

ISSUES IN INTEGRATIVE STUDIES
No. 19, pp. 149-169 (2001)

Applying More Integrative Potentials for IDS Program Planning and Development

by
Stephen L. Payne

Georgia College and State University
Department of Management

Abstract: The continuing development and success of IDS (Interdisciplinary Studies) programs in higher education depend on the quality of processes associated with their planning, implementation, and review. Underlying and often taken-for-granted assumptions influencing IDS-planning processes are important to uncover and critically examine in dialogues involving IDS and institutional stakeholders. Potential integrating approaches and methods for IDS planning initiatives are explored, based on the author's background in the applied social sciences and the fields of management and organization studies. These integrative potentials from the fields of strategic management and organizational development/change should empower more stakeholder voices and create alternative forms of dialogical inquiry to fit particular institutional cultures. Challenges remain for faculty and administrators in recognizing these integrative approaches and having facilitative resources to increase their potential for success.

THERE SEEMS LITTLE DOUBT that American colleges and universities will continue to establish interdisciplinary studies programs and courses, perhaps at growth rates similar to the significant increases reported for the decade of 1986-1996 (Edwards, 1996). One factor that will obviously help determine the continuing growth and success of IDS programs is the effectiveness of their administration, or the planning, implementation, and assessment of these programs relative to an individual institution's missions, goals, and culture. IDS programs should benefit from the participation of faculty and staff members who are particularly knowledgeable concerning issues of organizational strategy, planning, and development. Certainly IDS theorists, such as Casey (1994), concentrate on difficult challenges in the administration and governance of interdisciplinary programs, yet IDS planning that involves facilitators and consultants who use many group processes derived from the applied social sciences is scarcely reported in the United States.

Management sub-fields, concepts, and approaches that stress integrative and strategic concerns appear to offer unique and neglected perspectives for IDS program planning, implementation, and assessment. This article explores integrative processes from applied social science fields, which are both underdeveloped in the IDS literature and worthy of more serious consideration by key stakeholders involved with IDS programs and courses.

Integrative Challenges for IDS Program Planning and Assessment

IDS pursuits often bring faculty from the humanities, sciences, and social sciences together collaboratively to develop new programs and courses. Many integrative and collaborative challenges for these pursuits exist. Some have been described in the IDS literature, particularly within the context of IDS group or team planning. Individual anxiety (Armstrong, 1980, p. 56), conflicts (Davis, 1995, p. 120), and withdrawal tendencies have been described and associated with IDS program and course planning. Additional and broader challenges for IDS programs can also occur, leading to increased participant frustrations with the IDS planning process and disappointments with the IDS program. Planning and review can be viewed by some participants as elitist and top-heavy, as confused and chaotic, or as otherwise dysfunctional processes in some universities.

Among the major challenges and potential pitfalls for effective IDS program planning and assessment seem to be the following concerns:

- 1) lack of continuing integration of IDS program planning, implementation, and assessment with the institutional mission and institutional strategies;
- 2) lack of continuing participant motivation (associated with intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for them);
- 3) conflicts caused by differing ontological, epistemological, and teaching/learning assumptions of participants; and
- 4) unresolved issues of politics and power differences among participants.

The challenges above are not unique to IDS programs, but the necessary integrative inquiry and the diverse resources needed for successful IDS programs magnify the importance of these issues. Such challenges are hardly independent or isolated ones for IDS administrators to confront. Often the question is not whether the problems are present and intertwined, but to what degree the lack of recognition and resolution of these challenges has undermined the quality of IDS participant involvement. My hunch is that they have undermined that quality considerably.

First, IDS program planning, implementation, and assessment should fit or be closely integrated with the overall mission and strategic management of the university or college. The quality of communication channels between IDS faculty and top institutional administrators is critical, since institutional strategy and decision processes provide the resources upon which IDS programs depend for survival. Differing assumptions and communication barriers can develop among institutional and IDS leaders concerning the role of the program, particularly over time and with changes in leadership, as well as shifts in external forces shaping university strategy and policies. A variety of problems can confront program leaders when strategic linkages of IDS to the overall institutional mission and objectives are weak. For example, *suboptimization* at the university level can occur when IDS program leaders obtain an inordinate share of university resources at the expense of other university programs and priorities. Such an abundance of resources may be of great advantage to the program in the short term, but this can generate unrealistic expectations and disappointment for IDS participants when the institution, over time, may have to shift priorities and funding to maintain accreditation of other academic programs. Another type of problem occurs for IDS program leaders when they are less than fully involved as active participants in the overall institution's strategic management. Often, IDS program leaders cannot convincingly communicate what resources are necessary for their programs to contribute to the university's mission and strategic vision.

Second, faculty have teaching, research, and service responsibilities in most institutions of higher learning, and a common sentiment expressed by faculty is having "too much to do and not enough time to do it." Faculty can perceive limited time available for yet another set of meetings, particularly if they have had negative experiences with time-consuming committees and poorly organized planning and decision-making processes. These perceptions concerning time and other resources for collaboration are formed within institutional and faculty cultures, and these views reflect underlying values, interests, and taken-for-granted assumptions. IDS administrators often seek to involve talented faculty, who have responsibilities elsewhere, and many institutions place greater rewards on disciplinary or departmental roles than on IDS program contributions. IDS programs can be introduced with considerable fanfare and resources tied to faculty involvement, but the program leaders may not be able to sustain or build the level of resources and rewards that will continue to motivate participant effort. Administrators may not recognize nor respond to the differing motivations or desired rewards for par-

ticipating faculty members.

Third, in most of their social interactions, individuals follow somewhat established cognitive routines, patterns, schemas, and scripts in a relatively unconscious way. These implicit behavioral assumptions influence our group processes more than we realize. Faculty and other participants involved in IDS program development and assessment processes possess diverse assumptions about the nature of reality, knowledge, teaching, and learning. Some of these diverse assumptions relate to disciplinary backgrounds, but even faculty within a specific discipline can have profound differences in paradigmatic assumptions for inquiry and knowledge construction. According to some observers (Burrell and Reed, 1995; Gareau, 1988; Hollinger, 1994; Hoover and Howard, 1995), paradigm wars or debates create communication tension among college faculty. Differences might well exist, for example, among participant assumptions of positivism versus social constructivism or radical versus incremental institutional reform potential. To ignore or try to maneuver around these differences in seeking available forms of consensus might seem a reasonable option, but Argyris (1985) warns us that we can spend a lot of ineffective time and effort on surface conflicts that mask more profound differences in individual assumptions and values. Limitations of available time, and even more, the lack of facilitative resources to acknowledge and accommodate such diverse assumptions within a continuing dialogue on IDS planning, implementation, and assessment can inhibit creativity and integration of contributions for overall program development. Do most IDS planning and assessment processes really seek to uncover, test, and work through stakeholders' contrasting assumptions? Or do limitations of perceived time, questions of continuing participant interest and motivation to confront contrasting assumptions, and other barriers force administrators and leaders to take more expedient routes that at least they can support and hope others may come to accept?

Fourth, a common concern in many academic cultures is a perception of a much politicized environment in which "turf" protection, rivalry for resources, and less than open communication channels are present. Power differences exist due to contrasts in the formal authority, credibility, knowledge, reward/punishment capability, and communication skills of participants. There are varied motives for participation in IDS planning initiatives, and, according to Stember (1991, p. 6), different levels of power among participants. Inviting students and other stakeholders to participate in IDS planning and assessment activities does not ensure a voice in asserting their concerns and claims. Administrators and high-profile faculty often use words such as em-

powerment and collaboration without being able to establish processes in which high degrees of these virtues occur. Unexamined power inequities and political “turf” interests can produce weak dialogues that fail to raise the assumptions and views of many participants. Klein and Newell claim “The key to stimulating interaction is providing non-hierarchical structures that foster dialogue, self-criticism and risk taking, trust and mutual respect, and a sense of mutual ownership” (1996, p. 408). Yet even some facilitators engaged for collaborative IDS program planning can devote more attention to “selling” their own particular approach than uncovering and integrating the diverse learning assumptions of a particular institution’s participants. Difficulties in gaining broader and deeper participant involvement (time, motivation, and exploration of underlying assumptions) are compounded when IDS leaders resort to power tactics and/or expediency to try to determine processes and outcomes. A vicious circle can be created as these tactics result in less participant trust; less participant motivation; and less collaboration, creativity, and success.

Certain IDS theorists have commented on the relationship among some of the four challenges introduced above. Stember believes that approaches for reducing IDS power struggles should be employed, including initial meetings to support intellectual integrity and to explore epistemological and methodological differences (1991, p. 6). Keeseey (1988) addresses implicit and explicit knowledge assumptions and suggests that these assumptions be tested within particular cultures or contexts and be transformed for specific learning purposes and outcomes. Klein introduces an integrative process or protocol for IDS planning to overcome problems created by differences in participant language and worldviews (1990, pp. 188-189). She offers a variety of integrative techniques for groups, including role clarification and role negotiation. Her 12-step integrative process includes a logical sequence of steps such as defining the problem, determining knowledge needs, gathering current knowledge, and searching for new knowledge. However, this integrative process and her suggested techniques do not focus attention on particular approaches to empower stakeholders and to raise and test their implicit assumptions during this process. The epistemological and other assumptions of these participants, if raised and evaluated, might suggest an integrative inquiry or process that is open to social constructivist, postmodern, and critical/reflexive energies that complement Klein’s integrative process.

The fields of social psychology, group dynamics, organizational behavior, and organizational ethics, among others, have much to offer IDS planners in terms of potential group processes and methods that address voice and as-

sumption-raising issues for improved stakeholder dialogues. Concerns such as tendencies for *groupthink* and tactics for understanding and working through what we informally call the *forming, storming, norming, and performing* stages of group development have already been introduced in the IDS literature (e.g., Davis, 1995). Much more guidance concerning integrative and dialogic processes for inquiry and decision making, though, exists outside the IDS literature. One example is research in the social sciences that seeks to access and take into more account the moral claims of diverse stakeholders affected by planning and development issues (Isaacs, 1999). Proposed forms of dialogue by Isaacs and others build upon the diverse disciplinary contributions of Buber, Bahktin, Levinas, and Bohm¹ and seem particularly appropriate for forms of integrative inquiry and IDS program development, particularly when stakeholders with diverse backgrounds and value assumptions are invited. Isaacs' book on dialogue as the "art of thinking together" includes detailed suggestions for improving integrative inquiry processes (1999, title). Isaacs' work in the early nineties at the MIT Center for Organizational Learning led to his partnership with others at DIA-logos, a large consulting firm offering facilitation and training programs for individuals interested in inquiry and decision processes through dialogic practices.

Management theorists have long studied integrative approaches to problem identification/resolution, decision making, and organizational renewal as well as planning, implementation, and evaluation cycles associated with long-term projects and programs. These integrative approaches for integrative inquiry and organizational learning, however, are resources often unfamiliar to many faculty members outside the social sciences. More unfortunate for IDS planning, though, is that administrators or facilitators are often unaware of, or fail to consider, these perspectives. Management fields, and in particular, strategic management and organizational development, can contribute to integrative inquiry and learning associated with IDS program development. Even a partial and brief description of integrative concepts and methods often found within the management and organization studies literature offers IDS proponents fruitful grounds for conceiving and developing stronger IDS programs.

Strategic Management Perspectives and Concerns

The field of strategic management provides an appropriate initial framework for many IDS program initiatives, primarily because it is often applied for overall institutional administration. Three decades ago, strategic management concepts for organizational goal setting, implementation, and evalua-

tion were articulated in basic management textbooks; at that time, however, their direct application within public and private sector organizations was limited. Today, it is fairly common for a new university president to arrive and declare as his or her first priority some form of strategic management or planning for the institution. Strategic frameworks for corporate planning and operations now are certainly the norm. Although many market or private-sector metaphors, such as *customer-driven*, can be inappropriate or limiting metaphors for institutions of higher learning, some strategic management concepts can suggest creative, dynamic, and positive potentials. A sophisticated strategic management perspective for an institution and an IDS program can draw together and support a collaborative vision, such as community building and service, and a set of guiding metaphors and moral values.

Within a strategic management perspective, concepts such as mission, objectives, strategies, tactics, policies, and various controls, including audits or evaluations, can be applied as basic integrating tools for IDS program planning. Objectives for IDS and other institutional programs need to be integrated into the institution's overall mission and set of objectives if these programs are to support the achievement of that institutional mission and also to receive priorities from institutional plans and budgets. Strategies are potential paths or high-level plans to take us from where an institution or program may be at present to fulfilling its mission or new vision. Tactics are more specific, shorter-term plans designed to facilitate strategies. Policies are communicated guidelines or generalized expectations for the implementation of strategies. Audits or evaluations can reveal gaps between plans and actual performance as well as suggest planning or implementation problems to be addressed in future planning cycles. These basic administrative tools and others are often defined specifically as integrative mechanisms to match or fit the characteristics of internal organizational competencies to the external environmental change facing the organization. This more integrative or systemic view of IDS program activities can reduce tendencies for suboptimization and other inefficiencies in how resources support and enhance an overall institutional mission and set of objectives.

Strategic management perspectives often include a number of component or supplemental concepts. One is a strategic planning concept known as *stakeholder analysis* (e.g., Freeman, 1984), which identifies the interests and power of the many individuals and groups directly and indirectly affected by strategic pursuits. Stakeholder analysis can lead to recognition of power differences among stakeholders and suggest inclusion of previously neglected groups, with moral claims, who might potentially be affected by institutional

change. Its application in the private sector has often been a shift from excessive concentration on stockholders, owners, top management, and customer interests to try to take employee and broader social or community interests into greater account. Applied to IDS pursuits, stakeholder analysis should demand that greater attention be given to diverse interests other than those of participating administrators and faculty. Thus, students, area employers, and community service leaders are more directly considered and often invited to participate in early planning sessions. Associated also with strategic management and stakeholder analysis is strategic *issues management* (e.g., Ansoff, 1980). Issues management is the analysis of a set of emerging social, moral, economic, technological, political, and other environmental issues that could affect stakeholders and the organization. The process determines how stakeholders perceive or interpret these issues and the implications of these emerging issues for plans and activities. From a strategic management perspective, key issues and their implications for the institution and its programs, such as IDS, are considered in an early, discovery stage before actual strategy formulation.

An approach for collaborative strategy formulation allows participants to begin to test some of their deeper and more implicit assumptions concerning other stakeholders, emerging issues, and appropriate means for inquiry and decision making. Known as the *strategic assumption surfacing and testing technique* or SAST (Mason and Mitroff, 1981), this method usually employs either a *dialectical* or *devil's advocate* approach to raise and evaluate a more diverse set of assumptions held by stakeholders to the particular program and institution. Dialectical or devil's advocate approaches for planning and strategy formulation force individuals to evaluate counter-positions relative to the assumptions that they initially generate (Schweiger, Sandberg, and Rechner, 1989). Often such counter- or "polar opposite" positions can be quickly dismissed or are overwhelmingly disavowed. In certain cases, though, these counter-assumptions, upon examination and dialogue, are seen as having a paradoxical or supplemental contextual validity for knowledge construction. One business school administrator, as an example, used a variation of this approach, in which the author participated, to test recent planning premises used by the business school. This was accomplished through the invitation of students, faculty, other university administrators, and community business leaders who participated in diversely composed, small groups trying to raise and test assumptions about forces influencing the business school.

To continue collaborative strategy formulation, systemic and synergistic

thinking by participants should take into account how potential strategies and plans might be implemented and assessed. Concerns for strategy implementation and assessment, for example, might suggest pilot programs/courses prior to commitment of larger scale IDS program resources. A strategic management perspective seeks to link strategic planning, implementation, and assessment in a cyclical, continuing examination of program quality and support of institutional mission. Assessments of outcomes associated with initial plans and strategies become inputs for future goal setting and strategic planning. Strategic assessment or control concepts include various approaches such as “best practices” review and benchmarking, which have been described and applied to academic institutions, departments, and programs (e.g., Nichols, 1995). Strategic assessment methods vary in intent and focus. Among forms of assessment are types of policy analysis known as *policy capturing* and *bootstrapping*. The purpose of policy capturing is to determine implicit strategies that have led to previous key decisions, making those strategies more explicit, analyzing their effectiveness, and considering whether to follow these strategies for the future (Szilagi and Wallace, 1983, pp. 319-320). Bootstrapping is the study of previous institutional or program policies to diagnose flaws and to build upon policies that have led to success (Dawis, 1971). For example, after a year or so of IDS program operation at a particular institution, several outside IDS consultants might be invited to informally critique existing integrative and collaborative inquiry at both the program and course levels. They would observe current decision-making processes and interview planning participants to determine how previous strategies and plans had been constructed. These consultants would then communicate their evaluations and proposals for an improved process of planning and strategy formulation. Strategic assessments, such as bootstrapping, focus more attention on the quality of processes leading to outcomes, in contrast to the more “bottom-line” or results/outcomes orientation often found in benchmarking studies. The particular mix of strategic assessment concepts/tools chosen within a strategic management framework seems less important than an actual obligation assumed by IDS administrators to include assessment concerns early in the strategic formulation or planning process. This early concern for program accountability and measurement should inform the generation and evaluation of potential strategic options and plans.

A strategic management perspective and approaches such as stakeholder analysis, issues management, SAST, and policy capturing or bootstrapping help ground IDS planning to the institution’s mission, strategies, and objectives. They also lead IDS planning groups to pursue some of the following

issues and questions:

- 1) Are early calls for creating an IDS core curriculum, an IDS area/ethnic studies program, or other IDS initiatives coming from an assertive or dominant voice or voices, and, if so, what are the assumptions that are driving and informing these proposals?
- 2) Are there alternative assumptions concerning the needs of students that have not been voiced?
- 3) Have diverse assumptions concerning environmental forces and crucial issues really been voiced and significantly explored in planning or pre-planning dialogues?
- 4) How do proposed IDS alternatives “fit” perceived or well-established statements of the existing strategic direction of the university?
- 5) Will new IDS initiatives drive a changing institutional strategy, or do they fit well into an existing strategy?
- 6) What are the true competencies of faculty and other key institutional resources, and how do these relate to potential IDS initiatives?
- 7) How might existing institutional resources and competencies need to be supplemented for an IDS program alternative to have a good chance to succeed and at what cost relative to other IDS or institutional alternatives?

These are indicative of questions that might be raised and explored through a dialogic process and a strategic management perspective involving relevant stakeholders in IDS programs.

Although strategic management frameworks can expose certain integrative concerns and issues—such as those above—that might otherwise be missed, any set of such integrative knowledge assumptions and methods should be further examined to expose the partiality of their knowledge claims and expanded to include additional perspectives.² Stakeholder analysis, issues management, SAST, and related approaches for IDS strategy formulation and planning should help address the four integrative challenges for IDS program development that were described earlier. However, the critical and reflexive energies of organizational stakeholders to confront diverse assumptions and political barriers cannot be guaranteed by conventional approaches to strategic management. Deeper aspects of the particular institutional culture, associated with the implicit assumptions of stakeholders and obstacles to potential changes in thinking and behavior, also need to be explored. Potential tools or approaches for such exploration come from other social sci-

ence fields.

Organizational Culture, Behavior, and Development

Additional integrative IDS potentials to supplement and enhance strategic management perspectives come from the fields of organizational behavior (OB) and organizational development (OD). Chapters on both strategic management and OB/OD are common even in introductory management textbooks. Research and concepts associated with OB/OD derive from the social sciences, and particularly from psychology, sociology, and social psychology. Fields such as personnel psychology and organizational communication, for example, are even more specific concentrations of scholarship that are appropriate for management and administrative education. Anthropologically rooted research on organizational culture and subcultures (e.g., Ott, 1989) contributes to better understandings of particular change obstacles and potentials associated with strategic planning and management. A concern for organizational culture reminds IDS planners to look beyond surface behaviors and artifacts of organizational life to consider underlying values and taken-for-granted assumptions of institutional stakeholders (Schein, 1991). Often, proposed organizational strategies fail due to a lack of knowledge of existing cultural influences and change potentials.

The field of organizational development (e.g., French and Bell, 1995) takes into account the particular organizational cultures and characteristics in which change is considered. OD techniques are intended to enhance the diagnostic, problem solving, decision making, and renewal processes of an organization. Yet OD can be contrasted with other management change techniques in its emphasis on *unfreezing* and then challenging cognitive patterns and assumptions of individuals and groups. Diagnostic and intervention tools for OD include survey feedback, sensitivity analysis, role analysis and negotiation, process consultation, and many other tools directed toward individual, group, and/or organizational levels of change. OD approaches such as process consultation concentrate on the quality of existing stakeholder interactions, usually through the use of an outside consultant or facilitator. Other OD diagnostic and intervention methods are useful to identify unrealistic goals, implementation problems, or lack of criteria for establishing the effectiveness of institutional programs. Outside consultants with knowledge of OD and change approaches, as well as an IDS background, should be considered for IDS planning pursuits. Consultants having only extensive IDS backgrounds might not have the knowledge and change skills to help transform even a very successful IDS initiative developed elsewhere to fit a different

organizational culture. Unlike some *experts* who contract with groups and organizations to give them the *content* of their change recommendations, OD consultants usually facilitate a *process* in which those present are encouraged to generate many of their own models for change, choose some of these options, implement these, and determine their effectiveness. Such consultants try to avoid excess *dependency* by clients on their consulting/facilitation role, so that institutional stakeholders can develop facilitation knowledge and skills among themselves over time.

Action research (Whyte and Hamilton, 1964) is a form of inquiry and change process, and similar to OD, can inform a strategic management perspective. Action research, or the closer integration of research and action concerning an issue or purpose, involves continuing cycles of problem identification, analysis, decisionmaking, implementation of decisions, and evaluation. Research/inquiry and actions are linked more closely and immediately for learning purposes than in conventional and more abstract forms of social science. This approach for organizational learning through “hands-on” implementation of research and the immediate evaluation of actions has actually been applied for faculty development in at least one European university (Schatz, 1993). The University of Innsbruck (Austria) in a faculty development program brought faculty of different disciplines together to support each other in conducting action research in their respective areas to improve teaching. PAR (e.g., Chein, Cook, and Harding, 1948) is a form of action research that demands the active participation of a broader set of stakeholders than just a typical institutional planning or research team. More diverse assumptions and values are included in the planning process through efforts to invite, and to accept as full partners, some stakeholders who might not have as strong or obvious a stake in the process and outcomes of planning. The addition and encouragement of the voices of such participants in PAR is intended to lead to increasing critiques of the views and assumptions of more powerful stakeholders. This or other action research models might be used to evaluate recent IDS program planning.

Approaches such as *action learning* (Revans, 1980) and *action science* (Argyris and Schon, 1989) have evolved from action research. Action learning stresses the value of practical research and of the learning that occurs in personal work settings when continuous efforts are made to solve actual problems that confront individuals and groups. Action science emphasizes ways to improve communication and learning processes by, e.g., reducing the defensive communication routines of participating stakeholders and teaching more complex listening and communication skills. Often individuals have

valid criticisms of aspects of existing programs or activities, but they err when they frame their communication or feedback to others. Argyris (1985) describes *double-loop learning*, and others such as Senge (1990) have called for more sophisticated or complex forms of learning. *Single-loop learning* is our direct application of existing values, attitudes, and cognitive constructions to issues and challenges. Although usually applied and beneficial in response to situations that we confront, such single-loop learning is not appropriate for all challenges. Disconfirming as well as affirming interactions are necessary in dialogues involving stakeholders with diverse assumptions, values, and interests. Single-loop learning alone will not allow us to challenge, test, and potentially change existing individual assumptions and views within a dialogic process. Shifts from more common single-loop learning to double-loop learning are needed for truly integrative inquiry. For more shifts in cognitive framing and double-loop learning to occur in dialogues, the inappropriateness and/or negative consequences from single-loop learning alone for dialogic purposes should be examined and accepted. Isaacs (1999) has described how participating stakeholders, through facilitation and a “safe space” for dialogue, can move through a stage of frustration over conflicting cognitive constructions to a stage of higher-order learning and testing of implicit assumptions.

For planning purposes, Argyris (1985, pp. 79-92) recommends the recognition of occasional contradictions of our *espoused* “theory of action” (based upon our stated beliefs and values) and our “theory in use” (values and assumptions that seem to be applied when we face threat or confrontation). Alternative communication and learning patterns, avoiding the extremes of aggressive/dominating or passive/yielding responses, often require practice and reinforcement, even for highly educated stakeholders. An important element in double-loop learning for IDS initiatives is developing improved self-perception and communication skills among participating faculty and other stakeholders. Argyris’s many books provide training and development through cases and role-playing exercises to help individuals recognize and partially overcome limiting attitudinal and cognitive barriers for collaborative learning.

IDS planning participants can better facilitate double-loop learning through the recognition of communication barriers to integrative inquiry, such as our tendencies to make *unillustrated attributions* of others (see Argyris, 1985, 58-77). According to Argyris, our assumptions lead us to interpretations of reality and, particularly, perceptions of the characteristics of other individuals with whom we are interacting. Many potentially important perceptions

or attributions of others that occur in our communication with them are never opened to our question or testing. The result is often reciprocation by others and the creation of defensive communication routines, rather than dialogic and constructive engagement. Publicly testing perceptions or attributions of other participants in integrative inquiry or IDS planning may seem difficult or awkward, but allowing these attributions to remain implicit, yet negatively influence participant reactions to others' inputs, can inhibit strong dialogue and reduce integrative insights resulting from interactions (pp. 258-272). Finding necessary time and having communication skills within a group of stakeholders to be able to work with and through such communication and cognitive strains will likely remain significant obstacles in many academic cultures, but processes such as action research/science at least sensitize planning participants to the need for addressing these obstacles if improvement of IDS processes and outcomes is the goal.

Occasionally associated with dialogues concerning organizational change are early efforts to learn the existing social reality of organizational members and stakeholders through metaphorical or narrative analysis. Institutional or IDS stakeholders might use creative license to describe their own particular viewpoints and perceived challenges through vivid metaphors, myths, legends, jokes, or narrative constructions. Underneath these metaphorical and narrative constructions are often implicit assumptions and values of stakeholders that can be raised and analyzed. Various processes recommended for organizational renewal and change, such as *total systems intervention*, rely on stakeholder analysis in the early stages of dominant narratives and metaphors associated with the organization (e.g., Flood and Jackson, 1991, pp. 11-15). Potentials for OD and change are better understood by specific approaches such as *appreciative inquiry* (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987) and *generative metaphors* (Barrett and Cooperrider, 1988) to try to view organizational realities more creatively. In appreciative inquiry, participants are encouraged "to marvel, and in marveling to embrace, the miracle and mystery of social organization" (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1988, p. 131). Such inquiry is a deeper examination of what is working well here and elsewhere and to establish synergistic potentials through further inquiry and dialogue. Using such approaches, a number of IDS participants at one institution might visit other institutions and the IDS faculty and classes there. An exercise for these visitors afterward would be for each individual to generate images, metaphors, and narratives that connect and/or contrast approaches at other schools to IDS visions for their department or institution. A sensitivity-raising process of metaphor generation associated with trying to describe exist-

ing IDS program realities can also identify underlying attitudes and obstacles of cynicism, frustration, smugness, etc. for some stakeholders. The emergence of metaphors such as “jungle” (possibly projecting confusion and/or frustrations) or “games” (possibly signaling excessive politicization and rivalries) in such an exercise could suggest particular cognitive and affective obstacles for improved IDS program planning and development.

There are other management concepts and practices that might contribute to reducing integrative barriers at the institutional level or for IDS program or course planning. These concepts and practices include bargaining and negotiation methods, conflict resolution approaches, and program planning aids such as the *nominal group technique* (Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson, 1975). A nominal group technique (NGT) is a structured planning process often used when individuals reach an impasse over a particular issue or concern. The method also has particular relevance when participating stakeholders have different levels of power and voice. It allows assumptions, concerns, and suggestions to be written by individual participants and then communicated anonymously to the whole group by the facilitator. In successive rounds of survey feedback involving planning participants and a facilitator, inputs are shared that otherwise might be inhibited by fears of quick criticism or rejection by supervisors or powerful others. NGT is designed to uncover more participant assumptions and to encourage more insights about issues prior to any criticism, decision, or evaluation stage of planning. Only after assumptions and ideas have been fully raised would the NGT stage of anonymous balloting and evaluation of participant inputs begin. Benefits from this method include an opportunity to concentrate on a particularly difficult issue and to achieve a sense of closure or some kind of decision on the issue. A nominal group technique, as well as other more structured decision-making and planning methods, are not suited for certain forms of dialogue, particularly those that emphasize more spontaneous interactions or when institutional stakeholders are addressing a variety of issues.

Since participants vary somewhat in learning styles or preferences, IDS planning might engage increasing participant involvement by offering both more- and less- structured planning processes or sessions. For example, early planning sessions might include more structured concerns such as analysis of IDS linkages to institutional mission and strategies as well as assessment of previous IDS planning and policies through bootstrapping and policy capturing. A process of stakeholder analysis and issues analysis could be undertaken through largely open-ended multi-stakeholder dialogues that encouraged appreciative inquiry and the use of generative metaphors leading to the

various strategy and planning options. PAR might be considered if one wishes to help participants translate vague or general plans into pilot programs or continuing experiments, while also encouraging stronger stakeholder voices by providing them meaningful roles in this action research. The nominal group technique might be used for particularly difficult/complex issues or impasses involving participating stakeholders. These and other concepts and approaches having potential value in IDS planning and development activities are summarized in the Table below. IDS program leaders aware of such management perspectives could choose more appropriate integrative approaches for IDS program development based on their own knowledge of faculty and academic cultures as well as the advice of outside facilitative resources.

Table: Tools, Purposes, Sources

I. Strategic Management Perspectives		
	Major Purpose	Sources
A. Basic tools (strategies, policies, etc.)	Integrating program planning and connecting it with overall institutional mission and strategies.	Strategic management texts and references such as Freeman (1984).
B. Stakeholder analysis	Learning more about stakeholder needs/power and implications for planning.	Strategic management texts and references such as Freeman (1984).
C. Issues management	Examining key issues of concern for stakeholders and that confront the institution.	Strategic management texts and references such as Ansoff (1980).
D. Strategic assumption surfacing and testing technique (SAST)	Surfacing and testing stakeholder assumptions (usually through a dialectic or devil's advocacy).	Some strategic management textbooks and references such as Mason and Mitroff (1981).
E. Policy capturing and bootstrapping	Assessing implicit aspects of previous strategies and policies to determine process weaknesses and strengths.	Szilagi and Wallace (1983) and Dawis (1971).
II. Organizational Change Perspectives		
	Major Purpose	Sources
A. Organizational development (OD)	Raising the sensitivity and implicit assumptions of stakeholders for them to study and improve decision making, communication, and renewal processes.	Many management/organizational behavior texts and references such as French and Bell (1995).
B. Action research	Linking more closely the process of inquiry/research to include actions taken by inquiry participants	Many books on social science research and references such as Whyte and Hamilton (1964).
C. Participant action research (PAR)	Enhancing action research through including a broader set of participating stakeholders.	References such as Chein, Cook, and Harding (1948).
D. Action science	Improving listening and communication skills in inquiry and decision making processes.	References such as Argyris and Schon (1989).
E. Appreciative inquiry and generative metaphors	Using narratives, metaphors and other cognitive constructions to more deeply examine social realities and potentials for improved processes.	References such as Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) and Barrett and Cooperrider (1988).
F. Nominal group technique	Addressing challenges of empowerment/voice of certain stakeholders and resolving dialogic obstacles or impasses.	References such as Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson (1975).

Concluding Remarks

The concepts and approaches briefly described in these sections are, again, only a partial inventory of potential contributions from management-related fields. A strategic management framework and other process-oriented approaches such as OD can more closely integrate IDS initiatives with overall institutional mission and strategies. These approaches can be used to identify and discuss certain resource, motivation, and reward deficiencies for participating IDS faculty and administrators. The quality of integrative inquiry and dialogue among participating IDS program stakeholders is critical. Concepts and approaches such as those summarized in the Tsbllrcan help participants overcome many of the common challenges encountered in IDS planning and development.

Fields related to management and organizational studies do not supply a discrete set of techniques that can be “plugged into” existing IDS planning challenges for “quick fixes.” A simple contingency or “if-then” orientation that links certain problems facing IDS planning groups, such as those described in the early section of this article, to certain management-related methods is not being suggested. Challenges—such as lack of integration of IDS planning and overall university mission and strategies, limited faculty time and motivation for IDS contributions, differing participant assumptions, and power or political barriers—are often interdependent and difficult ones to address without the strong introduction and encouragement of more genuine participant dialogue that critically examines the existing institutional culture. The discipline of management has long been associated with diagnostic and intervention approaches such as management by objectives (MBO) and, more recently, total quality management (TQM). Such approaches have been applied successfully within some organizations, but these approaches often failed elsewhere, even with serious attention given to following their suggested guidelines and procedures. Cultural, political, and economic considerations, as well as integrative and facilitative skills, in applying such administrative perspectives were often neglected. Although strategic management and OD approaches described in this article better incorporate and integrate such key considerations into addressing organizational challenges, a philosophy of encouraging active, extended, reflexive, and integrative inquiry must be adopted “top-down” by university and IDS program officials. Less than such a commitment may not be enough to overcome many of the described IDS program challenges. Stakeholders involved in IDS program development need not already be familiar with strategic management and OD, if facilitators have “top-down support” and are knowledgeable about these in-

tegrative resources for establishing high-quality dialogues.

Approaches from management and organizational studies as well as other applied social science fields may be inappropriate for many IDS purposes and contexts. Management-related fields have been criticized for their limitations and biases in integrative inquiry. Cheit (1991), Easton (1991), and Zand (1996) appraise the potential of the disciplines related to management and organization studies to integrate diverse types of knowledge, and they find weaknesses and continuing challenges. Zand (1996) explores some progress made toward more integrative contributions in these fields and discusses their “extensive but only partial rapprochement with the humanities” (p. 251). Although useful inputs from “deconstructive, rhetorical and narrative analysis from literary theory and some engagement with history and historical analysis has occurred,” much more integrative input, particularly from philosophy, is possible (p. 260). But surely a contrasting concern for the development of improved integrative inquiry and IDS planning, though, is lack of awareness of integrative processes from applied social science fields such as management. Integrative perspectives and processes including many of those previously described have not been carefully examined within the IDS literature nor, I believe, applied to any significant extent for IDS program development at most universities.

Perhaps many believe that established integrative processes from the IDS literature effectively raise assumptions and insights from all key institutional stakeholders. While they may do so in principle, I question the potential of suggested IDS models and processes to do this well and on their own behalf in specific institutional settings—particularly given the constraints to integrative inquiry found in many academic cultures. Although the additional concepts and approaches described in this article directly tackle certain challenges for IDS planning processes, these perspectives complement IDS principles while at the same time demanding facilitative knowledge and skills that may not always be easy to locate and access. However, the inclusion of one or a few individuals knowledgeable in applied social sciences, strategic management, and/or organizational development seems imperative for successful integrative IDS planning. More critical is a strong commitment among IDS planners to broader stakeholder inclusion and to empowerment of the voices of all participants. An espoused commitment to such values is common in IDS; actual skills and practices necessary to fulfill this commitment seem much less common within academic cultures and institutions of higher learning.

Biographical Note: Stephen Payne is Associate Professor of Management at Georgia College and State University and a faculty member for one of the core courses in its interdisciplinary program. Since the 1970s, his research has appeared in publications in many academic fields, including business ethics, organization behavior, and management education. Dr. Payne was senior editor for the book *Ethical Dilemmas for Academic Professionals* (1987) and served on the committee that drafted the ethical code for the Academy of Management.

Note

1. While Martin Buber is well known, I recommend Nealon (1997) on Bahktin and Levinas, and Bohm (1996) for his key ideas.
2. For example, a few postmodern critics of education have indicated how current social *texts* and constructs might be studied first as a ground against which deconstructive thinking and arguments would follow. Texts or cognitive frameworks that are socially accepted, systematic, structured, and coherent narratives help us understand aspects of our culture and social realities, but they should subsequently be deconstructed, criticized, and modified to display the complexity, contradiction, and ambiguity of life (Cherryholmes, 1988, pp. 69-70).

References

- Ansoff, H. I. (1980). Strategic issues management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1(2), 131-148.
- Argyris, C. (1985). *Strategy, change and defensive routines*. Boston: Pitman.
- Argyris, C., and Schon, D. L. (1989). Participatory action research and action science compared. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 9(5), 612-623.
- Armstrong, F. (1980). Faculty development through interdisciplinarity. *Journal of General Education*, 32(1), 52-63.
- Barrett, F. J, and Cooperrider, D. L. (1988). Using generative metaphor to intervene in a system divided by turfism and competition. *Academy of Management's Best Papers Proceeding*, 252-257.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. London: Routledge.
- Burrell, G., and Reed, M. (1995). Ethics and morality, side by side. *Organization*, 2:2, 179-180.
- Casey, B. A. (1994). The administration and governance of interdisciplinary programs. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 58, 53-67.
- Chein, I., Cook, S., and Harding, J. (1948). The field of action research. *American Psychologist*, 3, 43-50.
- Cheit, E. (1991). The shaping of business management thought. In D. Easton and C. Schelling (Eds.), *Divided knowledge: Across disciplines, across cultures* (pp. 195-218). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

- Cooperrider, D., and Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In R. W. Woodman and W. A. Pasmore (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (pp. 129-169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Davis, J. R. (1995). *Interdisciplinary courses and their teaching: New arrangements for learning*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Dawis, R. M. (1971). A case study of graduate admissions: Three principles of human decision making. *American Psychologist*, 180-188.
- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., and Gustafson, D. H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Easton, D. (1991). The division, integration and transfer of knowledge. In D. Easton and C. Schelling (Eds.), *Divided knowledge: Across disciplines, across cultures* (pp. 7-36). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Edwards, A. F. (1996). *Interdisciplinary undergraduate programs: A directory* (2nd ed). Acton, MA: Copley Publishing Group.
- Flood, R. L., and Jackson, M. C. (1991). *Creative problem solving: Total systems intervention*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- French, W. L., and Bell, C. H. (1995). *Organization development* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gareau, F. H. (1988). The long, uncertain road to social science maturity. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 29, 175-186.
- Hollinger, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and the social sciences: A thematic approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoover, J. D., and Howard, L. A. (1995). The political correctness controversy revisited. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 38:7, 963-975.
- Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. New York: Currency Books.
- Keesey, R. (1988). Transformations in disciplinary knowledge assumptions and their implication for reforming the undergraduate discipline. *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 6, 82-125.
- Klein, J. T. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory, and practice*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Klein, J. T., and Newell, W. H. (1996). Advancing interdisciplinary studies. In J. Gaff and J. Radcliff. (Eds.), *Handbook of the undergraduate curriculum* (pp. 393-415). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mason, R. O., and Mitroff, I. (1981). *Challenging strategic planning assumptions*. New York: Wiley.
- Nealon, J. (1997). The ethics of the dialogue: Bakhtin and Levinas. *College English*, 59 (2), 129-148.
- Nichols, J. (1995). *A practitioner's handbook for institutional effectiveness and student outcomes assessment implementation*. New York: Agathon.

- Ott, J. S. (1989). *The organizational culture perspective*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Revans, R. W. (1980). *Action learning: New techniques for management*. London: Blond and Briggs.
- Schein, E. H. (1991). What is culture? In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Louis, C. Lundberg, and J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 243-252). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schrantz, M. (1993). Crossing the disciplinary boundaries: Professional development through action research in higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 12(2), 131-142.
- Schweiger, D. M., Sandberg, W., and Rechner, P. (1989). Experimental effects of dialectical inquiry, devil's advocacy, and consensus approaches for strategic decision making. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 745-772.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Stember, M. (1991). Advancing the social sciences through the interdisciplinary experience. *Social Science Journal*, 28(1), 1-14.
- Szilagi, A. W., and Wallace, M. J. (1983). *Organizational behavior and performance*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Forsman.
- Whyte, W. F., and Hamilton, E. L. (1964). *Action research for management*. Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey.
- Zand, M. N. (1996). More fragmentation? Unfinished business in linking the social sciences and the humanities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 251-261.