

Contents

[Call for Papers: Managing the Boundaryless Organization by Richard W. Woodman](#)

[What are the Basic Values of OD? by Allan H. Church & W. Warner Burke](#)

[Articles by Members](#)

[Books by Members](#)

[News About Members](#)

[Call for Papers: The Society for Advancement of Management](#)

[The Impact of Planned Organizational Change: Results of a Meta-Analysis by Peter J. Robertson, Darryl R. Roberts, & Jerry I. Porras](#)

[Past Division Chairpersons: A Historical Timeline](#)

Call for Papers: Managing the Boundaryless Organization

by *Richard W. Woodman*

The 1993 annual meeting of the Academy of Management will be held August 8-11, 1993 in Atlanta, Georgia. The theme for this meeting is "Managing the Boundaryless Organization." As always, the Academy will continue to welcome paper and symposia submissions on topics of traditional interest to its members. Since this is the case, one might wonder about the significance of this, or any other, theme for an Academy meeting. (I confess to often feeling this way.) On the other hand, someone has gone to some trouble in selecting an overarching theme that might carry meaning and significance for the profession. Seen in this light, a theme presents an invitation to rethink our scholarly activities and perhaps to recast them in a manner that develops new areas of inquiry and managerial action. I encourage you to explore this theme in this spirit.

While employees are the constituency typically focused on by Academy of Management members in their research and writing, the theme of this year's meeting invites us to look beyond the organization's traditional boundaries. Shareholders, customers, suppliers, regulators, and representatives of various public interests are among the stakeholders whose relationship to the organization could be meaningfully investigated by organizational scientists.

Mary Ann Von Glinow, Academy Program Chair for the 1993 meeting, has suggested the following examples of topics which are relevant to the theme of the "boundaryless organization."

Cause-effect relationships between various managerial and organizational values, practices, or attributes and organizational productivity or shareholder wealth;

Effects of various managerial and organizational values, practices, or characteristics upon cycle time, quick response capability, product/service cost, certification of quality (e.g., Baldrige award), or other facets of customer satisfaction;

Effects of various managerial practices or attributes upon organizational compliance, ethical standards, environmental responsibility, or other aspects of global citizenship; or the effect of formal or informal action by representatives of the general public upon managerial and organizational characteristics and practices;

Description and analysis of various organizational efforts to permeate the boundaries that separate them from their external constituencies.

What are the implications of these and similar dynamics for the science of understanding organizational change and the art of changing organizations? The field of organizational change and development continues to expand its focus. Although, as is true with other areas of the Academy, this focus has perhaps been too narrowly constrained by organizational boundaries. In keeping with the Academy theme, we invite you to consider papers and symposia which challenge these boundaries and might, thus, move our discipline into new arenas for inquiry and action.

Please consult the Call for Papers which will appear in the Academy Newsletter for a detailed list of submission rules. I would like to call your attention to a few of the more crucial rules as you are preparing your papers and symposia proposals.

1. Participants may only submit (or be included in) three papers or symposia. This limitation does not apply to pre-convention activities.

2. Papers should be no more than 21 total pages (including title page, abstract, references, etc.).

3. Papers will be blind reviewed so the author's names should appear only on the title page. Please ensure that complete names, addresses, and phone numbers are on this title page.
4. Symposium proposals need to include a 3-5 page overview statement, a 2-5 page synopsis of each presenter's contribution, and a signed statement from each presenter indicating their intention to participate.
5. Four copies of the submission plus one additional copy of the title page and the abstract page should be submitted.
6. Submissions should be accompanied by a self-addressed stamped legal size envelope to be used in returning program committee decisions.

As has been the case in the past, submissions will be judged primarily on (1) original contribution, (2) overall quality, and (3) interest to Academy members. We will provide reviewers' comments to authors when they are notified of the program committee decision.

The deadline for the receipt of papers and symposia is January 4, 1993. Manuscripts for our division should be submitted to Richard W. Woodman, Department of Management, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX 77843.

WHAT ARE THE BASIC VALUES OF OD?

by Allan H. Church & W. Warner Burke

Values are at the core of everything we do as organization development (OD) practitioners. A value holds the kernel of the ultimate comparison. It embodies the standards and principles of conduct, which serve a higher morality than the basic norms that shape much of our daily behavior in different social and professional settings. Although our values themselves can be a complex phenomena to actually measure, they stipulate the mode and processes by which we work and the outcomes that are desired most for our consulting efforts. The origins of OD, as a field, are rooted in the humanistic values of the early missionaries bent on bringing democracy and a sense of human worth to their client organizations. Founded on a position directly opposed to the more traditional styles of management, OD

practitioners, and in fact the term OD itself, have often been associated with a soft, "touchy feely," and somewhat evangelistic approach to facilitating organizational change. While business performance has always been an important issue to practitioners in the field, since it is, after all a sign of organizational effectiveness and one of the primary reasons consultants are sought out in the first place, it has not been the focus of traditional OD efforts.

With the number of significant and complex changes in the business arena over the last several years (e.g., workforce 2000, globalization, increased competition), the question arises as to whether the practice of OD, and perhaps even the values of the discipline itself, have changed as a result of these new influences and concerns in our client organizations. Interestingly enough, very little empirical research has been conducted that actually provides a "snapshot" of the values that practitioners hold about their work in the field today. So far, the only information that exists regarding values comes from the prominent writers, academics and practitioners who have filled our heads with such concepts as quality of worklife, empowerment, participation, leadership, and open communication. Since the strength and unique contribution of the field of OD lies in "our values, not our methods, in the marriage of democracy and science, and not in science, behavioral or any other kind, alone" (Weisbord, 1982, 7) assessing and measuring these characteristics of OD practitioners is important for the further development of the discipline. There is also significant benefit in trying to understand, measure and articulate OD characteristics since this provides the mark against which those in, outside, and newly entering the field can assess themselves. Further, in order to understand the nature of the field today and its direction for the future, we need to know what we as practitioners value in simply doing the work of OD.

To begin to address some of these questions and issues, we recently surveyed 1,000 OD practitioners regarding the values in the field, using names randomly selected from two professional associations (The OD Network and The American Society for Training and Development -- OD division). Although the results of this work have been described in detail elsewhere (e.g., Church & Burke, 1992; Church, Burke & Van Eynde, 1992; Hurley, Church, Burke & Van Eynde, 1992; Van Eynde, Church, Hurley, & Burke, 1992), the purpose of this article is to provide a brief summary of the survey results as they relate specifically to the values held by practitioners today, the values most favored in the ideal, and on the differences between these two sets of ratings.

Overall, we achieved a response rate of about 29%, which represents completed questionnaires from almost 300 current OD practitioners in the field. Generally speaking, the sample was quite diverse in background, with almost

equal representation for internals versus externals as well as for males and females. There was also interesting variability in terms of practitioners' professional affiliation, highest formal level of education obtained, content area of specialization, academic affiliation, and years of experience in the field. (For further details on sample composition, instrument construction, other elements of the survey results, multivariate analyses and related issues see the references at the end of this paper.)

Listed below is a summary of some of the more interesting and important findings relating to the values of OD that emerged from our survey. Briefly, the values section of the questionnaire contained 31 statements on which ratings were given both for today and ideal. Thus, each value item yielded two data points based on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 = of little importance and 5 = extremely important.

Summary of Findings

I. The five most important values that currently drive work in the field of OD today:

1. Increasing effectiveness and efficiency
2. Creating openness in communication
3. Empowering employees to act
4. Enhancing productivity
5. Promoting organizational participation

When we asked respondents to rate the relative importance of each of the 31 values to OD practitioners in the field today, the results clearly point to a dual emphasis on organizational effectiveness and humanistic-participative concerns. Three of the five highest-rated values describe human processes (i.e., communication, empowerment and participation), while the remaining two focus more on organizational outcomes or performance (i.e., effectiveness and productivity).

A factor analysis of the 31 items provided statistical support for this dual nature of OD values as well, with 20 of the items clustering around "humanistic values" and another 8 representing more the "business effectiveness values." Thus, the results of our survey confirmed empirically what many authors in the field have already suggested; that is,

that there are only two primary value constructs underlying practitioners' work with organizations in the OD field. These are (1) fostering humanistic concerns--such as empowering managers and enhancing quality of worklife--and (2) focusing on the more traditional business needs and measures, including increased effectiveness, efficiency, and profitability.

Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly when one looks at the single highest rated value overall, the business effectiveness factor yielded a significantly higher mean score than did the humanistic one. This would suggest a slightly stronger emphasis or slant among contemporary OD practitioners toward organizational outcomes rather than human processes. If one accepts our sample as being representative and reflective of the values that those in the field hold in general, such a heightened focus on organizational performance is a substantial departure from what has classically been referred to as a "touchy feely" discipline. Clearly, this emphasis on the bottom-line inherent OD work today is a concern that is shared with those professionals who are strictly in the management consulting business. However, the important aspect and the strength of the values of OD, which differentiates our field from these other professionals--and which is our competitive advantage, if you will--is the nature of our dual emphasis on the humanistic side of management and people processes, and on performance. These values comprise the "underlying philosophy and perspective" (Friedlander, 1976; p.8) of the field of OD and represent the driving force that sets the boundaries for the appropriate actions, outcomes, and ethics involved. This duality in focus is an important element of our field, and as long as it remains on at least an equal footing with performance, OD practitioners will continue to provide something above and beyond strictly business management expertise.

II. The five most important values that should ideally drive OD work:

1. Empowering employees to act
2. Creating openness in communication
3. Facilitating ownership of process and outcome
4. Promoting a culture of collaboration
5. Promoting inquiry and continuous learning

When we asked respondents to rate these same values in the ideal, or what "should be" driving the field of OD, we found a substantially different pattern of results. Interestingly, this time all five of the highest rated values concerned

the nature of human processes rather than the business outcomes. Thus, while the values relating to empowerment and open communication remained at the top of the list, ownership, collaboration and continuous learning received a greater degree of emphasis than the remaining 26 items on the list. Further, none of the business effectiveness values made the top 5 in the ideal. This pattern of results would suggest that, ideally, OD practitioners would prefer to focus more on the humanistically oriented values if all other concerns were held in a vacuum; i.e., if the consultant were not concerned about losing the contract and the client emphasis was not always one of a "show me" or "produce results" mentality. Perhaps, then, the increased focus on business outcomes and performance that is evident in the field today is more a reflection of the necessity of the times, than of a true shift in the values mentality from the origins of the discipline. This conclusion confirms what many people in the field have written about, and supports the missionary emphasis on personal growth, development, and human dignity that were once the hallmark of OD. It would seem that these values are still at the heart of practitioners' values in the field but perhaps no longer constituting their primary agenda for change. In an ideal sense, OD practitioners appear to be espousing certain process and humanistic values as moral imperatives.

III. The five values that increased the most in relative importance between ratings:

1. Promoting inquiry and continuous learning
2. Protecting the natural environment
3. Fostering corporate citizenship in the community
4. Transferring OD skills and technologies to clients
5. Promoting a concern for human dignity

These five items, selected for their difference scores, represent the highest degree of change in importance between the "should be," ideal values ratings and the "current" ratings of the state of OD today. In comparing the two sets of ratings, we find items or values that are seen as increasingly important to practitioners, but not as predominant motivating factors for OD work at the present. In some ways, these values may be seen as emerging trends in the field. For example, the findings suggest that, ideally, the value "promoting inquiry and continuous learning" is important (ranking 5th out of 31), but it doesn't appear to be a prevailing motivation in OD work today. And even though the relative importance of this value increased dramatically when practitioners rated the values in the ideal, this is a concept that was originally rated at the bottom of the list for the field today (ranking 24th). This is

also true of the value of "transferring OD skills and technologies to clients"--a concept that is fundamental to the notion of empowering the client to internalize, learn and eventually manage his or her own change efforts. How can organizations ever wean themselves of their consultant relationships if we do not make a concerted effort to train our clients in the skills, processes and content of OD, particularly as these aspects relate to organizational change?

Other values that received significantly greater emphasis in terms of their importance in the ideal include "protecting the natural environment," "fostering corporate citizenship in the community," and "promoting a concern for human dignity." High difference scores on these three items suggest that practitioners may feel an increasingly greater need to serve their client organization in a sort of moral "conscience" role, with respect to the humane treatment of people within the organization and key stakeholders outside the social system as well. In this day of acid rain, polluted beaches and nuclear accidents, protecting the environment and giving back to the community have become important considerations as well, even for those not directly working with these issues. From these data we can surmise that OD people in their work with organizations do indeed care about more issues than just the bottom-line and human processes. In other words, enhancing organizational performance for OD practitioners may no longer mean just financial performance, but may instead require efforts directed at a much broader metric--mainly one of social accountability and citizenship.

Conclusions

Overall, these findings are quite revealing about the nature and values of OD practitioners in the field today. Although OD people apparently are becoming focused more on emphasizing business and performance issues than on crusading for the humanistic values of the founders, the traditional values have not been entirely lost or abandoned (and appear to be particularly strong in the hearts and minds of practitioners in an ideal sense). These humanistic and process oriented concerns remain in the duality of shared focus with organizational outcomes that have served to differentiate OD from the beginning, and continue to be an important dichotomy in the practice of the field today. While we had anticipated the existence of this pattern, it was somewhat surprising to note the high degree of consistency between many of the respective value ratings and their associated factor outcomes. It really does suggest that there are only two fundamental dimensions on which practitioners' perceptions of the values of OD rest.

There may be cause for concern, however, if the shift toward placing performance over humanistic concerns

continues. Today's business emphasis is overwhelmingly on results, whereas OD's focus is on process; thus, how one achieves the bottom line is just as important as the bottom line itself. Moreover, if the process is done right the outcome will be an improved bottom line. It is possible, however, that with the current rush to results, to enhance the bottom line per se, the how may get overlooked if not lost in the dust. For example, when a merger occurs between a pair of successful companies, two of the primary goals of the effort usually include establishing a unified organizational culture, and maintaining and eventually exceeding former levels of profitability and effectiveness. The OD consultant involved in such a situation is often expected--whether the assumption is implicit or explicit--to facilitate the attainment of both these goals simultaneously (e.g., Burke & Jackson, 1991). Although the relative priorities of values and desired outcomes in these and other efforts will vary as a function of both the client's and the consultant's energies, it seems safe to say, based on the data presented above, that both elements of focus are present to some degree among practitioners in the field today.

Unfortunately, it is often the case that different interventions will yield different outcomes. The choice of a particular intervention, and subsequently one's approach to the change effort, often forces the prioritization of one of the two primary values over the other. In a perfect world, all OD efforts would be directed equally at improving employees' quality of worklife, their empowerment and interpersonal skills, as well as impacting positively the overall profitability and performance of the business. Our experience, however, suggests that every consulting situation is unique (or at least has a substantive number of unique elements) and priorities and issues vary in importance from one change effort to the next. While making such a forced choice in values may not be problematic for those practitioners whose personal priorities agree with the direction of their efforts, it can be a source of internal conflict and frustration when one's actions (and choice of focus) do not fully reflect one's own beliefs.

References

Burke, W. W., & Jackson, P. (1991). Making the Smith Kline Beecham merger work. *Human resource management*, 30, 69-87.

Church, A. H., & Burke W. W. (1992). Assessing the activities and values of organization development practitioners. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 30, (July), 59-66.

Church, A. H., Burke W. W., & Van Eynde, D. F. (1992). Values, motives and interventions of organization development practitioners. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Friedlander, F. (1976). OD reaches adolescence: An exploration of its underlying values. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 12, 7-21.

Hurley, R. F., Church, A. H., Burke, W. W., & Van Eynde, D. F. (1992). Tension, Change and Values in OD. *OD Practitioner*, 24, (September), 1-5.

Van Eynde, D. F., Church, A. H., Hurley, R. F., & Burke. W. W. (1992). What OD practitioners believe. *Training & Development*, 46, (April), 41-46.

Weisbord, M. R. (1982). The cat in the hat breaks through: Reflections on OD's past, present, and future. In D. D. Warrick (Ed.), *Contemporary organization development: Current thinking and applications*. (pp. 2-11). Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.

(For additional information, contact the authors at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027

ARTICLES BY MEMBERS

Bargal, D. (1992). Conflict management workshops for Arab-Palestinian and Jewish youth--A framework for planning, intervention and evaluation." *Social work with groups*.

Bargal, D. (1992). The early stage in the creation of two self-help organizations. *Administration in social work*, 16, 1-2.

Bargal, D. & Bar, H. (1992). Field theory and intergroup workshops for Arab-Palestinian and Jewish Youth." *Journal of social issues*, 48(2), 139-154.

Bargal, D., Gold, M. & Lewin, M. (Eds). (1992). Kurt Lewin and Field Theory. *Journal of social issues*, 48, 2.

Bargal, D., Gold, M. & Lewin, M. (1992). Kurt Lewin: Theory and practice--introduction to special commemoration issue of the journal of social issues." *Journal of Social Issues*, 48(2), 3-13.

Bargal, D. & Schmid, H. (Eds.). *Organization development and change in the human services: Introduction.* *Administration in social work*, 16, 1-2.

Mai-Dalton, R.R. & Barnes, F. Barry. (1991). "The Evolution of an Employee Training Program. A Three Year Flexible OD Effort." *Group & Organization Studies*, 16(4), 452-471.

McConmick, Donal W. & Smith, Kenneth E. (1992). Integrating theory and experience in the Short Essay Assignment. *Journal of Management Education*, 16 (4), 499-502.

Morrison, A.M. (1992). How can an organization attract the best of the new work force and help them reach their full leadership potential? *The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America.* San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Patten, Thomas H. (Winter 1992). "Beyond Systems: The Politics of Managing in a TQM Environment." *National Productivity Review*, 11(1), 9-19.

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. (1991). *Improving development program performance: Guidelines for managers.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Cooper, Cary L. & Robertson, Ivan. (1992). *International review of industrial and organizational psychology.* 7. New York and Chichester (UK): John Wiley & Sons.

Dale, Barrie & Cooper, Cary L. (1992). *Total quality and human resource management.* New York & Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Ingersoll, Virginia Hill & Adams, Guy B. (1992). *The Tacit Organization*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Mangham, I.L. & Pye, A.J. (1991). *The doing of managing*. Oxford: Blackwells.

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

Robert A. Gregory has been named director of the San Diego Branch at the Center for Creative Leadership.

Ravi R. Kumar of Indian Institute of Management (India), will be visiting professor at various European Management Training Institutes.

CALL FOR PAPERS: The Society for Advancement of Management

The Society for Advancement of Management will hold its 1993 international conference in Orlando, April 1-4. The theme is "Corporate Environmental Responsibility: Making Greening Work." Papers, workshop proposals, and requests to serve as a discussant or session chair should be sent to Dr. Moustafa H. Abdelsamad, Dean, College of Business Administration, Corpus Christi State University, 6300 Ocean Drive, Corpus Christi, TX 78412 (FAX 512/994-2725).

Meeting on Nonviolent Large Systems Change: You are invited to present a paper at The 8th Annual Meeting of the international, inter-organizational meeting of The Research/Study Team on Nonviolent Large Systems Change being held May 16-18, 1993 at George Williams College just outside Chicago. For more information, contact: Donald W. Cole, The OD Institute, 781 Beta Drive, Suite K, Cleveland, Ohio 44143.

THE IMPACT OF PLANNED ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: RESULTS OF A META-ANALYSIS

by Peter J. Robertson, Darryl R. Roberts & Jerry I. Porras

The field of planned organizational change can benefit from periodic efforts to aggregate the findings of the empirical evaluation literature. Therefore, we conducted a meta-analysis of fifty-two planned change evaluations, to estimate the impact of five categories of interventions on seven categories of dependent variables.

Our classification of interventions and dependent variables is based on a recently-proposed model of change dynamics (Porras & Robertson, 1992), in which four primary categories of interventions are identified. Interventions in each category implement change in one of four interrelated subsystems of the organizational work setting: 1) Organizing Arrangements, the formal elements of the organization that provide the coordination and control necessary for organized activity; 2) Social Factors, the characteristics of the people in the organization, individually and in groups, and their patterns and processes of interaction; 3) Technology, the factors directly associated with the transformation of organizational inputs into outputs; and 4) Physical Setting, the characteristics of the physical space in which organizational activity occurs. In some cases, interventions are designed to implement change in work setting variables in two or more subsystems. These are labeled Multi-Faceted interventions, the fifth category examined in this research.

The model suggests that interventions generate change in seven dependent variable categories. Four of these are the above four categories of work setting features. Since these features are interdependent, an intervention implementing change in one work setting variable can produce change in other work setting variables. A fifth category of dependent variables is Individual Behavior. An organizational work setting provides an environment which strongly influences the task behavior of organizational members. If the work setting is changed, individuals are likely to change their behavior in response. In turn, individual task behavior change is necessary for improvement in organizational effectiveness to occur. Organizational effectiveness is defined in terms of Organizational Performance and Individual Development, which comprise the final two categories of dependent variables.

Each study was coded as to category of intervention used, and all dependent variables were coded into one of the seven categories. Based on procedures outlined by Hunter, Schmidt, and Jackson (1982), an effect size (r) was then calculated for each dependent variable. The effect size is a common metric that assesses the amount of change occurring in a dependent variable as a result of the intervention. Mean effect sizes and their variances were then calculated across studies for all the relationships between specific inter-vention and dependent variable categories, and for each of these categories as a whole. A mean effect size represents the average amount of change in the dependent variables of interest resulting from the interventions of interest. Confidence intervals (95%) were calculated for these means to determine whether they are significantly different from zero and from each other.

The overall mean effect size, reflecting the impact of the full set of planned change interventions on all dependent variables, is .10. This is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1969). As for the impact of each intervention category on all dependent variables combined, Social Factors interventions have the largest effect size (.19), followed by Multi-Faceted (.17) and Organizing Arrangements interventions (.14). These three effect sizes are not significantly different, however. Physical Setting interventions have a relatively weak but significantly negative effect (-.07), and Technology interventions yield a non-significant effect size (.03). Thus, the overall effects of the various intervention types also tend to be relatively small (i.e., less than .30, according to Cohen [1969]) or negligible.

The intervention categories demonstrate different patterns of impact across the separate dependent variable categories. Organizing Arrangements interventions yield positive effects across all six categories of dependent variables measured. Social Factors interventions do as well, except for their non-significant impact on Organizational Performance. The only significant effect of Physical Setting interventions is a negative impact on Social Factors variables. Technology interventions have diverse effects, with two positive, two negative, and two non-significant effect sizes. Multi-Faceted interventions also have diverse effects, with three positive, one negative, and one non-significant effect size. Some of these positive effects for specific categories of dependent variables are medium size (i.e., greater than .30). Thus, since different types of interventions are not equally effective in generating change in different dependent variables, careful consideration must be given to the type of factors in which change is most desired.

As for the impact of all interventions combined on each of the seven categories of dependent variables, the strongest effect size is found for Organizing Arrangements variables (.24), which is significantly different from all others except for Individual Behavior (.15). Social Factors and Individual Development variables demonstrate approximately equal levels of change (.11 and .12, respectively), non-significantly greater than the Technology variables (.06). The effect sizes for Physical Setting (.02) and Organizational Performance (.02) variables are non-significant.

Among the work setting variables, the above pattern of impact is consistent with the results for intervention categories. Organizing Arrangements and Social Factors variables undergo the most change, while Technology and Physical Setting variables demonstrate little or no change. Of the remaining three categories, the individual-level variables (Individual Behavior and Individual Development) are impacted more than the Organizational Performance

variables. This is somewhat surprising, since one of the main goals of planned change is to enhance Organizational Performance, and previous reviews have found significant effects for this category of variables. Three reasons may explain these results: 1) more exogenous factors (e.g., changes in markets) impact Organizational Performance; 2) insufficient time transpired in many of these studies for Organizational Performance to have been impacted; and 3) aggregating the various Organizational Performance variables into the same category obscures variation in the impact on distinct types of variables.

The dependent variable categories exhibit different patterns of impact from the separate intervention categories. Organizing Arrangements variables are positively affected by all four types of interventions for which they were measured. Social Factors and Technology variables demonstrate more diversity. In each case, three categories of interventions generate positive change, one type produces negative change, and one category yields non-significant change. Only six Physical Setting variables were measured, in studies with two types of interventions, and they show no change. Individual Behavior variables were measured with three types of interventions. Two generate positive effects and the third results in negative change. Three intervention categories generate positive changes in Individual Development variables, while two others do not yield significant effects. Finally, for Organizational Performance variables, only one category of interventions leads to a positive impact, one has a negative effect, and the remaining two yield no significant change.

This study suggests some changes in practice and research that should be adopted in the field. First, more multi-faceted interventions that target a variety of the work setting subsystems should be used and evaluated. Since considerable differences were found across categories of dependent variables, a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of these interventions would be useful. Second, physical setting changes deserve more attention. Since they have been utilized and studied rather infrequently, and tend to have negative effects, a better understanding of such changes is necessary before they can be strategically introduced as a means of enhancing organizational effectiveness. Third, more research should focus on Individual Behavior, especially specific on-the-job behaviors, as a dependent variable. Few studies have examined actual behavioral change resulting from intervention activity, even though change at the organizational level requires individuals to change their work behavior. Furthermore, focusing on a common set of behaviors (cf. Porras & Hoffer, 1986) would provide a unifying construct for the field, and increase comparability of findings across studies.

References

Cohen, J. (1969). *Statistical power analyses for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Academic Press.

Hunter, J. E., Schmidt, F. L., & Jackson, G. B. (1982). *Meta-analysis: Cumulating research findings across studies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Porras, J. I. & Hoffer, S. J. (1986). Common behavior changes in successful organization development. *Journal of applied behavioral science*, 22: 477-494.

Porras, J. I. & Robertson, P. J. (1992). Organization development: Theory, practice, and research. In M. Dunnette and L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.), Vol 3: 719-822. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

(For more information on this research, contact Peter J. Robertson, School of Public Administration, VKC 370 MC0041, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089.)

PAST DIVISION CHAIRPERSONS: A HISTORICAL TIMELINE

1971 Wendell L. French, University of Washington

1972 Wendell L. French, University of Washington

1973 Wendell L. French, University of Washington

1974 Craig C. Lundberg, Oregon State University

1975 Dale E. Zand, New York University

1976 Robert T. Golembiewski, University of Georgia

1977 Frank Friedlander, Case Western Reserve University

1978 Newton Margulies, University of California at Irvine

1979 Larry E. Greiner, University of Southern California

1980 W. Warner Burke, Columbia University

1981 Michael Beer, Harvard University

1982 Thomas G. Cummings, University of Southern California
1983 Donald D. Warrick, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
1984 Jerry I. Porras, Stanford University
1985 L. David Brown, Boston Collage
1986 Marshall Sashkin, U.S. Dept. of Education
1987 William A. Pasmore, Case Western Reserve University
1988 Robert E. Kaplan, Center for Creative Leadership
1989 Eric H. Neilsen, Case Western Reserve University
1990 Jean M. Bartunik, Boston University
1991 Robert E. Quinn, University of Michigan
1992 Susan A. Mohrman, University of Southern California
1993 Luke Novelli, Center for Creative Leadership