Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 16, Issue No. 5, April-2019, ISSN 2230-7540

A Study on Trends Shaping the Future of Organizations and Organization Development

Dr. Anita Singh*

Professor, IMS, Ghaziabad

Abstract – People also do not realise what 'organisational growth' means and yet they are more likely to have been interested in it if they function in international development. Essential to achieving strategic objectives more quickly and efficiently is a scheduled, organisational initiative. This report draws on current literature, Organizational Development, Trends For The Future, Developing, improving, and reinforcing strategies, structures, and processes, Build capacity to change and achieve greater effectiveness, Critical and science-based process.

Keywords – Organizational Development, Organizational, Trends, Shaping

----------X----------

1. INTRODUCTON

Much of us operated with a people's organisation – sometimes a family is a kind of organisation. The term is so common that it may often lose its sense. The word implies a group of resources which work together to achieve a common goal. We also mean a community of people when we speak about an organisation.

People's organisations, in several ways, arrive. They may be a small group of people that come together randomly to fix a short-term need such as removing litter on any part of the road. Or, it may be a well-gathered, aligned, and cohesive community that has long-term needs addressed, for example, the end of poverty in a region.

A whole organisation, for example different divisions and teams of staff, can include a number of smaller organisations. The way people function together in an organisation relies on a range of variables, including cultural beliefs, the essence of their leadership and current needs they meet. See What Each Organization Makes.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Organizational growth is a vital and scientific mechanism that lets organisations create their potential for transformation and greater efficiency by designing and optimising policies, framework and processes and strengthening them.

Some elements (adapted from Cummings & Worley, 2009) are in this description which distinguish.

- **Critical and science-based process:** OD is a method focused on facts and organised. It doesn't matter to wait to see what happens. It involves the use of empirical results as feedback and the construction of a formal and regulated procedure for testing hypotheses. Finally, the question is whether the results represent the purpose of the procedure.

- **Build capacity to change and achieve greater effectiveness:** Organizational growth focuses on the productivity of organisations. Consequently, it has some (business) results. This may vary between companies, but they typically include financial achievement, consumer loyalty, membership involvement and an improved ability to adjust and refresh the organisation. This is not necessarily straightforward. It often involves creating a competitive advantage in some manner that we describe.

- **Developing, improving, and reinforcing strategies, structures, and processes:** The last part of our description says that the improvements in policy, function and processes are the subject of corporative growth. This means an attitude to the method, which focuses on the whole system. The whole organisation, one or two sites or one department may be used.

Over time, organisational design has become more essential. Volatility, insecurity, complexity and ambiguity are characteristic of today's environment (VUCA). This VUCA universe demands modern corporate agility, which is the means to do this.

The key players are internal and external to the enterprise in its corporate growth. External owners are management and staff. Customers, owners, manufacturers, local authorities and municipalities are external stakeholders.

In addition, IT redefines the operation of existing business structures and creates creative firms that can reach a global audience in only a few years. Only a year after its debut, a million registered users were hit by Facebook. In the first year, 10 million daily users were affected by Snapchat a couple years back. This exposes the persons responsible to disturbance.

Finally, enterprise processes improve the measurement of relevant results and change the measurement of performance. In addition, applied analytics will contribute to further the results of the enterprise.

3. TRENDS FOR THE FUTURE

Trend 1:

A shift of product platforms We are seeing the first big change already occurring in some areas as framework – i.e. the transition of goods into networks of shape. Over the last five to ten years, new modes of corporate architecture appeared, many of them because of the increase in e-commerce to make systems looser, virtual, flowing and interactive (such as platforms) (Boudreau, et al., 2015). In industry conditions, which allows them to be more stable and durable. Although the existing brick and morter companies are still trying to adapt, some are more challenged by the nature of market models, the complexity of their technologies and some aspects of their communities which are embedded in the need for ancient relationships amongst schools. Those firms who move to platform models, though, are increasingly based on a complete output type of quality management (TQM), and are thus directed at an agile service strategy. Gulati (2009) discusses this change in terms of "customer attention," although others focus on the idea of conceptual architecture (Brown, 2008). No matter what the word is, it marks an important change in the way people conceptualise jobs, how they function and engage the client and the face outside the marketplace (remember the EVP and employer brand ideas mentioned earlier). However, a key element in the thought and establishment of resilient organisations, as should be well-known to DO professionals, is the embrace of a method point of view. The latest review of the extension of standard OD applications to other kinds of organisations, our thought here about how to move networks over goods (i.e., those in the government sector).

Burke (2017) spoke about "all other organisations" in a special issue of the OD practitioner. The question he explored was whether OD has (and still has) social technology based on tightly-connected systems of top-down management applicable for federal and state government organisations, as were, in the late 1950s and 1960s mostly corporate industrial organisations including Harwood Manufacturing Corporation, General Mills and Humble Oil. After examining the related changing literature, he concluded that OD's decision-making mechanism involving individuals who specifically influence their job and the level of engagement, for example, performed successfully irrespective of the organisational form. In substance, the discrepancy was. The material for businesses is mostly strategic — consumer needs are defined, the way to defeat the opponent, and those needs are satisfied. The primary contents of government agencies are distance, that is, long-term rather than short-term. In the field of healthcare, the main question with a specialist responsible for the clinic; for the ambulance service, and so on is the dispute about whether or not the company is concerned with achieving budgetary targets and revenue issues, for instance, Hippocratic Oath vs. fulfilling the requirements of the organisation. Their varied structure and interdependency, the key features of a closely tied-up arrangement (Burke 2014), have long surrounded these business-business organisations, government and healthcare, and are common to us. But what about today's new organisations, particularly those in the category "platform?" Is "natural" OD suitable for these

organisations' attempts at change? Let us examine this matter briefly. The Internet has greatly altered our jobs, killing products, e.g. telegram and producing others — the so-called web company we previously described. While certain organisations have today a forum for transactions in cyberspace, a location on the internet. Maybe the simplest thing to grasp for this ilk is eBay.

This company offers an internet portal (platform) for consumers, eBay customers who want to trade, say a baby crib for every person who wants a crib (think yard sales) and who doesn't have to spend a lot for it. All parties negotiate on the amount, and the crib is sent by the seller to the buyer. EBay makes a share of the money from the contract. Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter and Uber are other network organisations. This blend of the central office with a large network consisting of transacations on the company's website is what makes these organisations distinctive and representative of the future. However, these purchases are separate from the business. They are not regulated by the headquarters. A portal organisation, then, is at least two organisations – a central command that seeks to function like any other businesses, i.e., including a CEO at the top of a hierarchical level, having interdependent roles, such as financing, commercialisation, logistics, human resources etc. In other terms, these two organisations, the one headquarters, a closely linked structure and the other, a client network, are strongly coupled. From an OD point of view one operates very differently for these two structures (see Burke, 2014).

Travis Kalanick knows at some point that Uber's CEO is independent drivers. He also recruited hundreds of social scientists and data scientists (see Trend #4) to inspire driver to work more hours and provide monetary objectives for their day of work. Naturally, these inspirations are not drivers' organisational ambitions, so the dedication is troublesome. The lengthy New York Times report showed this two-way rivalry very drastically (Scheiber, 2017). Uber drivers are not employers, after all. Although they are not systematically chosen as contractors, which has led to various problems (Church & Silzer, 2016). Rather, they are subject to contractual stipulations, but otherwise they are separate, able to determine for themselves their working hours and in any way their territorial dominance. They literally have a price to pay for that right, for example the expense of their vehicles, repairs, benefits and petrol. And the outlook is not rosy for a long time. Slowly but never so intentionally, Kalanick and his management peers are heading towards driverless cars. In the meanwhile, the dispute between the two schemes will continue. The practise of OD would have to be performed with a real framework vision for these network organisations.

It must be accommodating in an approach that emphasises shared objectives between the two programmes. It must also be adapted to various job conditions and structures. For instance, consider performing an examination of a company's culture or commitment. Would the drivers be included in the survey? And, can you think that the primary company would be able to respond to the same kind of questions? Can they be included in the company or not? What if their standard of commitment is smaller, is that expected acceptable? Likewise, how does management of results function there? How would you account of the lack of coordination between drivers in 1,000s of distant locations and the structured association if you focused on using an OD dialogue model (e.g., Bushe & Marshak, 2009)? Communications are carried out via handheld devices in brief explosions. Clearly, we ought to be more flexible than ever before with OD experts and our approach to collaborate for organisations.

Trend 2:

A Change to Mechanical Digital The second big change that is taking place today in companies is the digital over analogue (or mechanical) market practises. The need for mobility and speed in order for companies to adapt to knowledge requirements is being rapidly ingrained in our lives. While structured positions (e.g., a head of digital officers, the eCommerce department, the digital marketing function...) are always the first move in this path, the main obstacles lay in the ability to transform the whole company into a fully digital emphasis.

This assumes that emerging technology is integrated into all current structures such as individuals, culture and framework, and that new capabilities and infrastructure have been created, as they have never existed through their business models. This is not simple, unfortunately, nor are many conventional organisations willing to make the move. Research carried out by, for example, MIT Sloan Management Review and Deloitte (Kane et al 2016), showed that 90% of managers expect their industries to be largely or moderately affected by emerging developments, whereas just 44% believe their organisations are adequately positioned today for these challenges.

One of the most intriguing facets of the digitalization is the fact that it forces companies to consider and function at the structure level again (above the need for more consistency within the construction meaning itself). Although most writers presently write about the complexities of modern technology do not base themselves on OD room, they actually promote the idea of structures that thought, whether deliberately or not. In its fundamental nature, we speak clearly as outlined by classical social psychological theory regarding inputs, throughputs and results (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

The least we can hope is positive. But (1) the essence of these inputs (i.e.) details of a totally different nature, along with goods and/or services), and (2) their speed and trajectory in the method are the main discrepancies we will see with the current emphasis. The method flow follows a simpler supply chain model of conventional mechanical structures of organisations. The raw materials are inserted into the scheme, converted into products or services and distributed into a commodity (material or knowledge). Data collected along with the process itself are created in the Digital Environment, and feedback loops which take place everywhere, if only for the performance, are at least as significant. They are end-to-end processes and more quickly, profoundly and reciprocally than ever before between the organisational subsystems. In other words, truly digital companies can produce, capture, synthesise and process real-time knowledge to enable them to pivot and adapt their distribution models. This leads to maximum versatility (or at least that is the goal most hope to achieve with a digital transformation).

While feedback loops have often been a central component of process processes and the OD origins of double-loop learning (Argyris 1977), this thought has been brought to the next stage in organisations through the modern emphasis. Although the impact could be evident (e.g., they are having uphill battles and need to re-develop their strategy and/or radically reinvent designs for companies with more conventional business process models), what are the parallel effects on our OD efforts? First of all, we need to help leaders recognise the change and what it entails for their organisations to the digital world. This may actually be an educational and preparation method in certain situations. In others, we will have to figureout how to support our customers develop new knowledge, skills and behaviours (such as how decision making can be accelerated, how facts can be capitalised – see trend #3).

In others it can also take to see if the representatives themselves are fit and change themselves to make room for more enlightened talents (see trend #4). Second, to facilitate the digital revolution it is crucial to balance the various elements of the organisation. The level of coordination and congruence among various elements in the organisational structure needs to be handled, as with any large-scale interference (and the transition from traditional/mechanistic to numerical is probably just another form of cultural change). The vision, framework, method and method, leadership and management conduct, cultural messages, environment and priority proposals for employees must all be aligned correctly (Burke & Litwin, 1992). If a company moves to a new mentality and the managers do not, for example, utilise computers or evidence to make decisions, there is no trust between workers that the change is genuine or funded. It's all OD 101. Thirdly, we agree that the idea of mass personalization (Golay & Church, 2013) can be understood and embraced by OD professionals when it comes to our interventions.

Mass adaptation to OD means making decisions under those limits for workers. Given the smooth processes required to support and maintain a digital enterprise, the OD technologies and offerings placed in place must be able to adapt to the requirements and circumstances of individuals. In light of the earlier consequences of Trend #1, employees expect choices in how to manage their performance, the ways they receive developmental feedback and learning, the mechanisms to provide feedback to managers or to provide their views and suggestions about the organisation as a whole, the way jobs are created and done. As OD practicers, our approaches to some of these aspects of corporate functioning have to be so consistent and formal.

We must consider the distinction between customization and setup in terms of information systems. Nor do we expect everyone to pursue the same exact direction, nor does any OD intervention or method need to follow its own particular route. The answer is intermediate somewhere, so we have to find out where this is. This was never a concern in SMEs, but many of us are working hard and organisations, in spirit of sustainability and efficiency, are actively striving to standardise. Finally, we as OD practitioners need to begin to adopt systems thought, as with the first pattern mentioned above. Technology must also be embraced. This includes developing new skills and technologies in the digital market by integrating our conventional interventions into this new platform where possible. While none of these should be difficult, our last OD study (Shull, Church & Burke, 2014) shows the reverse. This means that the importance of systems thought (out of a potential list of 36) was 13th in the overall ranking, which is well below what we might have expected.

Clearly, a change in OD has occurred away from an important machine viewpoint. The conclusions about our capacity to use technology are, though, more disturbing. In particular, the item 'helping companies bring technology into the workplace' was rated 40th and 'socio-technical infrastructure growth' was almost at the bottom of this list with 56 of the 63 potential initiatives currently being implemented. In this region, OD does not seem to be especially progressive. Some people may study these details and argue that this is not a problem but that OD is more about person and social contact. And they would be false. And they would be right. We would argue, though, that OD is old school, existing in the past from the perspective of "technology" and data in several respects. We must think larger as a region. Our capabilities and procedures need to be developed more flexible and will shape a new wave of data and applications as never before. This should not

mean that the human aspect can be lost sight of. We may be the last stronghold of people who depend on it! Imagine the day when the digital revolution hits its next level of growth, and also in the technical sector, robots is the standard. OD must be able to help this transition organisations, their representatives and their people. However, we remain part of the equation if we are not part of the answer. It is up to us to identify and accept "modern OD," regardless of the meaning.

Trend 3:

A Transfer to Data Insight The third big change is data use. This emerging modes of organisation (e.g. streaming platforms) provide masses of information as might be inferred from the debate above. While the usage of data in organisations is nothing new, perceptions of how data is used and used are rapidly shifting. In particular, as already stated, it is not enough to gather and process this information alone. In today's landscape companies, insights from this data have been produced. Insights that guide management decisions, motivate specific activities and help to define potential paths for business.

Indeed, in the Big Data phenomenon, the combination of digital transformation and the needs to create insights into the vast amount of data generated (Church & Dutta, 2013; Guzzo, et al., 2015). This is where analytics research meets the corporate approach, mathematical modelling and preparation of staff. So it's no secret that companies often employ leading data scientists (along with chief digital officers). It is understandable why companies would want to connect different knowledge sources and classify possible relationships (and again is not entirely new). New is the sheer number, diversity, truthfulness, and speed of data accessible to me and the consequent technologies and skills needed to model and exploit it properly. With regard to OD professionals, we had lifted the red flag of this skills mismatch before their data analysis capacity (Church & Dutta, 2013; Church, Shull, & Burke, 2016).

Current practitioners are important for analysing a wide range of information, for finding the appropriate and practical insights and for tying them into an attractive organisation. This is simply not the case with the typical O Der nowadays. Since OD has often based itself on decision- and evidence-driven approaches (e.g. Burke, 1994; Nadler, 1977; Waclawski & Church, 2002), and the fundamental importance of the data's position may be argued for by qualitative or quantitative data being at the heart of 50% or more of the traditional consultancy pattern of OD (Church, 2017). Customers are pressured not only to demonstrate the ROI of our current OD activities, but also to combine and synthesise different data sources to discover innovative link-based technologies that we never even imagined would occur. Would a great deal of "value-free analytics" function theoretically? Yeah, the response. Only when a connection is scientifically found doesn't necessarily imply or is the best thing to do philosophically with the ethos of a company or its staff (Church, 2017).

Does the lack of exposure to theoretical constructs, structures and cultural backgrounds prevent organisations from focusing on those with profound analysis skills to evaluate answers to their challenges versus depending on those who might have a more knowledgeable perspective (for example, OD)? It doesn't deter them a whit. The response is no. They are, after all, data researchers and we are ODs. It has to be remedied. Perhaps you would eventually, if you haven't faced this problem already. We learn about OD (and other) professionals competing with professionals from other fields such as economics, banking, IT and statistics, through which they have greatly improved their expertise in deep analytics and modelling. In Big Data implementations even industrial-organizational psychologists, who typically have a more reliable degree of analytical ability, are not skilled (Church & Rotolo, 2015; Guzzo, et al., 2015).

We think that today many professionals are too badly unfitted to keep up to date with the new field of big data. This is an arena in which OD experts now need to step up their game to ensure that the specialised doctoral and master's programmes in the sector set the right foundation until it is too late. If we don't move fast, we will be overshadowed as core contributors to understanding how companies work and whose weaknesses to accelerate progress. In this respect we lose our position at the table when we actually have more contexts and experience of what organisations can do than any people. Recall that just 29% quoted figures in your toolkits in our survey of existing OD practitioners. Whilst this can also be achieved in the light of modern DO philosophical frameworks to collective and adaptive consultation (e.g. Bushe & Marshak, 2009), today's analytical capabilities and perspectives fail.

Trend 4:

The fourth and final change we see today in companies is even more divisive than the second, namely, the focus on creativity over staff. This movement is at the heart of the HR and OD agenda, with immediate relevance to the consequences for companies and the practise of OD. The first difference in the field of talent management (i.e. undue emphasis on the few) and OD was created by Church (2013; 2014), throughout this respect (a concerted focus on the many). We both believe that OD has strong origins in people, communities and organisations' creation and growth. Following the original war of talent (Michaels, et al., 2001), the dot.com boom has precipitated, and, more recently, the emphasis has been placed on changing population trends both in employees and in multinational workplaces and on

how to navigate these, (e.g. Deal & Levinson, 2016; Zemke, et al., 2000; 2013).

Indeed, the attention has changed from building a growth culture in general to concentrating on methods of promoting talent differentiation and segmentation in many firms (and particularly those with broad existing roles such as Church, Rotolo, Ginther and Levine, 2015). In brief, it involves directing funds and services into high-potential and non-high-potential groups for decision making to identify and classify individuals. This is to ensure that the best groups within the management pipeline have insufficient funding (Silzer & Church, 2010).

As a consequence, we are deploying more regularly for evaluation and decision-making the evidence based approaches and ODs we utilised for developmental interventions (e.g. 360 reviews, assessments, personality tests — Waclawski & Church, 2002). This focus not only puts more strain on OD individuals, since their application is now more weight-related, it also calls into question many practitioners' core assumptions. Any people clearly cannot make attempts of any kind which would divide creativity into haves and have notions. In addition, several companies are fully moving away from OD. Recent survey results of 71 well-known organisations on their practical reporting systems (Church and Levine 2017) showed that 71% of their official OD groups and 68% of their cultural and communication teams currently report formally on the Talent Management position. Just 49 per cent of the diversity teams and 12 per cent of the overall benefits disclose to TM compared.

This means that the alignment of capital with time and where tradeoffs are necessary may be a possible obstacle. OD professionals must consider thoroughly how our key instruments can and cannot be utilised and under what circumstances are required in order to create effective, legally defensible decision-making (TM) vs. implementation (OD) only processes. OD individuals will certainly opt not to function in these settings. You should boycott TM-enhancing organisations. Yet we tend to take the infant out with the bathwater. If not, anyone in HR does the job and we play a vital role in ensuring that everything is performed properly and that citizens are handled with respect. The OD practitioners are responsible for ensuring that our principles are expressed in the way data-driven tools and processes are used to create or make decision.

This ensures that we are in the sphere of ensuring equal treatment for individuals, a transparent communication of the mechanism and openness and responsibility for how and when when distinction happens. And we should make sure politicians really take responsibility for their decisions. Back in the 1990s, we were asked to design a 360 Input to use to segmental talent and to decide who and who will not be promoted. No, we didn't mention something so close at least once. But things have improved now. Today. The 360 method is no longer fad but has proved stable when performed properly and very widespread as a measuring instrument. Organizations are also utilising 360 to decide whether for success monitoring (Bracken & Church, 2013) or for talent management and recognition of high-possibilities (Church & Rotolo, 2013). If the appropriate protocols are adopted during the design and implementation of the process, the company and staff may benefit well. After all, millenniums love their reviews and want to know whether or not they would be good with their new business (Church & Rotolo, 2016).

Through our perspective, the keys to guaranteeing a work of this kind are always OD principles: (a) feedback is always provided in a meaningful and supportive way to the participant; (b) psychometrically valid measurements are made which are appropriate if the decision is taken; (c) the data are used by people in a right and proper manner and at the right time.

4. CONCLUSION

We will see the opportunity for great change as we think at the future of organisations and the position OD professionals can and should have in them. The OD has the chance to have an impression, while corporate models begin to transform into networks and other interactive systems, and company processes themselves becoming fully interactive. Given that we are based on social sciences and structures we would be one of the strongest classes of experts to help leaders learn about the effects of these improvements on the necessary society, human beings, procedures, configuration, behaviour, and other aspects of the whole organisational environment. As long as we don't lose sight of our machine thought abilities at higher levels, OD practitioners who use technology during a modern era have space to expand, it has real value to give. This debate makes us question, though, if the time has come for a return to the socio-technical paradigm. What occurs when data collection and insights outweigh our desire to even be part of the conversation is our fears about the sustainability of the DG and perhaps organisations as well by implications.

When leaders seek for observations, decisions, and interventions from data analysts, we have to understand how the statistics were conducted, if any qualitative factors were taken into consideration, the testing methodology and controls analysed, etc. As social scientists, our backgrounds help us grasp the real nature of social processes, but our effect on policy is declining. It is time to develop our skills in these fields and to prioritise our academic and vocational programmes. If we don't ensure these

skills for our students, they can just concentrate on places where data has little impact. Following the above breadcrumbs between portal organisations, which have loses connections and the standard for digital networks and robotics, would just reduce our chances of impact. Last but not least, although the heart of OD is about growth, several major companies subsume the area under the TM function and use our processes and instruments in other ways. We must acquire the skills required by 20 OD practitioners Vol. 49 No. 3 2017 to take them on instead of looking the other way or running from these problems. In particular, who better designs and helps the organisation find and choose who can lead in the best future than an OD person? Who better train those skilled leaders who, due to their talents, opportunities and skills, were not chosen for a specific position, if not a specialist? We should be managers of the TM and OD equation from all sides. This is how we feel when everything is viewed from the best point of view.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (Eds.) (2016). The Oxford handbook of work and family (pp. 455–464). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

2. Argyris, C. (1977). Double loop learning in organizations. Harvard Business Review, 55(5), pp. 115–125.

3. Beasley, K. (2013). Should employees access social media at work? Business2Community.com. Retrieved from http://www. business2community.com/social-media/ employees-access-social-media-work0639919#Egu8D1FjdUW2SEBf.97

4. Bersin, J. (2012). Big Data in HR: Building a competitive talent analytics function— The four stages of maturity. Bersin & Associates Research Report.

5. Boudreau, J. W., Jesuthasan, R., & Creelman, D. (2015). Lead the work: Navigating a world beyond employment. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

6. Bracken, D. W., & Church, A. H. (2013). The “New” performance management paradigm: Capitalizing on the unrealized potential of 360-degree feedback. People & Strategy Journal, 36, pp. 34–40

7. Beckhard, R. (1969). Organization Development: Strategies and Models. Boston: Addison-Wesley.

8. Beer, M. (1976). The Technology of Organization Development. Chicago: Rand McNally.

9. Bennis, W. (1969). Organization development: Its nature, origins, and prospects. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

10. Chell, E. (1993). The psychology of behaviour in organizations. In C. Huffington, C. F. Cole, & H. Brunning, A Manual of Organization Development. London: MacMillan.

11. Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2009). Organization Development & Change. Mason, USA: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Corresponding Author

Dr. Anita Singh*

Professor, IMS, Ghaziabad