seashore dated December 13, 1962). From this and other correspondence between Harwood and the ISR it is clear that the Puerto Rican operation was in much better shape than Weldon and required far less effort to improve its performance, which is hardly surprising since it was a new plant and Harwood had hired and was training all the managers and supervisors himself. Nevertheless, some of the training and other initiatives used at Weldon were used in Puerto Rico. See correspondence re the Puerto Rican developments in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ⁹ See correspondence between Alfred Marrow and Bowers and Seashore in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ¹⁰ From personal correspondence with Dr Barbara Bunker, Professor Emeritus, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- ¹¹ See 'Audit of 1963 Manufacturing Performance' and letter from David Bowers to Alfred Marrow dated October 24, 1963. Both documents are in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ¹² See Harwood Inter-Office Memo from Larry Cohen to Alfred and Seymour Marrow dated November 17, 1965 in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ¹³ See letter from Marrow to Seashore and Bowers dated November 25, 1968 in the Alfred J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ¹⁴ See letter to John French from Alfred Marrow dated July 7, 1944 in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ¹⁵ For example, see the letter from the Chatham Manufacturing Company to Alfred Marrow dated February 1, 1963 in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ¹⁶ From Personal Correspondence with Professor Jack Sherwood.
- ¹⁷ Personal correspondence with Professor Arnold Tannenbaum. See also, the Association of Research Librarians, "Minutes of the Seventy-Fifth Meeting".
- ¹⁸ From personal correspondence with Professor Karen Seashore Louis, Stanley Seashore's daughter.
- ¹⁹ From personal correspondence with Professor Karen Seashore Louis, Stanley Seashore's daughter.
- ²⁰ From personal correspondence with Professor Karen Seashore Louis, Stanley Seashore's daughter.
- ²¹ From personal correspondence with Robert Crosby.

-
- ²² From personal correspondence with Robert Crosby and Marvin Weisbord.
- ²³ From personal correspondence with Barbara Bunker, Robert Crosby and Marvin Weisbord.
- ²⁴ From personal correspondence with Robert Crosby and Marvin Weisbord. See also Burke (1995).
- ²⁵ From personal correspondence with Robert Crosby and Marvin Weisbord.
- ²⁶ For most of its existence, Harwood was a private company and details of its financial performance are difficult to obtain. However, in 1969, it became a publicly-listed company (though most of the shares remained with the Marrow family) – see letter from Alfred Marrow to Michael J Kami dated July 24, 1969 in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron. Consequentially, Harwood had to issue annual reports. The profit, loss and sales figures given here come from reports which appeared in the *New York Times* and *PR Newswire* in the 1970s and early 1980s, i.e.. *New York Times* March 19, 1975, February 23, 1977, October 22, 1977, February 24, 1978, February 28, 1979, March 31, 1981, *PR Newswire* July 15, 1980, November 11, 1980, October 31, 1981, April 25, 1983. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com>. Accessed 7 November 2014.
- ²⁷ For the 1960s' figure, see Harwood Inter-Office Memo from Larry Cohen to Alfred and Seymour Marrow dated November 17, 1965 in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ²⁸ See *PR Newswire* July 15, 1980. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com>. Accessed 7 November 2014.
- ²⁹ See *PR Newswire* April 25, 1983. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com>. Accessed 7 November 2014.
- ³⁰ Interview with ex-Harwood worker May 21, 2012.
- ³¹ Interview with ex-Harwood worker May 21, 2012.
- ³² Interview with long-serving ex-employee May 26, 2010.
- ³³ Interview with ex-Harwood manager May 24, 2012.
- ³⁴ There are also many Harwood memos and reports from the 1950s and 1960s which show that the Puerto Rican plants were managed in the same way and with the same managerial philosophy as Harwood's US plants. These are located in the A J Marrow papers, which are housed in the Drs. Nicholas and Dorothy Cummings Center for the History of Psychology at the University of Akron.
- ³⁵ Maquila or maquiladora are factories established by US companies in Free Trade Zones in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. They are characterised by low wages, poor working conditions and few if any legal protections for workers (Moure–Eraso *et al*, 1997).
- ³⁶ *PR Newswire* (1996) *Sara Lee Corporation to Acquire Leading Men's Boxer-Short Maker*. *PR Newswire*, July 22. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com>. Accessed 7 November 2014.
- ³⁷ Interview with long-serving ex-employee October 7, 2010.
- ³⁸ Interview with long-serving ex-employee October 7, 2010.
- ³⁹ Interview with long-serving ex-employee May 26, 2010.
- ⁴⁰ Interview with long-serving ex-employee April 14, 2009.
- ⁴¹ Interviews with long-serving ex-supervisor April 16, 2009 and May 26, 2010.
- ⁴² From personal correspondence with Marvin Weisbord and Professor Jack Sherwood.
- ⁴³ From personal correspondence with Professor Jack Sherwood.
- ⁴⁴ From personal correspondence with Professor Jack Sherwood.