

Contents

[The 1993 ODC Program by Richard W. Woodman](#)

[Creating Leadership in Organizations: A Role for ODC by Luke Novelli, Jr.](#)

[Books by Members](#)

[Articles by Members](#)

[Choosing and Leading a Fundamental Change by Richard Beckhard](#)

[Possible Applications of Bayesian Methods to OD Evaluation and Decision Making by Matthew S. O'Connell, Daniel J. Svyantek, and Terri L. Baumgardner](#)

THE 1993 ODC PROGRAM

by Richard W. Woodman

This year's annual meeting of the Academy of Management will be held in Atlanta, August 8-11, 1993. Preconvention activities will begin on Friday, August 6th. The division received a number of interesting and well written papers and symposium proposals. From these, an excellent program has been selected by the division's large panel of volunteer reviewers.

The ODC division has a total of six symposia on its program. One of these, "Customer Satisfaction in the Boundaryless Organization: Activating Excellence" (Mary Tucker, chair), has been selected by the Academy as a showcase session. Other sessions are: "Networks, Hierarchies, and Markets: Emerging Visions for Large Scale System Change" (Sandra Waddock, chair); "And the Walls Come Tumbling Down: Organizational Strategies for Breaking Down Barriers Within and Between Organizations" (Karen Mishra, chair); "Transforming Management in the Boundaryless Organization: A Status Report on Empowerment Theory, Research, and Practice" (Gretchen Spreitzer, chair); "Intimate Encounters with Everyday Resistance: Understanding Localized Expressions of Organizational Opposition" (Walter Nord, chair); and "Developing Theory and Practice for the Caring Organization" (Roy Jacques & Joan Kofodimos, chairs). Great titles--and the content is even better, so I hope to see you at these sessions. Interestingly, all six of these symposia are co-sponsored with one or more other divisions/interest groups.

Our co-sponsors this year include Business Policy and Strategy, Managerial and Organizational Cognition, Organizational Behavior, Organization and Management Theory, Public and Nonprofit Sector, Social Issues in Management, and Women in Management. Whether this co-sponsorship represents a healthy crossing of subdiscipline boundaries or simply reflects conventional wisdom about increasing the odds of getting on the national program remains to be seen. For whatever reason, however, the trend toward co-sponsored symposia is a welcome development which seems to create richer arenas for scholarly inquiry.

The ODC program also includes four competitive paper sessions each containing three papers. These sessions address "new perspectives" in the field of organizational change and development, boundary issues in organizational change, explorations of organizational culture and change, and research issues in the field. In addition, we were again allowed to select three papers to be included in the Academy's poster sessions. Poster sessions were introduced during the 1992 program, and were quite successful. We have selected papers focusing on communication, decentralized decision making, and group incentive issues in organizational change as the ODC division contribution to the Academy's "Distinctive Poster Session."

Monday afternoon, ODC is proud to offer a Distinguished Speaker. Our invited speaker this year is Robert E. Quinn of the University of Michigan. Bob's talk is entitled "New Directions in OD: A Radical Perspective." This provocative talk will be followed by the division business meeting to be held from 5:15 to 6:15 on Monday, August 9. Among the important issues to be discussed is a proposal to revise the governance structure of the division. The proposed new structure would increase the number of elected positions in the division providing two elected "tracks" in place of the current single track. Please plan on attending so that you can voice your preferences and concerns with regard to this and other issues. The Best Paper Award, which carries a \$500 prize sponsored by the Journal of Organizational Change Management, will be announced at the business meeting. The business meeting will be followed by a social hour that you will not want to miss.

In addition to the above, there are several preconvention activities and a postconvention workshop. As has been the case for a number of years, we are jointly sponsoring a doctoral student consortium with OMT and OB. Sue Mohrman is the ODC division representative for designing this event. Jean Bartunek, Bob Quinn, and myself will represent the division as faculty for the consortium.

Back by popular demand is the preconvention workshop of the Empowering Work/Action Research Network. This workshop, entitled "Emerging Concepts of Empowering Work and Action Research: Sharing Ideas Across National Boundaries," will be presented by Rupert Chisholm, Max Elden, R. J. Bullock, and Tom Cummings. The workshop begins on Saturday, August 7 and ends Sunday at noon. While the workshop is free, preregistration is required of participants. To register, contact Rupe Chishom at (717) 948-6052 or by fax (717) 948-6320. A postconvention workshop, coordinated by R.J. Bullock, will take place on Wednesday, August 11 as a follow-up to this preconference session.

The ODC division is also pleased to co-sponsor (with OMT) another preconvention workshop entitled "Business Without Bosses: Real-Life Stories About Self-Managing Teams." This event will be on Sunday, August 8 from 8 a.m. to 12 noon and is coordinated by Hank Sims and Chuck Manz.

An ongoing concern in the Academy is creating bridges between the academic and practitioner communities. I am pleased to note that the following organizations are represented on the ODC 1993 program: Petrella, Block Associates, Air Products Corporation, United Steelworkers of America, Health Administration Press, O'Brien, Passen & Associates, Coopers & Lybrand, Sherwin-Williams Company, Ford Motor Company, Forum Corporation, Saturn Corporation, MetLife, and 3M.

I would like to express sincere thanks for their hard work to the 42 reviewers who selected the symposia and papers for the ODC program. Even though we used a large panel of reviewers, the division had more volunteers than needed. This is a comfortable position for a program chair to be in and I am most grateful for the division's supportive response. Thanks also to those who volunteered but were not asked to serve.

Reviewers for the 1993 ODC program were: Achilles Armenakis, Auburn University; Frank Barrett, Naval Post Graduate School; Jean Bartunek, Boston College; David Bednar, University of Arkansas; James Bowditch, Boston College; Don Bowen, Tulsa University; Tony Buono, Bentley College; David Cooperrider, Case Western Reserve University; Tom Cummings, University of Southern California; Joel Deluca, Coopers & Lybrand; Evelyn Dravecky, independent consultant; Max Elden, University of Houston at Clear Lake; Helene Fine, University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth; Ronald Fry, Case Western Reserve University; Bob Golembiewski, University of Georgia; Mary Ann Hazen, University of Detroit; Tom Head, DePaul University; Susan Hocevar, Naval Post Graduate School; Gerry

Ledford, University of Southern California; Craig Lundberg, Cornell University; Marion McCollom, Boston University; Mike McCuddy, Valparaiso University; Gary McMahan, Texas A & M University; Sue Mohrman, University of Southern California; Kenneth Murrell, University of West Florida; Luke Novelli, Center for Creative Leadership; Bill Pasmore, Case Western Reserve University; Ron Purser, Loyola University; Gaylord Reagan, independent consultant; Richard Ryberg, University of Redlands; Rami Shani, California Polytechnic State University; Robert Silvers, Central Washington University; Gretchen Spreitzer, University of Southern California; Bob Steel, Air Force Institute of Technology; Dan Syantek, University of Akron; Bill Torbert, Boston College; Glenn Varney, Bowling Green State University; Frances Viggiani, SUNY Binghamton; Grady Wade, Atlanta, Georgia; Gordon Walter, University of British Columbia; Don Warrick, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs; Rita Weathersby, University of New Hampshire

Again, our thanks to the above individuals for their unselfish contributions to this year's program. Serving as a reviewer for the annual meeting is an excellent way to get involved in ODC activities. All of the chairs and discussants for competitive paper sessions were drawn from the above list of reviewers. If you would like to make such a contribution, please come to the division business meeting and volunteer to help with the 1994 program. See you in Atlanta!

CREATING LEADERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS: A ROLE FOR ODC

by Luke Novelli, Jr.

The concept of leadership has a significant impact on how we conceive of organizational development and change (ODC) processes. I would suggest that the field, as a whole, should pay more attention to leadership. In many cases, we have taken for granted some common sense notions of what leadership is. These notions about leadership may not possess sufficient conceptual variety to deal adequately with the ODC issues generated within organizations facing increasingly turbulent environments. A key role for ODC theory and practice is developing a richer understanding of leadership and helping organizational members enrich and elaborate their concept of leadership. With conceptual constraints about leadership loosened, more effective organizational practices and structures are likely to emerge. Below are outlined some preliminary ideas about current conceptions of leadership and how the concept of leadership might be usefully expanded.

Current Views of Leadership

Most current views focus on leadership as characteristics inherent in an individual (Rost, 1991). The view is something like the following. Positions are located within an organizational hierarchy. Each position has attached to it a certain amount of authority, responsibility and accountability. A person is chosen to fill the position. That person inherits the prerogatives associated with the position. In short, the person and the position are coterminous. Developing leadership means finding or developing exceptional people to become leaders. This view results in perpetuating the heroic myth of leadership (Bradford & Cohen, 1984) -- the idea that leaders are exceptional people who have a special ability needed by more ordinary followers.

The current view of leadership outlined above is conceptually adequate for dealing with organizations existing in more stable environments. The relative degree of certainty allows a premium to be placed on developing effective strategies and plans, and implementing command and control structures that keep the organization on track with the plan. With manageable environmental complexity and enhanced information processing capabilities, leaders are able to monitor key information about environmental conditions and internal functioning. This allows them to retain effective decision making over key issues.

The dominant theories and practice activities within the ODC field seem to accept this view without serious questioning, although there is increasing recognition that more people can be leaders. The emphasis on empowerment provides a case in point (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1991). At its core, empowerment means someone at a higher organizational level giving power to someone else at a lower level. The person at a senior level articulates a vision and strategy that incorporates key organizational values and establishes the decision premises that guide the empowered managers. This allows those lower in the organization to make the same decisions that those higher in the organization would make if they had knowledge about local circumstances. Empowerment entails people in higher hierarchical positions deciding how much power those below have. The route to empowerment typically involves training both those that are empowering as well as those that will be empowered. Empowerment seems to imply that better leaders will be more empowering and organizations will be more effective when those lower in the hierarchy have more discretion about how to respond to local conditions within the parameters established by senior leaders. In short, empowerment can be operationalized without addressing basic leadership issues.

A Process View of Leadership

Rather than viewing leadership as characteristics inherent within an individual, it can be thought of in process terms. The key features of a process view follow. An organization is a purposeful collectivity of individuals. Accomplishing purposes requires that certain functions be performed. One key function is leadership, which provides a sense of orientation. Two important subfunctions, 1) establishing, maintaining or changing organizational purposes as appropriate, and 2) continually recreating organizational steering capacity are provided through a set of four processes. The processes are: monitoring and coordinating production related activities; legitimating influence processes and tactics; developing people who will match organizational needs; and interpreting or making sense of ambiguous and contradictory situations. The processes are enhanced by well formed and delineated roles. People within roles, enact the processes. A wide variety of people can fill multiple roles. There are a number of alternative ways to design the features of the leadership function.

The process view outlined above allows a shift in thinking about leadership. It makes it easier to move away from thinking about leaders and towards thinking about people who are involved in a leadership role. It helps us move beyond thinking about developing abstract leadership qualities in a person who is or will become a leader to thinking about developing skills within an organization that allow a variety of people to fulfill roles associated with the various processes. It allows us to think about ways of designing leadership processes so that we might take advantage of the skills and capabilities within the organization and to avoid creating requirements for individuals that may be difficult or impossible to fulfill. It helps us consider leadership as multi-faceted and moves us beyond the debate about whether and how managers and leaders might differ. Finally, it implies a need for high levels of learning capacity because it frames leadership as a highly flexible process that can be designed to respond to changing internal and external conditions.

Implications of the Process View of Leadership

The self managed work team concept provides a prototype for a process view of leadership and hint of the organizational ramifications of applying this view at higher organizational levels. In the traditionally designed work group, the supervisor position was accorded accountability, responsibility and authority for the work unit. The person in the supervisor position was the leader and the decision maker for the work group. In one version of self-managed

work teams, a number of important team functions are determined (e.g., production, group process, safety, personnel, etc.), and roles are created with responsibility for the team functions. Team members are then trained to take on the various roles and they are required to rotate through each role.

The point of the above example is to illustrate some key issues with the process view. How people think about leadership has a major impact on the kinds of alternative work arrangements they can conceive. As long as people thought about leadership as what a work group supervisor did, it was very difficult to consider or even imagine how the work group could be organized differently. Peoples' concept of leadership shapes their assumptions about how people can work together. Even today, the ability of peers to appraise and discipline each other is not universally accepted as possible. A new role for the former leader becomes problematic when leadership processes are established that distribute leadership roles more broadly.

The concept of leadership as process, at least as incorporated in socio-technical systems theory, has been around for nearly forty years. Yet an equivalent evolution of the leadership concept has not seemed to occur above the production or service unit level.

A Role for ODC

Increased environmental turbulence requires increased organizational flexibility and adaptiveness. New organizational forms are emerging to provide these features (Miles, 1992). ODC can help mid-level and senior managers surface and make explicit their concept of leadership. Once made explicit, the self-imposed limitations inherent within their concepts can be addressed. This can serve as a starting point for reinventing a leadership concept that has sufficient conceptual variety to deal with increasingly complex organizational phenomena.

Obtaining top management support for the large-scale systems change demanded by today's environment is not sufficient. Helping top management see more clearly how their concept of leadership is part of their organization's difficulty in coping with change takes on increasing importance. Developing a different concept of leadership could very well mean a shift in how they see themselves and a recognition of how they might need to change in order to promote the kinds of changes they are asking in others.

References

Rost, J.C. 1991. Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York: Praeger.

Bradford, D.L. 1984. Managing for excellence. New York: Wiley.

Miles, R.E. & Snow, C.C. 1992. Causes of failure in network organizations. California Management Review, 53-72.

Quinn, R.E. & Spreitzer, G. M. Summer, 1991. The empowerment process. ODC Newsletter: Academy of Management.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Harris, Thomas E. (1993). Applied organizational communication: perspectives, principles, and pragmatics. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Buono, Anthony F. & Nurick, Aaron J. (1992). Intervening in the middle: Coping strategies in mergers and acquisitions. Human Resource Planning, 15(2), 19-33.

Ferguson, Jeffery M. & Zawacki, Robert A. (1993). Service quality: A critical success factor for IS organizations. Information Strategy: The Executive's Journal, pp. 24-30.

McCormick, D.W. (1993). College-level learning and prior experiential learning assessment. Adult Learning, 4(3), 20-22.

Norman, Carol A. & Zawacki, Robert A. (1991). Team appraisals-team approach. Personnel Journal, pp. 101-104.

Zawacki, Robert A. (1993). Key issues in human resources management. Information

CHOOSING AND LEADING A FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE

by Richard Beckhard

The "demand system" surrounding organization leaders in private and public organizations is without precedent in modern history. For many of us an appropriate metaphor is: "If we were on a white water rafting trip, we would experience continuous white water, with no quiet pools between rapids."

Given this set of demands from multiple constituencies, including competitors, interest groups, social values, the current state of the economy and political priorities, organization leaders are forced to examine their place in the scheme of things, the ways in which they work, and their relationships to their constituencies both inside and outside the organization. Such an examination tends to bring to the surface the assumptions and paradigms which have been driving current practices.

For more and more leaders, this examination brings forth some new assumptions and principles. Two obvious examples of historic assumptions that need reexamination are:

We can control our own destiny if we are smart enough,

We will be operating in a generally predictable environment.

Most leaders know that neither of these applies today. They also know they must provide the direction for their organizations to both survive and thrive into the next century. Specifically, they need guidance on how, in the new conditions, to manage the tensions in three dilemmas:

The tension between planning the future based on the leaders' experience, values and style and planning based on the demands from outside the leadership, both outside and inside the organization.

Establishing a New Balance between the survival and growth needs of the ORGANIZATION and the motivational and developmental needs of INDIVIDUALS.

Managing the tension between forces for stability and continuity and forces for change.

Choosing a Change Strategy

Since we know that most organization leaders either are or soon will be aware that change is not only desirable but necessary and inevitable, the challenge is to design and conduct a change program that can move the organization to a new state of "health"; one that can be implemented in a way that does not destroy all the good in the present condition.

We can easily find an analogy in the national dilemma we all face today. Can we stand the costs of a Fundamental Change in our priorities, values, and policies?

It is the position of this paper that organization leaders MUST examine the needs for Fundamental vs. Incremental Change and develop a strategy that meets both. In the rest of this paper, I will focus on the choice of a Fundamental Change Strategy--its components and implications.

Examples of Fundamental Strategies include:

Change in the Mission(reason to be) of an organization. The leadership of Federal Express decides that they are no longer in the package delivery business. They are in the TRANSPORTATION business.

Change in Identity (how we want to be defined). Sears management decides it wants to be seen as a one stop financial/retail service business. Unfortunately both customers and employees still defined Sears as a retail business.

Change in Relationship to key constituencies. An organization changes the relationship between its purchasing agents and its suppliers from adversarial to "partnerships".

Change in basic "ways of work". A manufacturing organization eliminates the departments of purchasing, manufacturing, engineering and distribution, and replaces them with ONE department of "Product Supply".

Change in Cultural Norms. Top Management decides to move the organization culture from Results Driven to Service Driven.

The Character of Fundamental Change

Several assumptions are operable in most successful fundamental change efforts.

"Business" demands and decisions (what the organization does) should drive organization change efforts.

In a Fundamental Change everything is subject to immediate, not incremental change. "Everything" includes: Human resource policies and practices, financial control systems, information management, and rewards practices.

The leadership must address the change effort with a systems-thinking stance.

The organization must move to a learning mode.

There must be a conscious "communicable" management structure for leading the "transition state"--that time and space between the present and the changed state where all the "changing" takes place.

The leaders must determine how to manage their personal dilemmas: The role they want to play in the change effort, their own style and values, how they want to be "seen" by key players, and the effects on their life (family, outside activities), etc.

The tension between leading the existing system and leading the change.

In sum, the "statement" of this piece is that given the unprecedented demands on organization leaders due to the turbulent environment, leaders are faced with new choices between organization survival and organization health.

Choosing a developmental strategy that will best lead to a thriving future organization is increasingly necessary. Such a choice means examining, and often changing, the Essence or Core of the Organization.

If a FUNDAMENTAL change strategy is selected, the organizational consequences are: (1) Everything is subject to immediate change; (2) The organization must become Vision Driven; (3) The organization must move to a Learning Mode; (4) There must be a dedicated Transition Management Structure; and (5) The leadership must consciously "manage" their own personal dilemmas.

References

Beckhard, Richard & Pritchard, Wendy. (1992). *Changing the Essence: The Art of Creating and Leading Fundamental Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

POSSIBLE APPLICATIONS OF BAYESIAN METHODS TO OD EVALUATION AND DECISION MAKING

by Matthew S. O'Connell, Daniel J. Svyantek and Terri L. Baumgardner

Organization Development (OD) suffers from the same problems found in other applied social science fields. For example, random sampling and more importantly, randomization of treatment levels are luxuries not often encountered in field settings (1). This poses serious threats to traditional statistical control and analysis which assumes random assignment of subjects to groups (2). This paper introduces a new means of evaluation for Organization Development (OD) utilizing Bayesian statistical analysis.

The Logic of Bayesian Statistics

Bayesian approaches are finding applicability in a variety of settings today. The basic foundation of Bayesian statistics is the quantification of a prior probability (or distribution) for a phenomena being studied (3). This prior probability often represents the consensual beliefs of a group of experts about the expected results of an experiment (4). These prior probabilities are used after gathering experimental data in an ongoing study in the calculation of a posterior probability (or distribution). The posterior distribution constitutes a revision of the prior distribution based on the data gathered in the current study.

Resistance to the use of Bayesian statistics is strong. The primary reason for this is that Bayesian statistics requires the quantification of subjective judgement by the researcher. The idea of introducing subjective judgments into statistics continues to receive a great deal of criticism. Critics argue that classical statistics and research methods

are objective due to their reliance on significance testing based on a known sampling distribution. The question of subjectivity's role in Bayesian and classical statistics is based on the assumption that classical methods are objective and the estimation of prior probabilities in Bayesian statistics is subjective. The argument against Bayesian statistics presented by classical statistic advocates is that it is very likely that ten different researchers would have ten different opinions regarding the estimate of the prior probability. Berger and Berry (4) disagree: They believe that experts, within an area can come to a consensual estimate which is reasonable. Bayesian methods do not require that an exact mean or an exact probability be specified for the prior distribution. Ranges of realistic values are all that are necessary. Given this, it seems likely that many researchers could agree on at least a reasonable range of possible values.

Applications to OD

One clear application of the Bayesian approach is in the action research model. The basic steps in the action research approach are 1) problem identification, 2) consultation with behavioral science expert, 3) data gathering and preliminary diagnosis, 4) feedback to client or group, 5) joint diagnosis of problem, 6) action, 7) data gathering after action. It is proposed that Bayesian analyses could be of great assistance to both the researcher and the client in steps 3-7.

The basic purpose and major advantage of the action research model is that it allows for continual revision and refinement of the problem and the solution. Traditional statistics are not geared to assessing the effects of this type of experimentation with continual refinement. This approach could be reworded in Bayesian terms to say that prior information is continually revised by the data to arrive at a clearer and more refined understanding of the situation. Pollard (5) argues that a Bayesian approach is more amenable to this type of research than classical methods, "As I have pointed out, classical statistics has little to say about how the results should be used. It is left to the user to extract informally from significance levels and confidence levels the implications for what one should think or do. Bayesian statistics, on the other hand, explicitly deals with how the data should modify one's thinking and choice of action; it comprises a normative theory of research utilization." (p. 17).

At the heart of the action research model are various decisions concerning the planned intervention. A decision must be made regarding which intervention is right for the current situation. A decision, or series of decisions must also

be made regarding the effectiveness of the intervention, i.e. is it working, and if not what should be done. The Bayesian school may provide clearer directions concerning the relative advantage of various paths to follow (3).

The proposal for a Bayesian approach to OD evaluation is particularly salient when one considers that an OD practitioner may be faced with implementing an intervention on a very small group of workers. In these situations, traditional statistical analyses may prove to be seriously misleading. Schmidt, Ocasio, Hillery, & Hunter (6), for example, have shown that even moderate sample sizes, such as an n of 68, can lead to a wide range of validity coefficients over repeated trials. This being the case, how confident can a researcher be when s/he is faced with analyzing an intervention conducted with a sample of 5, 10 or even 20 people? One possible alternative, especially when one is very unsure about possible outcomes, is to utilize what is known as a noninformative or flat prior in the Bayesian analysis. In this case Bayesian and classical methods will arrive at the same answer from the data set. The difference is that the resulting value from the Bayesian approach can be used in further analyses as a prior.

Another problem inherent in classical statistics that is avoided in the Bayesian approach is that of significance levels. Although extremely useful as a decision making tool, significance levels are limited because they do not really take utility, or any other information into account. Pollard (5) provides a graphic example of how the inclusion of risk functions, determined from error characteristic curves and loss due to error, leads to the conclusion that in comparisons of the difference between two treatments, $\alpha=.50$ provides, on the average, the smallest risk when no prior information regarding the location of the difference value in relation to the break even level is allowed into the equation (i.e., as in classical methods).

An interesting thing to note about the Bayesian approach is that it leaves significance up to the user and not to an arbitrarily fixed alpha level. This allows the testing of the practical significance of an intervention. Thus, although a mean shift of 0.10 may prove to be statistically significant when an N size of 500 is used, it is questionable what practical significance this has to the user who is looking for a shift of 0.5. Bayesian methods allow this information to be incorporated in the estimation of statistical significance (7,8).

In summation, this article proposes that current statistical methods often provide less than ideal information regarding OD evaluation and decision making. Bayesian statistics are, by their very nature, more suited to the type of analysis that is often done in OD. Organization development is a dynamic process and requires something other

than non-dynamic statistical methods to fairly evaluate it. It is hoped that OD researchers and practitioners will be willing to consider Bayesian statistics' applicability to their field.

References

1. Bullock, R. J., & Swyantek, D. J. 1987. The impossibility of using random strategies to study the organizational development process. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 23, 255-262.
2. Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design & Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
3. Iverson, G. R. 1984. *Bayesian Statistical Inference*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
4. Berger, J.O. & Berry, D.A. (1988). Statistical analysis and the illusion of objectivity. *American Scientist*, 76, 159-165.
5. Pollard, W. E. 1986. *Bayesian Statistics for Evaluation Research: An Introduction*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
6. Schmidt, F. L., Ocasio, B. P., Hillery, J. M., & Hunter, J. E. 1985. Further within-setting empirical tests of the situational specificity hypothesis in personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 509-524.
7. Swyantek, D.J., O'Connell, M.S. & Baumgardner, T.L. (1992). Applications of Bayesian Methods to OD Evaluation and Decision Making. *Human Relations*, 45, 621-636.
8. Swyantek, D.J., O'Connell, M.S. & Baumgardner, T.L. (1992). A Bayesian Approach to the Evaluation of Organizational Development Efforts. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 6, 235-266.

Individuals interested in the application of Bayesian methods to OD

may contact Dr. Daniel J. Swyantek, Psychology Department, University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-4301

