

**REPORT TO THE ACADEMY PROFESSIONAL
DIVISION REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE DIVISION
1999-2003**

Gretchen M. Spreitzer, Division Chair, 2003-2004
Gavin M. Schwarz, Special Projects Coordinator, 2003-2004

Special thanks go to the ODC Executive Board for their input and insights into the report.
We also thank the members of the division for all they do to make the division so
successful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Domain/Mission of the Division	1
II. Governance	1
Constitution Bylaws	1
Governance Structure	1
Nomination and Election Procedures	2
III. Annual Meetings	2
Preconference Activities	2
Meeting Program	3
IV. Membership	4
Current Status	4
Trends	4
Membership Services	5
V. ODC Best Practices	6
VI. Finances	6
Current Financial Status	6
Trends	6
VII. Division Survey	7
VIII. SWOT Analysis	8
XI. Action Plan	9
Appendix I – Rules and Procedures	11
Appendix II – Members of ODC Executive Committee, 1999-2003	12
Appendix III – Preconference Activities, 1999-2003	13
Appendix IV – Example of Evaluation Forms used for National Meeting, 2003	15
Appendix V – ODC Reviewers for National Program, 1999-2003	19
Appendix VI – ODC Membership 1999-2003	24
Appendix VII – ODC Newsletters 2003	25

Appendix VIII – Winners of Outstanding Paper Award	36
Appendix IX – Income Statements 2003	38
Appendix X – ODC Division Report Survey Results	39

Report of the Organizational Development and Change Division 1999-2003

I. DOMAIN/MISSION OF THE DIVISION

Specific domain: The development of theory and innovative practice relevant to organization change. Major topics include: change processes within organizations, with or without assistance by change agents; active attempts to intervene in organizations to improve their effectiveness, and scholarly studies of such interventions; the roles of change agents; and problems of self-awareness, responsibility, and the political consequences of OD theory and practice.

To help address the ever-changing nature of our field, we recently worked on developing a mission/vision statement for the division:

The ODC division represents scholar/practitioners committed to individual and organization success and to the fulfillment of humanity's spirit and potential. It encourages efforts that create, develop, and disseminate knowledge or extend the practice of constructive change management and organization development. The division affirms the importance of a triple bottom line in organization effectiveness (human-social, financial, and environmental); justice, dignity, and trust; and shared accomplishment resulting in positive, meaningful contributions to the global society. The division acknowledges and accepts the responsibility for contributing to the creation and enhancement of an ethical and humane global community.

The genesis of this vision statement was a PDW on envisioning the future of our division in Washington, 2001. We reviewed it at the ODC business meeting in Denver in summer of 2002. Then, the ODC Executive Committee invited feedback on the web. The many responses resulted in more revisions. The following statement is the result of this two-year process. We expect it to be a living document.

II. GOVERNANCE

a. **Constitution/Bylaws:** Our rules and procedures are outlined in Appendix I.

b. **Governance structure**

Current structure in 2003: The ODC executive committee currently consists of 11 members: chair, past chair, program chair, PDW chair, Chair of nominations, two 2 year division representative, a scholar-practitioner representative (appointed), an international representative (appointed), a graduate student representative, and a newsletter editor. The Executive Committee meets twice a year, with the first meeting in February and the second in conjunction with the annual Academy meeting. Our February meeting usually lasts 1.5 days and is traditionally hosted by the division chair. For the August meeting, in addition to the time formally designated by the Academy, the Executive Committee has a working dinner as well. A list of individuals who have served on the ODC Executive Committee during the review period is contained in Appendix II.

i. **New structure for 2004:** At the Seattle conference, the Executive Board made several changes to the governance structure. The first change that we will implement by the 2004

Academy meeting will be the addition of an appointed Secretary/Treasurer. The treasurer role will allow one person to monitor our finances and build knowledge across years about how to best allocate the division's resources. The secretary role will ensure that we create an organization memory for the division (including taking board/business meeting minutes).

The second change involves the sequence of officer roles. Our current rotation has a board member going from program chair to division chair to past division chair. Most other divisions have a year in between program chair and division chair. As a result, our officers are "off-cycle" and losing out on the cohort effect that is so important for building social capital. The new rotation will have officers go from program chair to division chair-elect to division-chair. We will no longer have past division chair position. The division chair-elect will be in charge of planning the doctoral consortium in conjunction with OMT and MOC.

c. Nomination and election procedures

Members of the Executive Committee are nominated and elected using the following process: The nominating officer seeks nominations from the membership in the Winter Newsletter. Using this member input, the nominating officer develops a list of potential candidates willing to serve and presents it to the Executive Committee which develops a list of candidates for the ballot. The nominating committee confirms the commitment of nominees to serve if elected and solicits candidate biographical sketches. The ballot is then put on the division web site, and an email encourages members to vote. An email announcing the results is sent out to members and announced at the next business meeting.

III. ANNUAL MEETING ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAM

A. Preconference Activities

ODC conducts two types of Professional Development activities – consortia and workshops. Two consortia are regularly offered in the ODC Division Professional Development program: The OMT/ODC/MOC Doctoral Student Consortium, and the Executive Doctoral Consortium. From 1999-2003, the Doctoral Student Consortium has been jointly sponsored with the OMT and the OB divisions. It has become almost too successful with many students competing for the limited spots (capped at 80). Given the growing size, the OB division will run its own consortium next year. Consequently, in 2004, we will partner with OMT and MOC to better integrate our core strengths as divisions.

Since our last five year report, we have also developed the Executive Doctoral Consortium under the leadership of Peter Sorenson and other ODC leaders. The purpose of this consortium is to offer a complement to the traditional consortium aimed at doctoral students who are employed as they are doing their doctoral work. As such this consortium has a more applied flavor to the substance of the sessions.

In contrast to the consortia, the PDWs are open to any member of the Academy. The number of ODC PDWs has flourished from 1999 to 2003. As an example, in the entire five year period from 1994-1998, the ODC division reported 18 preconference workshops. At the 2003 National Academy Meetings alone, the number of preconference workshops was 11. A list of the ODC pre-conference activities over the 5 year period is contained in Appendix III.

B. Meeting Program

1. Selection Procedures: Proposals are solicited through the Academy’s “call for papers”, the ODC Winter newsletter, in an all division email, and on our website. Proposals are received by the Division’s Program Chair, who then solicits reviews from three reviewers whose professional interests match the topic. The number of papers received by each reviewer is generally between 2 and 4. Unlike paper submissions, because symposium submissions are not blind, the ODC Executive Committee evaluates symposia submissions. Reviewers are asked to evaluate submissions using a standardized reviewing form that provides for ranking on several dimensions and for written feedback to authors (see our evaluation forms in Appendix IV). The submissions are rank ordered. The highest rated submissions are accepted, following the allocation of units provided by the Academy’s Program Chair.
2. Reviewers: ODC solicits reviewers through the Newsletter, emailed invitations, and requests made at the annual business meeting. Prospective reviewers indicate their areas of expertise. The Program Chair compiles this information into a database for assigning submissions to reviewers. Individuals who have reviewed for ODC from 1999-2003 are listed in Appendix V.
3. Program Statistics: Statistics for the Division’s programs for 1999 through 2003 are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Category	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Total Submissions	118 (80 papers, 38 symposia)	97 (73 papers, 24 symposia)	85 (64 papers, 21 symposia)	101 (79 papers, 22 symposia)	105 (74 papers, 31 symposia)
Papers/paper sessions accepted	26	39	24	27	19
Interactive papers accepted	5	8	13	13	7
Shared interest track papers	11	4	3	7	11
Total symposia accepted	21 (11 joint sponsored)	12	10	10	18 (12 joint sponsored)
Visual papers accepted	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4
Distinguished speaker	Rajesh Tandom	William Torbert and Pat Canavan	30 year Anniversary Guest Panel	Susan Mohrman	Jean Bartunek
Overall acceptance rate	55%	52%	59%	56%	56%

4. Special Events:

Social hours: ODC held a social hour immediately following the Business meeting each year. In 2003, the Division held a jointly sponsored with ONE social hour at the Seattle Aquarium. These social hours are an important community building activity for conversation and dialogue. We also hold two smaller social hours adjacent to the PDWs. On Friday night, we hold a reception to welcome international ODC members. And on Saturday night, we hold a reception to welcome the division's doctoral students. All three social hours are very well attended – ranging from about 50 for the smaller receptions to 200 for the main reception.

Distinguished speakers: Each year, we also invite a distinguished speaker to speak on a cutting edge topic relevant to ODC (please see the list of speakers in Table 1 above).

Theme sessions: Each year, we hold a theme session on a topic related to ODC and the Academy's theme. These sessions are typically standing room only. In 2001, as part of the Division's 30th anniversary celebration, a panel dialogue was held discussing the past, present, and future of ODC and the discipline. In 2002, the theme session explored potential collaborations with the OD network and the National Training Laboratories. In 2003, the theme session explored points of intersection with Positive Organizational Scholarship.

Business Meetings/Awards Ceremony: We use the business meeting to discuss new developments for the Academy and the Division. For example, in 2003, we had members help us with this report's SWOT analysis. We also present our division awards at this time.

IV. MEMBERSHIP

A. Current Status

As of 4 December 2003, the ODC Division had 2347 members. At this level, the Division accounts for approximately 17.3% of the Academy's membership.

B. Membership Trends

Membership figures show steady increases with an addition of 285 members over the past five years, paralleling the overall growth of the Academy. This increase represents a total growth of approximately 12.2% (see Table 2). Appendix VI shows the entire membership trend for the review period, indicating that in 2003 the Division comprised 1219 academic, 54 emeritus, 487 executive, and 587 student members. These data also indicate that a significant aspect of the Division's growth is related to new executive and student members. In keeping with the drive over the past 10 years to make the Division far more international, the Division's steady membership growth also reflects a constant increase in international members (24.6% over the five years). Appendix VI illustrates that most Division members also belong to OB, OMT, MC, or MED.

Table 2

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Total AOM Membership	11209	11520	12090	12416	13370
Total ODC Membership	2051	2081	2124	2177	2347

C. Membership Services

1. Newsletters: The ODC newsletter is published electronically twice a year. The newsletter typically contains program calls, articles written by members, lists of members' publications, news about members, and a feedback form for the editor. The ODC newsletter is under the editorship of Wayne Boss (University of Colorado). The annual publication of a current OD bibliographic listing is a unique service to our members. The newsletter also contains special invited papers and short reports from our best paper award winners. See Appendix VII for a sample of a newsletter (note: because the newsletter is web-based, the formatting is not so precise when reproduced as a word document).
2. Electronic Communication Services: The ODC division has an Internet User Group, ODCNET-L. This user group is supported by the LISTSERV at Pennsylvania State University and is managed by Robert Munzenrider (PSU, Harrisburg). The user group is available to members to discuss issues, make announcements, or seek help. We also sponsor a web site (<http://aom.pace.edu/odc/>), hosted by Eric Goodman (Colorado Technical University). The site includes detail on ODC membership, news, activities (e.g., listserv information, call for papers), and member resources (e.g., newsletter archive, teaching materials). The site also includes links to the Academy of Management web site.
3. Teaching and Practice-related Services: ODC has at least one PDW session on ODC teaching issues at the National meeting. These sessions give members hands-on materials and tools for improving the effectiveness of their teaching. Our website maintains a section where members can share their syllabi for teaching ODC. ODC also offers PDW sessions appealing to practitioners. For example, we have one of the longest running substantive PDWs led by Rupe Chisolm and others on empowerment. We also have a scholar/practitioner representative on the ODC Executive Board to ensure the voice of the practitioner is heard as well as our doctoral consortium for scholar/practitioner doctoral students.
4. Diversity-related Services: ODC has made significant strides in the internationalization of our division. First, we have an international representative as part of our executive committee. Second, during the review period, we sponsored several one international conferences and are in the process of considering additional conferences with international scholars to build our networks and the internationalization of the Division. Our international representative – Raymond Saner – is organizing this effort.
5. Recognition-related Services: The ODC Division grants four awards: The Best Paper Award, the Best Student Paper, the Best Practice Related Paper, and new for 2003, the Best Reviewer Award. In addition to a plaque for the winners, the *Journal of Organizational Change Management* provides a \$500 award for best practice related paper and the *OD Journal* provides a \$500 reward for best student paper. Beginning in 2004, we will also give a cash prize sponsored by the new *Action Research Journal* to the Best Action Research Paper. A list of winners during the review period is contained in Appendix VIII.
6. Evaluation-related services: Each year at our business meeting, we leave a space in the agenda for new business and concerns. As described in section I, we periodically evaluate

our domain statement as a division with input from our membership (as documented in the development of our Division vision statement in the recent review period).

V. ODC BEST PRACTICES

Additional governance positions:

- (1) International representative: To facilitate greater internationalization, we have an international representation on our Executive Board. This person is an international member of the division and is charged with keeping international issues on the board's radar screen.
- (2) Student Representative: Given that graduate students represent the future of our division, we wanted to give them a more formal role in the division. We conducted interviews with graduate students to determine the best way to give them voice. Consequently, we have an appointed student representative on the Executive Board.
- (3) Secretary/treasurer: Beginning in 2004, we will appoint a secretary/treasurer for a five year term. This person will be our organizational memory, keeping minutes of all of our meetings and keeping track of the various ODC initiatives. This person will also manage our department budget and expenses.

Executive Doctoral Consortium: Beginning in 1999, we instituted an executive doctoral consortium – a full day PDW that is focused on the needs of executive doctoral students.

Monthly mentoring conference calls: Once a month, selected members of the executive board have a conference call where they discuss program planning issues for the August meetings and PDWs, budget concerns, and developmental issues. This has been a major help to “younger” members of the board to get a realistic preview of their future roles.

Strategic innovations: ODC also won two strategic innovation awards from the Academy (both accompanied by \$500). The first was for an outreach effort to practitioners and the second for a bibliography initiative to support the ODC literature.

VI. FINANCES

1. Current Financial Status

According to the Academy's 2nd quarter 2003 financial documentation, our total operating funds (including the Division allotment) totaled \$24,533.93. The current income statement, for the period 2003 is contained in Appendix XI. This robust budget has allowed us to support special projects, help fund the doctoral consortiums, and provide financial support for PhD student members to attend jointly sponsored conferences in the US and overseas.

2. Financial Trends

As shown in the income statements in Appendix XI, ODC's financial situation is sound, with income rising slightly over the review period, largely as a result of increased membership. Notable trends over the review period include an increase in the PDW sponsorships in two of the five years and the receipt of awards. These income supplements total an additional \$2934.10.

The Division's total operating fund for the review period is as follows:

1999: \$21,366.25
2000: \$26,119.57
2001: \$30,534.23

2002: \$26,699.75
 2003: \$24,533.93

ODC has consistently generated a surplus over the past five years. While ODC has kept a relatively consistent financial growth pattern, the fluctuation in total operating funds reflects the Division's ability to save the differences in costs of the meetings in different locales. For example, in FY 2001, the Division carried over \$11,305.23 from the previous year. In general, the Division's surplus for FY 1998/9 through FY 2002 averaged \$7497.62.

Advances in technology have allowed ODC to save considerably in printing/production and postage expenses. In FY 1998/9 and FY 2000, these items made up a large percentage of the Division's expenditures (averaging \$2379). From FY 2000 onwards, ODC began to spend less on these items, but spent more on food, beverage and transportation than it had previously (at least partially due to increased members). In fact, in FY 2001 and FY 2002, the Division spent \$17,593.94 and \$18,236.07 respectively on food and beverage for PDW sessions and social hours at the National meetings, whereas both printing and production and postage expenditures dropped to zero by the end of the review period.

VII. DIVISION SURVEY

Overall, the division survey results paint a very positive picture of change within the ODC division compared with the survey five years ago. First, the 408 responses (17% of the membership) represent a significant improvement in participation (only 52 members responded to our survey for the 1998 5 year report). Forty-six percent (186/408) of those responding view ODC as their primary division in the Academy and the majority of respondents have been a member of the division for at least 4 years. In terms of reasons for joining the ODC division, 54% are most attracted due to their research interests. Teaching interests and opportunities for training and education are the second reasons that respondents have joined the ODC division.

The following table indicates the distribution of responses by position.

Table 3

Student	Instructor	Asst. Prof.	Assc. Prof	Full Prof	Practitioner	Other
57	30	57	42	63	113	39

In terms of the survey results (see Appendix X), the division is viewed as focused on non-social events (question #2), responsive (#3), not elitist (#4), providing a more interesting program (#5) and offering valuable PDW program (#6). However, the membership feels slightly less able to influence ODC division policies (#1) (possibly due to our increase in size).

Finally, in terms of moving forward, division membership is not as interested in developing non-annual conference meetings (#7), slightly interested in being more international (#8), and would like the division to spend more resources on professional development (#8). There is a trend toward more interest in ODC research (#11) and less interest in teaching and learning (#9), practitioner (#12), social and public policy (#13), and the development of OD scholars (#14) issues. Similarly, the members agree that the ODC division should be more active in shaping the Academy's future, but less strongly than five years ago.

The results are generally more positive than the prior survey indicating a positive trajectory. We plan to feed these results back to our members as a way of continuing our dialogue on how to improve the ODC division.

VIII. SWOT CONCLUSION

Highlights of the SWOT analysis for the division are offered below. We collected the SWOT data not only from the survey but in an interactive exercise at our 2003 business meeting.

A. Strengths

- *A spirit of creative new ideas.*
 - Interactive and innovative program design.
 - High quality annual conference program.
 - Sponsoring outside conferences on current themes and outside U.S.
 - New Action Research Journal edited by division members.
- *Diversity.*
 - Very strong academic/practitioner links.
 - Diversity of theoretical approaches and methodologies: Action research and co-inquiry principles and theory development.
 - Active group of non-U.S. members.
- *Effective communication* – website, listserv, email list and comprehensive bi-annual newsletter.
- *Strong leadership.*
 - Have groomed Academy leaders such as Jean Bartunek, Tom Cummings, and Sue Mohrman.
 - Significant efforts to develop next generation of leadership.

B. Weaknesses

- *Size of membership numbers make it difficult to connect.*
 - Seek more participation of students and non-North Americans.
- *Improve reputation and quality*
 - ODC members are underrepresented on Academy editorial boards
 - Don't get as many high quality submissions as other Academy divisions.
 - Lack knowledge to assess the quality of practitioner-oriented papers.
- *Direction of the Division*
 - Inability to keep up with new developments in change practices.
 - Myopic vision about nature of change in next century.
 - Too much focus on the "D" in ODC, need more focus on the "C".
 - Limited history of taking strong and thoughtful stands on social issues.
 - Difficult to keep up with changes around the world and staying open to new fields of change research and practice.

C. Opportunities

- Can draw on our global network of OD professionals to increase our global impact especially in developing parts of the world (e.g., Iraq, Afghanistan).

- Our main areas of Inquiry are central to recent Academy themes (e.g., “Time for Change” and “Creating Actionable Knowledge”).
- Can link more effectively with other divisions who have an interest in change. Can tie into the myriad of other OD professional associations and NGOs.
- Continue to help Academy in its own change process: Two ODC members, Tom Cummings and Larry Greiner, have been central in the Academy’s visioning process.
- Capability to take on major social issues and help create better understanding of the change dynamics contained within.
- To be the voice of relevance in the Academy on connections between research, teaching, and practice.

D. Threats

- Change in the ODC field is very rapid – avoid following fads.
- Lack of a scholarly reputation within the Academy.
- Academy bureaucracy (e.g., rigidity of meeting format).
- Retirement of great ODC leaders.
- Unclear identity with other divisions
 - MC, OB, OMT, MOC, ONE have overlapping missions.
 - For many, ODC is a secondary home.

XI. ACTION PLAN

The survey responses, the SWOT analysis, and the division’s continuing discussion of its vision and mission suggest the following conclusions: Similar to the Academy as whole, we have been concerned about our identity, our purpose, and the role we play within the Academy and society. Our conclusions, as fashioned in the vision statement, have been to expand our horizons. We have declared an intention to be more global, more environmentally conscious and more balanced between scholarly and practitioner issues. Our activities, reflective of that broadened scope, have been more diverse. We have sponsored more conferences beyond the Academy meeting, sponsored Ph.D. students to attend those conferences, and debated hosting our own international conference.

As a result, our ODC board has had long discussions about the implications of these actions. Are we doing too much? Are we not doing enough? What is our role? How much time can we devote to the ODC division? Clearly, the annual Academy conference is a time consuming event for the key members of the division’s executive committee. Elections, PDW programming, conference programming, and doctoral consortium planning require a lot of time and resources. The survey results give us some hope. They suggest being more focused on research and less concerned about teaching, conferences outside the annual meeting, and so on. This leads us to our action planning ideas as described below.

1. Share the results of the survey with division members: Highlight key improvements over last five years and key areas where would like to improve in the next five years. As a Division, we can identify the 1 or 2 priority items we will focus on and outline the specific action steps the board will take to move the Division forward on these issues. We can use the survey in the next five year review as our assessment instrument to track

our improvement on key measures. In the meantime, we can implement a mid-term evaluation on the subset of items that reflect the several key issues we identify as a board.

2. Continue to refine the vision statement with our membership. Following the vision work outlined above, the agenda for the board meeting/business meeting in the 2004 August Academy Meeting in New Orleans and the February, 2005 midyear Board meeting will be to develop a set of goals and a strategic plan to make choices about what we will and won't do.

Conclusion

In writing the five year report, I realize how proud I am of the ODC division's accomplishments over the past five years. First, we developed a new vision statement for the division that is already providing guidance to the board on the kinds of activities to undertake and the types of financial expenditures to make. Second, we are growing in terms of membership. Third, we are financially healthy which will allow us to continue to innovate in important ways. Fourth, we have implemented important governance changes which will allow a variety of members (students, international members, and scholar/practitioners) to have more opportunities for voice in how the division is led. In addition, the addition of a secretary/treasurer appointee will facilitate better organizational memory in terms of board actions and more expertise in the financial operations of the division. Fifth, the survey results indicate that the ODC membership is quite satisfied with the impact and direction of the Division. And last but not least, we are on an upward trajectory in terms of the energy and direction of the division and anticipate a high impact future for the division.

Appendix I

Rule and Procedures

Officer meetings: The executive committee meets formally twice a year. The first meeting is held in February and is focused on the Annual Academy Program and other division business. The August meeting is focused on division business.

Becoming an Officer: Each year a new Representative at Large is elected by the members to serve the members of the ODC division to serve a five-year term. The Representatives at Large then serve one year each as (1) Chair of the Elections Process, (2) the PDW Chair, (3) Program Chair, (4) Division-Chair Elect, and (5) Division-Chair. Each year a two year board position is also elected to assure that the board has a diverse set of members to draw on for governance tasks.

Appointed Positions: A newsletter editor, a webmaster, an executive/scholar-practitioner representative, an international representative (2 year term), and a student representative (2 year term), and a secretary/treasurer (New for 2004, 5 year term) are appointed to serve at the Board's request.

Communication: The division newsletter is published electronically semi-annually in the winter and the summer. In addition, the website is updated periodically with information for our membership. Finally, an email listserv is used to send out periodic emails to alert members of Division news.

Annual Program: The Program Chair plans the program with the guidance and assistance of the Executive Committee. Reviewers for papers are solicited at the August Business Meeting and by email. Current and former members of the Executive Committee serve as reviewers for symposium proposals.

Appendix II

Members of the ODC Executive Committee 1999-2003 in order of election

5 year term

A.B. (Rami) Shani, Cal Poly State University, 1996-2001
Ron Purser, San Francisco State University, 1997-2002
Peter Sorenson, Benedictine University, 1998-2003
Chris Worley, Pepperdine University, 1999-2004
Gretchen Spreitzer, University of Michigan, 2000-2005
George Roth, MIT, 2001-2006
Ram Tenkasi, Benedictine University, 2002-2007
Michael Manning, New Mexico State University, 2003-2008

Member at Large (2 year term)

Ella Edmonson Bell, University of North Carolina-Charlotte, 1995-1997
Peter Reason, University of Bath, 1996-1998
Amy Edmondson, Harvard University, 1997-1999
Robin Ely, Columbia University, 1998-2000
Linda Kilbourne, Xavier University, 1999-2001
Karen Whelan-Berry, Utah Valley State College, 2001-2003
Hilary Bradbury, Case Western Reserve University, 2002-2004
Julie Wolfram-Cox, RMIT University, Australia, 2003-2005

Executive Scholar-Practitioner

Lisa Cheraskin, Eli Lilly
Mary Ann Rainey, Commonwealth Edison Company
Phil Mirvis, Independent Consultant

International Representative (2 year term)

Henrik H. Larsen, Copenhagen Business School, 1999-2001
Raymond Saner, Centre for Socio-Economic Development (CSEND), 2001-2003

Student Representative (2 year term)

Jim "Gus" Gustafson, Benedictine University/Square D Co., 2000-2002
George Hay, Benedictine University/McDonald's Corp., 2002-2004

Other positions

R. Wayne Boss, University of Colorado, Newsletter Editor, 1999-2003
Eric Goodman, Colorado Technical University, Webmaster, 1999-2003
Robert T. Golembiewski, University of Georgia, Academy Council (now defunct), 2001-2003

Appendix III Preconference Activities 1999-2003

1999-2003	OB/ODC/OMT Doctoral Student Consortium ODC Executive Doctoral Colloquium
1999	“Organizational learning as a developmental journey” “Tour to McDonald’s University” “Complexity, evolutionary theory and Organizations” “Consortium for Alternative Doctoral programs in Executive Management and Organization Development”
2000	“Effective international business consultancy” “Accelerating organization development” “Accelerating the time to change” “Co-operative inquiry and action inquiry” “Spirituality, organization and consulting” “Management rhetoric in times of change” “Problem based learning in business schools” “Executive doctoral colloquium”
2001	“Perspectives on international consulting” “Planned change of information technology” “Applying environmental and change models to a case” “First person practice: Using action science” “Practice and research in a total theory of management” “Developing a vision for the OD&C division” “Enhancing self-aware consciousness for personal and organizational transformation”
2002	“International business consulting” “Struggling with network dilemmas” “Entry level OD competencies” “Five approaches to change” “Our art, our work” “Teaching organizational change” “Session with Elliott Jacques” “Case research and writing” “International reception” “Doctoral student reception”
2003	“International consulting panel” “OD&C competencies” “Experience SCR in the classroom” “Cross boundary learning” “Collaborative learning environment”

“Studying knowledge in management”
“Five approaches of change”
“Democratic principles in organizations”
“Teaching organizational change”
“Leadership for sustainability”
“Transparent enterprise”
“Cyert & March 40th anniversary”
“Changing organizational design”
“Transforming leadership research”
“Crisis management”
“Using reflection as a learning tool”
“Chinese culture, IS & Organizational Change”
“International reception”
“Doctoral student reception”

Appendix IV
Example of Evaluation Forms used for National Meeting, 2003

SUBMISSION REVIEW FORM

(Due to odcaom@umich.edu no later than January 31, 2003)

Submission ID # _____

Reviewer # _____

Submission Title: _____

Please use the following criteria to rate this submission. Each dimension should be considered independently in making your assessment. For example, a paper may not make a significant theoretical contribution but involve a properly executed study. Or, a paper may be superbly written but provide little contribution. A paper need not be empirical to be rated highly on 'scholarship.' Please use the pull down menu after each criterion to select your correct evaluation score.

A. _____ Contribution: to what extent does the submission significantly add to existing knowledge or significantly add something new to knowledge?

1	2	3	4	5
Little contribution		Neutral		Significant Contribution

B. _____ Interest: to what extent is the topic of interest, does it address an important or relevant issue?

1	2	3	4	5
Not interesting		Neutral		Provocative

C. _____ Scholarship: to what extent is the idea logically developed and grounded, how well is the study designed and executed?

1	2	3	4	5
Poor Logic and Design		Neutral		Excellent Logic and Design

D. _____ Presentation: is it the submission well-organized, does it read well, stay on focus, appropriately use tables and figures to supplement discussion?

1	2	3	4	5
Poor Presentation		Neutral		Excellent Presentation

MEAN SCORE: _____

(Please average your scores on the four dimensions above, and enter it on the "Summary Evaluation Form")

Comments to the author(s):

Include at least a couple paragraphs but ideally a page or so of constructive comments for the authors on the next page.

Appendix IV (continued)
Symposium Review Form
ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT & CHANGE

Please return this evaluation so it arrives **no later than January 31, 2003**

Symposium Submission ID #: _____

Reviewer Code #: _____

Symposium Title: _____

Please Rate this submission along the following dimensions:

****Please select only one ranking****

	Strongly Disagree		Neutral			Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Applicability to ODC domain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Interest to the ODC Division members	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Acceptability for presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Design likely to invoke intellectual change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

MEAN SCORE: _____

(Please average your scores on the four dimensions above, and enter it on the “Summary Evaluation Form”)

This Symposium ranks _____ of the _____ symposiums I reviewed (1 = best)

COMMENTS:

Please provide at least several paragraphs of constructive comments.

Appendix IV (continued)
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM

Reviewer # _____

Please email your reviews back to me at odcaom@umich.edu no later than **January 31, 2003**.

Please provide the following information for each submission in the chart below:

- Submission Number
- Mean score for each submission from the submission evaluation form
- Comments to aid final program committee decision including whether you think the submission has potential for a best paper award. We have several awards including best competitive paper and best paper linking theory and practice.

<i>Submission Number</i>	<i>Mean Score</i>	<i>Comments</i>

Appendix IV (continued)
Suggestions for Conducting an Effective ODC Review

We offer the following suggestions on conducting an effective review for ODC submissions. Reviewing is an important professional service to the ODC division. The purpose of your review is twofold: (1) to help us evaluate and select the best papers and symposia for the Academy program and (2) to provide constructive feedback to authors to help them improve their papers, regardless of whether it is accepted or not. You should schedule at least several hours to complete your reviews. Your review encompasses two distinct parts: (1) completely the evaluation form and (2) writing several paragraphs of comments to the authors (approximately one double-spaced-page of comments).

Review guidelines

- (1) **ALWAYS** maintain a *polite, professional, constructive* tone. Begin your review with a brief summary of the paper/symposium and what you like about it. Then you can move into your more constructive comments with suggestions for improvement. Address yourself directly to the author(s), using the pronoun “you.”
- (2) **DO NOT give an editorial opinion about publication** in these Comments (e.g., “this is a fine paper that should definitely be accepted”). Reviewers often disagree about the bottom line decision. The program chair must weigh all considerations voiced and then make a decision about acceptance.
- (3) **DO separate and number your comments**, rather than writing them in straight narrative style.
- (4) **DO cite page numbers** when referring to specific sections of the manuscript.
- (5) There is no clearly preferred strategy for organizing comments to the authors. Some reviewers organize their comments in terms of the rating dimensions. Others address points sequentially, as they appear in the paper. Still others organize their comments by importance: Most critical concerns first, followed by relatively minor points. Use the approach that best suits you.
- (6) If you make suggestions about additional literature for the authors to consider, be sure to **offer the citation** for these, so you do not send the authors on a wild goose chase.
- (7) Remember that authors appreciate specific comments on areas in their paper that could be improved, along with specific suggestions that you might have on how to make them better.

Appendix V

ODC Reviewers for National Program 1999-2003

1999 Meeting, Chicago: 83 Reviewers

Terry Armstrong	Guerre Don de	Ron Purser
Gayle Baugh	Arie Halachmi	Peter Robertson
Ella Bell	Mary Ann Hazen	Grace Ann Rosile
Eli Berniker	Huy Quy	Marshall Sashkin
David Boje	Anders Ingelgard	Ed Schein
Wayne Boss	Dennis Jaffe	Jim Sena
Hillery Bradbury	Karen Jansen	Linda Sharkey
Rick Brown	Richard Jenner	Caren Siehl
Steve Cabana	Johnson Homer	Ron Sims
Rupe Chisholm	Marty Kaplan	Peter Sorensen Jr.
Allan Church	Harvey Kolodny	Bengt Stymne
Susan Cohen	Karl Kuhnert	Ram Tankasi
Ken Colwell	Laurie Larwood	Kit Tennis
Roger Conway	Mark Levine	Torbjorn Stjernberg
Marcy Crary	Paul Lillrank	Jeff Trailer
Tom Cummings	Raanan Lipshitz	Glenn Varney
Evelyn Dravecky	Jan Lowstedt	Frances Viggiani
Vanessa Druskat	Jim Ludema	Ken Weidner
Amy Edmondson	Craig Lundberg	Andreas Werr
Max Eldon	Newt Margolis	Karen Whelan
Rebecca Ellis	Alfonso Montouri	Candis Williams
Robin Ely	Kurt Motamedi	Wong Yim Yu
Gerard Farias	Ken Murrell	Dick Woodman
Jeffrey Ford	Eric Neilson	Chris Worley
Victor Friedman	Bill Pasmore	Theresa Yaeger
Kay Glasgow	Asya Pazy	Youssef Samir
Allen Glassman	David Peach	Dale Zand
Bob Golembiewski	Joanne Preston	

Appendix V (continued)
2000 Meeting, Toronto: 82 Reviewers

Terry Armstrong	Dick Jenner	James Sena
Jane Baack	Homer Johnson	Rami Shani
Frank Barrett	Marty Kaplan	Ron Sims
Mike Beyerlein	Lynda Kilbourne	Linda Sharkey
David Boje	Harvey Kolodny	Peter Sorensen
Wayne Boss	Mark Kriger	Mike Stebbins
Hilary Bradbury	Laurie Larwood	Robert Steel
Steve Cabana	Paul Lillrank	Alexander Styhre
Steven Cady	Jan Lowstedt	Bengt Stymme
Rupert Chilsom	Jim Ludema	Daniel Svyantek
Allan Church	Barry Macy	Ram Tenkasi
Susan Cohen	Newton Margulies	Kit Tennis
Kenneth Colwell	Craig McGee	Tojo Joseph
Marcy Cray	Alfonso Montuori	Thatchenkery
Don De Guerre	Kurt Motamedi	William Torbert
John Dopp	Ken Murrell	Jeff Trailer
Evelyn Dravecky	Eric Neilson	Mary Fewel
Max Elden	Dennis O'Connor	Glenn Varney
Gerard Farias	Joyce Osland	Frances Viggiani
Mary Ferdig	William Pasmore	Nancy Waldeck
Frank Friedlander	Asya Pazy	Karen Whelan
Robert Golembiewski	David Peach	Susan Fox-Wolfrgramm
Eric Goodman Arie	Joanne Preston	Richard Woodman
Halachmi Mary	Peter Robertson	Theresa Yaeger
Ann Hazen	Grace Ann Rosile	Samir Youssef
Lisa Horvath	Gavin Schwarz	
Quy Huy	Cynthia Scott	

Appendix V (continued)
2001 Meeting, Washington: 87 Reviewers

Robert Akinyinka	Ralph Haug.	Oyvind Palshaugen
Akinyele	Mary Ann Hazen	Marianne Ekman Philips
Chris Argyris	Tom Head	Flemming Poulfelt
Terry Armstrong	Robert Head	Thoralf Qvale
Wayne Boss	Jorge Herrera	Peter Reason
Kathleen Buchman	Lisa Horvath	Will Rifkin
Tony Buono	Karen Jansen	Bob Roberts
Miguel Caldas	Richard Jenner	Teresa Rose
Sherry Camden-Anders	Christie Kennedy	Gavin Schwarz
Rupert Chisholm	Lynda Kilbourne	Jim Sena
Allan Church	Harvey Kolodny	Linda Sharkey
David Coghlan	Mitch Kusy	Peter Sorensen Jr.
Susan Cohen	Jean Livingston	Bob Steel
Julie Wolfram Cox	Jim Ludema	Alexander Styhre
Jane Crabtree	Craig Lundberg	Bengt Stymne
Marcy Crary	Barry Macy	Daniel Svyantek
Tom Cummings	Newton Margulis	Leslie Szamosi
Ben Dankbaar	Donald Marple	Ram Tenkasi
Don De Guerre	Victoria Marsick	Mary Fewel Tulin
Andre Delbecq	Joe Mcdonagh	Frans M. Van Eijnatten
Aaron Desmet	Craig Mcgee	Frances Viggiani
Evelyn Dravecky	Mark Michales	Nancy Waldeck
Christopher Anne Easley	Kurt Motamedi	Karen Whelan-Berry
Olav Eikeland	Gerald Mount	Yim-Yu Wong
Rebecca Ellis	Ken Murrell	Richard Woodman
Mary Ferdig	Eric Neilson	Chris Worley
Frank Friedlander	Mitchell Neubert	Therese Yaeger
Tim Goines	Quy Nguyen-Huy	Samir Youssef
Eric Goodman	V. Nilakant	
Arie Halachmi	Nick Nissley	

Appendix V (continued)
2002 Meeting, Denver: 94 Reviewers

John Adams	Bruce Hansen	Ron Purser
Terry Armstrong	Mary Ann Hazen	Thoralf Qvale
Keith Bahde	Tom Head	Rob Robert
Jeff Bailey	Jorge Herrera	Susana Rodrigues
Wayne Boss	David Jamieson	George Roth
Hilary Bradbury	Karen Jansen	Raymond Saner
Kathleen Buchman	Korin Kendra	Gavin Schwarz
Tony Buono	Lynda Kilbourne	Rami Shani
Steven Cady	Kim Kleason	Linda Sharkey
Sherry Camden-Anders	Toni Knott;	Scott Sherman
Paul Camper	Mary Lou Kotecki	Peter Sorensen Jr.
Bob Canady		Gretchen Spreitzer
Marilyn Carter	Mark Kriger	Bob Steel
Chip Chesmore	Miriam Lacey	Inger Stensaker
Rupert Chisholm	Bill Leban	Alexander Styhre
Samia Chreim	Jim Ludema	Daniel Svyantek
Allan Church	Craig Lundberg	Leslie Szamosi
Mark Ciavarella	Barry Macy	Laura Taplin
David Coghlan	Donald Maier	Kit Tennis
Julie Cox	Michael Manning	Frans Van Eijnatten
Tom Cummings	Rogelio Martinez	Glenn Varney
Kay Davis	Christine Meyer	Bob Verner
Don de Guerre	Phil Mirvis;	Frances Viggiani
Peter Docherty	Kurt Motamedi	Nancy Waldeck
Evelyn Dravecky	Ken	Don Warrick
Terri Egan	Eric Neilson	Karen Whelan-Berry
Marianne Ekman Philips	Mitchell Neubert	Richard Woodman
Mary Ferdig	Jennifer Nevitt	Chris Worley
Ann Feyerherm	Nick Nissley	Therese Yaeger
Frank Friedlander	Marcelle Penn	Feirong Yuan
Connie Fuller	Sandy Piderit	
Eric Goodman	Ned Powley	

Appendix V (continued)
2003 Meeting, Seattle: 124 Reviewers

John Austin	Eric Goodman	Seung-Yoon Rhee
Keith Bahde	Kathy Gurley	Peter Rivard
Mila Baker	Katrin Hansen	Bob Roberts
Jean Bartunek	Mary-Ann Hazen	Peter Robertson
Cecile Betit Purnima	Tom Head	Sophie Romack;
Bhaskar-Shrinivas	Jorge Herrera	Erin Ross;
Wayne Boss	Amy Hietapelto	Ken Rossi
Maree Boyle	Andrea Hornett	George Roth
Hillary Bradbury	Quy Huy	Josefa Ruiz-Mercader
Tony Buono	Karen Jansen	Raymond Saner
Sherry Camden-Anders	Mark Jenkins	Robert Sardy
Marilyn Carter	Daniel Keogh	Gavin Schwarz
Arran Caza	Janet Kiehl	Charles Seashore
Rupert Chisholm	Lynda Kilbourne	Rami Shani
Allan Church	Bill Kohley	Deb Shearer
Susan Cohen	Mary Lou Kotecki	Allison Shriberg
C. Keith Cox	Katherine Lawrence	Kay Snavely
Tom Cummings	Bill Leban	Scott Sonenshein
Miles Davis	Tony LeTrent-Jones;	Peter Sorensen Jr.
Jeannette Davy	Jean Livingston	Dale Spartz
Robert Dengler	Jim Ludema	Gretchen Spreitzer
Eric Dent	Donald Maier	James Sullivan
Anthony DiBella	Geri Markley	Cathleen Swody
Peter Dominick	Donald McCormick	Laura Taplin
Loretta Donovan	Gerry McLaughlin	Ram Tenkasi
Soeren Dressler	Janann Medeiros	Richard Thompson
Patricia Duffy-Atkin	Phil Mirvis;	John Ullmen
Steven Dunn	Aniel Mishra	Glenn Varney
Jeanne Enders	Mike Moch	Robert Verner
George Entwistle	Erik Monsen	Gail Von Gonten
Jennifer Evans	Kurt Motamedi	Paul Waight
Ann Feyerherm	Ken Murrell	John Watson
Krista Finstad-Milion	Eric Neilson	Paula Weber
Sylvia Flatt	Eric Neuman	Karen Whelan-Berry
Jan Flynn	Phyllis Okrepie	Julie Wolfram Cox
Gordon Forward	Debra Orr-Alfeo	Kym Wong
Susan Fox-Wolfgramm	Jennifer Palthe	Richard Woodman
Arnold Frigeri	Sangeeta Parameshwar	Chris Worley
Suzanne Geigle	Bill Pasmore	Therese Yaeger
Nicole Gillespie	Earle Potter III	Dale Zand
Robert Golembiewski	Ron Purser	

Appendix VI

ODC Membership 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Total AOM Membership	11209	11520	12090	12416	13370
Total ODC Membership	2051	2081	2124	2177	2347
Academic	1116	1126	1146	1160	1219
Emeritus	34	38	38	46	54
Executive	412	399	398	424	487
Student	489	518	542	547	587
Domestic	1506	1529	1490	1509	1625
International	545	552	634	668	722

Cross Divisional Assessment: ODC Members in 2003 are also Members of:

Business Policy & Strategy. 323 members
Careers. 82 members
Conflict Management. 104 members
Critical Management Studies. 110 members
Entrepreneurship. 135 members
Gender & Diversity in Organizations. 141 members
Health Care Management. 123 members
Human Resources. 431 members
International Management. 196 members
Management Consulting. 440 members
Management Education & Development. 393 members
Management History. 47 members
Management Spirituality & Religion. 136 members
Managerial & Organizational Cognition. 200 members
Operations Management. 57 members
Organization & Management Theory. 556 members
Organizational Behavior. 806 members
Organizational Communication & Information Systems. 125 members
Organizations & The Natural Environment. 72 members
Public & Nonprofit. 118 members
Research Methods. 183 members
Social Issues in Management. 106 members
Technology & Innovation Management. 175 members

Appendix VII

ODC Newsletters 2002 and 2003

Summer 2003

Contents

[ODC Division Program News by Gretchen M. Spreitzer, Program Chair](#)
[Defining Organization Development by Chris Worley, Division Chair](#)
[OB/ODC/OMT Doctoral Consortium](#)
[Call for Papers: Journal of Applied Behavioral Science](#)
[2003 Bibliography of ODC Literature - Free Copy, Glenn Varney](#)
[Some More Funny Things on the Way to the Future by Philip H. Mirvis](#)
[A Multilevel Analysis of Social Ties and Economic Performance: Chinese Private Enterprises During Market Transition by Wubiao Zhou](#)

ODC Division Program News

Gretchen M. Spreitzer, Program Chair

This year we received 105 submissions — 74 papers and 31 symposia. This is a small increase over last year's 101 submissions. But this year we received 11 more symposia than last year, so we have many more people actually on the program than before. Five of our symposia have been singled out as Showcase Sessions while another had the honor of being an All Academy Session. I am so excited about this year's program! We have two symposia on Appreciative Inquiry and other fascinating sessions on Positive Organizational Scholarship, Toxic Emotions at Work, Theatrics, Aesthetics, Inter-Organizational Learning, Sustain-ability, Collective Collaboration, Paradox, Dialectics, and many other great sessions. Just thinking about these dynamic sessions makes me want to head to Seattle right now.

We have co-sponsored many of our accepted symposia with other divisions and have excellent papers scheduled across all four presentation formats: regular paper sessions, interactive sessions, visual sessions, and shared interest sessions. In case some of you are not familiar with these different kinds of sessions, here is a short description of each:

1. Regular paper sessions are traditional paper presentations with a discussant.
2. Interactive sessions are in the spirit of more democratic exchange of ideas. IP sessions are grouped papers that are presented in a manner that encourages more discussion and interaction. At least 10% of submitted papers are in IP sessions.
3. Visual sessions are not formally presented but rather authors present a poster version of their paper. All of the ODC visual papers will be on display together in a special exhibit hall where they can discuss their papers with attendees.
4. Shared Interest Track Paper sessions were created to break down barriers between divisions by group together papers from different divisions that deal with a common topic.

Some of our very best papers are scheduled in each of these different types of sessions – none are second class citizens. In fact, two of our best paper award winners are in visual sessions and two are in interactive sessions.

Most of our sessions are scheduled to take place in the Convention Center. Here are some special division sessions to mark on your calendars:

- ODC Welcome and Continental Breakfast: Monday, 8:30 a.m. in CC: 304
- Theme Session on Positive Organizational Scholarship: Tuesday, 10:30 am in CC: 304
- ODC Distinguished Speaker Jean Bartunek. Jean is the past President of the Academy, past Division Chair of ODC, and a Professor at Boston College. The title of her talk is "How Planned Change Eventually Changes Itself." Tuesday, 4:10 pm in CC: 2A
- ODC Business Meeting and Awards Ceremony: Tuesday, 5:30 pm in CC: 2A
- A very special ODC Social Hour at the Seattle Aquarium! This is jointly sponsored by the Organizations and Natural Environment Division and supported by the Microsoft Corporation: Tuesday, 8:30 p.m.-10:30 p.m. Space is limited so come early for a great evening!

At our ODC Business Meeting, we will also be honoring our award winners and recognizing our outstanding reviewers.

2003 ODC Award Winners

This year's best paper awards are:

Best competitive paper: "Planning on spontaneity: Lessons from jazz for a democratic theory of change," by Frank J. Barrett (Naval Postgraduate School) and Mary Jo Hatch (U. of Virginia)

Best Practice paper: "Moral purpose and organizational resilience: Sandler O'Neill & Partners in the Aftermath of 9/11/2001," by Steven F. Freeman (U. of Pennsylvania), Larry Hirschhorn (CFAR), and Marc Maltz (TRIAD Consulting Group LLC)

Best Visual paper: "Seattle's experience music project: On color language and framing of organizational reality," by Anat Lechner (New York U.) and Leslie Harrington (Principal, LH.Color)

Best Student Paper: "A Multilevel Analysis of Network Effects: Chinese Private Enterprises during Market Transition," by Wubiao Zhou (Cornell U.)

A Big Thank You

I want to give a big thanks to everyone who helped in the development of the program. I would like to thank Jacoba Lilius, a PhD student at the University of Michigan, who was my assistant through this process. She helped keep every part of the program on track. I would also like to thank Dianne Haft and Paula Kopka at the University of Michigan for their terrific administrative support. And, I would like to thank my program committee, who did an excellent job of assigning reviewers to submissions: Eric Neuman, Alison Shriberg, and Scott Sonenshein. I would also like to thank the ODC Executive Committee for their help in selecting our best papers for this year, as well as Chris Worley, our Division Chair, for his exceptional mentoring.

On behalf of the ODC Executive Committee, I express our deep appreciation to our 124 reviewers. The quality of the reviews was generally excellent and just about everyone turned in their reviews by the due date – so thank you very much. The reviewers include: John Austin, Pennsylvania State U.; Keith Bahde, Benedictine U.; Mila Baker, Pfizer; Jean Bartunek, Boston College; Cecile Betit Purnima Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Pennsylvania State U.; Wayne Boss, U. of Colorado at Boulder; Maree Boyle, U. of Queensland; Hillary Bradbury, Case Western Reserve U.; Tony Buono, Bentley College; Sherry Camden-Anders, Alliant International U.; Marilyn Carter, Benedictine U.; Arran Caza, U. of Michigan; Rupert Chisholm, Pennsylvania State U.; Allan Church, PepsiCo, Inc.; Susan Cohen, U. of Southern California; C. Keith Cox, Tirawa Consulting, Inc.; Tom Cummings, U. of Southern California; Miles Davis, Shenandoah U.; Jeannette Davy, Wright State U.; Robert Dengler, R. A. Dengler Associates; Eric Dent, U. of Maryland; Anthony DiBella, Organizational Transition, Inc.; Peter Dominick, Stevens Institute of Technology; Loretta Donovan, Columbia U.; Soeren Dressler, A. T. Kearney Management Consultants; Patricia Duffy-Atkin, U. of Calgary; Steven Dunn, U. of Wisconsin Oshkosh; Jeanne Enders, Portland State U.; George Entwistle, Vortech, Inc.; Jennifer Evans, Dublin City U.; Ann Feyerherm, Pepperdine U.; Krista Finstad-Milion, I.C.N.; Sylvia Flatt, U. of San Francisco; Jan Flynn, Georgia College & State U.; Gordon Forward, Point Loma U.; Susan Fox-Wolfgramm, Hawaii Pacific U.; Arnold Frigeri; Suzanne Geigle, Pricewaterhouse Coopers; Nicole Gillespie, U. of Melbourne; Robert Golembiewski, U. of Georgia; Eric Goodman, Colorado Technical U.; Kathy Gurley, Fayetteville

State U.; Katrin Hansen, Gelsenkirchen U.; Mary-Ann Hazen, U. of Detroit Mercy; Tom Head, Roosevelt U.; Jorge Herrera, Culture Sense International, Inc.; Amy Hietapelto, Michigan Technological U.; Andrea Hornett, Pennsylvania State U.; Quy Huy, Insead; Karen Jansen, Pennsylvania State U.; Mark Jenkins, Nottingham U.; Knut Karevold, In3; Daniel Keogh, Davatech; Janet Kiehl, Case Western Reserve U.; Lynda Kilbourne, Xavier U.; Bill Kohley, Benedictine U.; Mary Lou Kotecki, Benedictine U./ John Deere Corporation; Katherine Lawrence, U. of Michigan; Bill Leban, Devry University; Tony LeTrent-Jones; Jacoba Lilius, U. of Michigan; Jean Livingston, University Health System Consortium; Jim Ludema, Benedictine U.; Donald Maier, Benedictine U.; Geri Markley, Detroit Public Schools; Donald McCormick, U. of Redlands; Gerry McLaughlin, DePaul U.; Janann Medeiros, Universidade De Brasilia; Phil Mirvis; Aniel Mishra, Wake Forest U.; Mike Moch, Michigan State U.; Erik Monsen, U. of Colorado, Boulder; Kurt Motamedi, Pepperdine U.; Ken Murrell, U. of West Florida; Eric Neilson, Case Western Reserve U.; Eric Neuman, U. of Michigan; Phyllis Okrepkie, U. of Mary; Debra Orr-Alfeo, Lewis U.; Jennifer Palthe, Western Michigan U.; Sangeeta Parameshwar, U. of Illinois; Bill Pasmore, Mercer Delta Consulting; Earle Potter III, Eastern Michigan U.; Ron Purser, San Francisco State U.; Seung-Yoon Rhee, U. O Michigan; Peter Rivard, Boston College; Bob Roberts, Benedictine U.; Peter Robertson, U. of Southern California; Sophie Romack; Erin Ross; Ken Rossi, Hawaii Pacific U.; George Roth, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Josefa Ruiz-Mercader, Universidad De Murcia; Raymond Saner, Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development; Robert Sardy, Progressive Research; Gavin Schwarz, University of New South Wales; Charles Seashore, Fielding Graduate Institute; Rami Shani, California Polytechnical U.; Deb Shearer, Lucent Technologies; Allison Shriberg, U. of Michigan; Kay Snavely, U. of Miami, Ohio; Scott Sonenshein, U. of Michigan; Peter Sorensen, Jr., Benedictine U.; Dale Spartz, John C. Lincoln Health Network; Gretchen Spreitzer, U. of Michigan; James Sullivan, Alliant International U.; Cathleen Swody, U. of Connecticut; Laura Taplin, Benedictine U.; Ram Tenkasi, Benedictine U.; Richard Thompson, Consulting Psychologists Press; John Ullmen, U. of California, Los Angeles; Glenn Varney, Bowling Green State U.; Robert Verner, Benedictine U.; Gail Von Gonten, McDonald's Corporation; Paul Waight, Griffith U.; John Watson, St. Bonaventure U.; Paula Weber, St. Cloud State U.; Karen Whelan-Berry, Texas Wesleyan U.; Julie Wolfram Cox, RMIT U.; Kym Wong, Benedictine U.; Richard Woodman, Texas A & M U.; Chris Worley, Pepperdine U.; Therese Yaeger, Benedictine U.; and Dale Zand, New York U.

And finally, I would like to thank my colleagues at the University of Michigan and my family for their untiring support throughout this process.

DEFINING OD by Chris Worley

The recent passing of several key OD founders provided me with an unnecessary prod to reflect on the purpose and identity of organization development. Coincidentally, several pre-conference workshops on OD competencies resulted in a hubbub of heated debate over whether they should be used to certify and regulate OD practitioners. Finally, the Board of Governor's strategic planning process and ODC Division's mission and vision activities in preparation for our five-year review raised important questions about the role, purpose, and identity of the ODC Division. None of the insights provided by these reflections, debates, and activities have been entirely satisfying, and I don't see any orchestrated approach to move the field forward. While I do see a lot of activity, I worry that the academy has become a place where the increasingly sophisticated search for the irrelevant is being fine tuned to an art form.

An OD graduate student's biggest fear is that the only question on the final exam will be, "What is OD?" For my part, I figured I better have my own answer to the question, and I'd like to take this opportunity to explore it.

Sources of Variation

I view the debate over what OD is or isn't as being driven by three distinct camps: the traditionalists, the pragmatists, and the academics. The traditionalists, and the neo-traditionalists, believe OD was and always should be confined to issues of human process. Supporting the field's traditional humanistic values, they normatively argue for more spiritual, diverse, and organic organizations. The archetype of this camp is the National Training Laboratories (NTL). For NTL, values take on the status of objective and outcome, and there is a strong normative culture to bring spirit, passion, and human integrity into the workplace. For the traditionalist camp, OD is the way a system is changed and whether the change was in the "right" direction.

The pragmatists want to integrate the field's process competencies with content drawn from organization behavior, project management, strategy, and organization design. Practice is the focus, performance is the central value, and process is important only because it represents a strategy to achieve desired outcomes. Relevance is the watchword of the pragmatists and what works is their mantra. The archetypes of this camp are the change management practices in large consulting firms as well as professional organizations, such as the OD Network. The primary drive in these organizations is getting OD work and applying it in organizations. For the pragmatists, OD is change management. Was the organization change successfully implemented?

A key source of variation in OD's definition is the conflict between these two camps. The traditionalists fear the pragmatists will consciously or unconsciously conspire with power elites toward ends (e.g., the concentration of wealth or environmental degradation) they would never support. The pragmatists worry that the traditionalists will promulgate OD's "touchy-feely" orientation. How, exactly, do spirituality in the work place, training, and attention to group process contribute to the success and survival of today's organizations?

Finally, the academics are generally unconcerned with the process or practice since their goal is understanding, prediction, and control. Performance and process are equally important. This camp is more distant from the subject of change than the others. It is more concerned with generalizable conclusions about how change occurs, how it is triggered, under what conditions it works well, and so on. Obviously, the archetype organization is the ODC division of the Academy. Writing papers, making presentations, and generally trying to understand why change occurs and how it relates to effectiveness are the key goals. For the academics, OD is the application of behavioral science knowledge to changing human systems.

Defining Organization Development

Each of the camps argues that they have the answer to the question, "what is OD?" But they are clearly at odds with each other and I believe that to survive, OD's definition must have scope and boundary. Without boundaries, what was known as OD will be absorbed by other disciplines increasingly interested in the organization change phenomena. But to thrive, I think OD's definition must be integrative. Otherwise, the three camps will continue to be at odds and the field will remain fragmented.

Worley and Feyerherm (2003) recently proposed three criteria for OD that I'd like to develop just a bit further. First, OD activities and research must involve change. This is a most obvious and fundamental criterion, but it's also the trickiest. For example, if a senior management team develops a new organization vision, can we say that an organization change has taken place? The answer is "no" because the vision was defined at the "organization" level but only a team's perspective has changed. It could meet this criterion if there was some description and assessment of the extent to which the vision became known, shared, or committed to by the organization. Thus, the level of analysis at which change is taking place must be specified and it's not fair to claim that change occurred because it happened at a lower level of analysis.

In addition to specifying the level of change, the core of this criterion is the explicit accounting of time in the description of a system's evolution. The work must be longitudinal and far too many of our models and frameworks do not take time into account. If research and practice under the rubric of OD cannot meet the requirements of demonstrated change in a defined level over time, then I'm not sure I see the difference between OD and traditional concepts in organization behavior, human resource management, or organization theory. A lot more thinking needs to go into what we mean when we say something has changed.

Second, a set of activities can be called OD if it involves learning. That is, the change process must be conducted in such a way that the system's knowledge and capability to manage change in the future is increased. This criterion gives a strong nod to action research and allows OD to differentiate itself from "change management."

This is a great responsibility for those who would lead or manage an OD process, but it is the only defensible value basis for the field. Despite the traditionalists' clarity that what distinguishes OD is "our values," nobody seems to know or agree on those values. In the absence of consensus, change agents can, consciously or unconsciously, substitute "my values" for "our values." And that's a slippery ethical slope on which to base a field's credibility. Adopting the transferring capability value as a criterion ensures that OD does "no harm" to the system and, at worst, allows

the system to be more accountable for itself in the future. Thus, the change agent's primary ethical responsibility is to build the system's capability to change in the future.

Third, the process must involve a deliberate and conscious effort to improve the performance or effectiveness of the client system. OD's future is best maintained if any effort under the umbrella of OD can address the "so what" question. Here, the issue is how much of the change in effectiveness is accounted for by the content of the change (what changed?) and by the processes (how successfully was the change implemented?). This is no small research methods challenge.

Conclusion

I believe that OD is ready to move out from the shadow of other social science disciplines. Sociology, anthropology, economics, and other disciplines each represent important foundations for OD. Processes that meet the three criteria above will help to define research and practice that are included within the boundaries of OD, and more importantly, the interventions and activities that are excluded. These criteria will not be easy to meet, but that is the field's practical and research challenge. If it is to be taken seriously, we must commit ourselves to both rigor and relevance, to both statistical and practical significance. Most importantly, OD must demonstrate that it is more than change management, and that it can improve not only effectiveness but also the capacity of a system to change in the future.

References

Worley, C. & Feyerherm, A. (2003). Reflections on the future of organization development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 39(1): 97-115.

OB/ODC/OMT DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM

As part of the Professional Development Workshop (pre-conference) program at the 2003 Academy of Management Meetings, we are again organizing the OB/ODC/OMT Doctoral Consortium. The Consortium will take place:

Friday, August 1, 6:00 pm to 8:00 p.m.

Saturday, August 2, 8:00 am to 5:00 p.m.

Sunday, August 3, 8:00 am to 5:00 p.m.

We have planned an interesting and energetic mix of presentations, discussions, and interactive sessions that are designed to launch doctoral students on their academic careers. Specific topics include Developing a High Impact Research Program, Research Trends in Organizations, Teaching Issues, Effective Writing, and Managing Your Career. Faculty participants from ODC include Jean Bartunek, Tom Cummings, Dick Woodman, Ram Tenkasi, Hilary Bradbury, and Peter Sorensen.

We encourage schools to nominate students for the Consortium. To keep the faculty-participant ratio to an optimal size, the number of participants will be limited. This has been a very popular program, so apply early!

To apply, interested students must be nominated by their schools. No university can nominate more than two students (and each doctoral program is limited to one nomination). Universities with multiple departments seeking to send students need to coordinate their nominations. In making the decision to accept students, preference is given to those who have made the most progress toward completing their Ph.D. program. The Consortium is not open to those who have already completed their Ph.D., as it is designed for students. New faculty will find the Junior Faculty Workshop appropriate for their interests.

Applications should be sent by the university department that nominates the student and should include in the body of the email the nominee's name, address, e-mail address, phone and fax numbers, and name of affiliated school and university and a statement by department certifying nominee's completion of doctoral coursework and comprehensive exams by August 1, 2003. Two attachments to the email will be requested:

1. an attached letter from a faculty member providing a general appraisal of the nominee, including an assessment of his/her progress toward a dissertation defense, expected defense date and subject of dissertation; and
2. a one-page bio summarizing the nominee's contact information, research and teaching interests, and publications. This one-page bio will be distributed among consortium participants.

Please send nominations and supporting materials by electronic mail to:
wocasio@kellogg.northwestern.edu.

CALL FOR PAPERS: JOURNAL OF APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science (JABS) welcomes manuscripts from members of the OD Division of the Academy of Management and others whose scholarship matches the journal's goals.

Journal Goals

The objectives of the journal are to: (a) present a range of conceptual frameworks that explain, predict, and illuminate the implications of action; (b) described social interventions, intervention techniques, consultation activities, emergent innovations, and educational practices; (c) include diverse methods of data collection and analysis, such as participant observation, descriptive and inferential statistics, systematic surveys, self-reflections, laboratory and field experiments, and archival records; and (d) examine the underlying values, assumptions, biases, and beliefs associated with various forms of change. In evaluating manuscripts the journal welcomes — indeed prefers — submissions that contribute to more than one of these goals.

Author Friendly Reviews

With a highly diverse editorial board, JABS practices "author friendly" reviews. Reviewers are asked to examine manuscripts in accord with their expertise and interests. Authors typically receive feedback designed to be helpful with 3-6 months of submission. Publication usually follows in less than a year after acceptance. Approximately 1 manuscript in 4 is accepted for publication. To aid the review process and increase the likelihood of having their manuscripts accepted, authors should follow carefully the Manuscript Submission Guidelines located inside the back cover of the journal.

McGregor Awards

Periodically, a JABS editorial committee selects approximately one manuscript per year to receive a McGregor Award for excellence in applied behavioral science research. Awards consist of a cash prize, a certificate, and an announcement in the Journal.

Additional questions about the journal may be directed to the Editor, Clayton P. Alderfer, at Rutgers GSAPP, 152 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8085, telephone (732) 445-5233, email: alderfer@rci.rutgers.edu.

2003 BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ODC LITERATURE - FREE COPY, Glenn Varney, Bowling Green State University

The first Bibliography of Organization Development: Sources and Applications was published by the American Society of Training and Development (ASTD) in 1975, with Kenneth Murrell and Peter Vaill as co-editors. Since then, the Bibliography has been revised seven times. It has been edited and published by the Master of Organization Development program at Bowling Green State University since 1998. The 2003 edition is now available on the web, on CD ROM, or in hard copy.

The Bibliography is public domain material and is designed to assist students, faculty, and practitioners in researching, studying and benchmarking a comprehensive collection of ODC literature in the following broad categories: ODC as a profession; Advancement of the knowledge base of ODC; Change Strategies, Interventions, and Implementation; Organizational Culture; Change Technologies; Data Based Change; Social/Technical and System Analysis; Evaluation and Assessment; Management and Change Leadership; Organization Structure and Design; Evolving and Changing Organizations; Productivity/Performance; International ODC; Sub-fields of Study; and General Related Topics.

The electronic version of the Bibliography provides searchable access and can be found at www.cba.bgsu.edu/mod/od_bibliography.html.

Since 1975 the Bibliography has grown from 70 pages and 450 entries to 314 pages and 2,600 entries. In 1975 there were 900 contributing authors. That number has now grown to 2,300.

The 2003 review panel was composed of the following individuals: Terry Armstrong, Georgetown University; Max Loeffler, Parker Hannifin, Inc.; Ramakrishnan Thenkasi, Benedictine University; Wayne Boss, University of Colorado at Boulder; Kenneth Murrell, University of West Florida; and Don Warrick, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.

We thank this group, especially Kenneth Murrell, who, in addition to his insightful reviews, provided editorial comments for the 2003 edition. The Bibliography will be revised in 2005. Anyone interested in serving on the 2005 review panel or wishing to submit entries for the next edition, please contact: Glenn H. Varney, gvarney@bgnet.bgsu.edu, (419) 352-7782.

Your comments and observations are always welcome.

**SOME MORE FUNNY THINGS ON THE WAY TO THE FUTURE by Philip H. Mirvis, ODC
Division Executive Scholar-Practitioner**

When I was first introduced to the field of ODC, one of the important theoretical and practical challenges was how to make work more interesting. This was the late 1960s/early '70s when "blue collar blues" were rampant in factories and "white collar woes" were creeping into offices. The young, better educated, free thinking workforce simply wouldn't countenance "mind-numbing" work, concluded the influential study *Work in America*, and congressional hearings amply documented the consequences of growing alienation: low morale, shoddy performance, and increased absenteeism among other forms of escapism. On a new television show, *60 Minutes*, a young, long-haired assemblyman at the Chevy plant in Lordstown, where job cycle time had been reduced to 45 seconds and car production was being sabotaged, was asked why he repeatedly missed work on Fridays. He replied, "Mr. Wallace, I don't make enough money to skip work on Thursday, too."

OD offered a number of alternatives to this sorry scenario: job enlargement and enrichment, notions of team assembly and socio-technical systems, and the chance to participate in work-related decisions. This promised to humanize work and to improve performance, too. And it delivered — maybe too well. Surveys find that very few people nowadays complain about a lack of interesting work. On the contrary, many feel brain-drained and overloaded, and have neither enough time nor energy left over for families or for themselves. In the downsized, 24/7, e-accessible anytime/anywhere work world, the challenge we now face is how to create balance between work and personal life.

Arlie Hochschild has come to the provocative conclusion that part of the problem is that work has become such an interesting place and prime source of personal connection, achievement, and meaning. Or, in other words, it offers satisfactions just like "home." And yet home life, especially for working parents, is increasing hurried and harried, paced by short-cycles of repetitive activity. Or just like work used to be! Her question: Where would you rather spend your time? I wonder: as ODers should we consider how to make work a little less interesting? Or turn our attentions to enriching home life?

Such speculations about time and circumstances bring to mind a reflective essay by Warren Bennis (1970) titled, "A funny thing happened on the way to the future." Bennis' earlier writings such as "Beyond bureaucracy" and "Is democracy inevitable?" had stimulated my interest in ODC. And his advocacy of "humanistic-democratic" ideals had fired my aspirations. But, by the early '70s, Bennis, then a university vice-president, found himself mired in militant campus dissent and beset by doubts about the potential of "human warmth and love" in the face of competing concerns with "power, prestige, and profits." The effectiveness of facilitative leadership, for example, was being undermined, to use his terms, by "black militants, drug users, draft resisters, and liberated women" who denied the legitimacy of establishment authorities, among them university VPs. And new ideas about human relations based on "small group behavior, social influence, and action research" seemed naïve in "macrosystems" marked by competition and interest group politics.

From today's vantage, Bennis and others in OD look prescient in promising the emergence of more flexible forms of organization and myriad expressions of voice in post-industrial societies. At the same time, macrosystems — in different ways — have had unpredictable and sometimes

unhappy effects on human relations. It sounds supercilious to "blame" OD for making work interesting and putting family life out of whack — even if you classify ODers as "servants of power." Better to point to the political-economic macrosystem and the collective "us" as shareholders, consumers, voters or, if you prefer, puppets of the system. On a happier note, the macrosystem is itself reshaped in interaction with microdynamics. In the parlance of postmodernism, for instance, race, gender, and social grouping feature in both individual and collective identity, and by general consensus, more diversity in leadership has not only been deemed legitimate, it is considered preferable.

Philosopher of science Gunther Stent makes the point that many grand ideas are "premature" — ahead of their time. Certainly the foundational ideas of OD were such but have since diffused to the mainstream. Other early gems in the field seem to have been overlooked or forgotten, only to appear in fresh formulations. Don Michael's accounts of "learning systems," as an example, prefigure many ideas advanced about organizational learning. In turn, Geoffrey Vicker's description of "appreciative management" has a lot to say about appreciative inquiry. And the writings of Carl Rogers, Bob Tannenbaum, and Jack Gibb, among others, anticipate the coinage of emotional intelligence.

Pet Peeve: Seldom are these original thoughts or thinkers cited by students or young scholars of OL, AI, and EI respectively. It has been said, of course, that aging professors reference ancient tracts and out-of-print books in their papers while the new and up-and-comers cite unpublished talks and works-in-progress. All part of the game exacerbated, I would guess, by electronic databases that date from 1995. My hat is off to the founders and followers of these fields whose time has come. But speaking as an OF, I would wish for more head nods to their forebears.

Interestingly, Stent also finds that new ideas are seldom unique. In many fields, and in different ways, he contends the same ideas are being worked on and out. They gain status and get embraced when the time is right. Of course, that time is itself in flux, or foggy, but is understood to be "post" the unreceptive, inhospitable, prior time — as in the postindustrial or postmodern.

One such example concerns a not-so-new thing called "relational practice." Even as early ODers were delving into group dynamics, leaders in community psychology and social work were unwrapping family systems. Why did the former move inexorably into the mainstream while the latter, largely unnoticed for years, pop-up full-blown in ODC through works by Joyce Fletcher and others? One hunch is that it was seen as "feminist scholarship" or at least gender-specific in the time before flux and fog. Now, its time has come. I am pleased, too, that contributions to theory and practice by Peter Frost (on toxic handling) and Bill Kahn (on caregiving) are welcomed as legitimate additions to this line of inquiry.

CSR — corporate social reporting — is déjà vu all over again. When I was a grad student, Ed Lawler asked me to help prepare and publish a social audit on the quality of work life in a public US corporation. At this time social auditing was growing in Europe and the US Department of Commerce was preparing guidelines on social reporting. Then the unfunny James Kirkpatrick, a 60 Minutes commentator, dismissed CSR as a "silly do-gooder scheme." The political-economic landscape turned with the election of Reagan, the shareholder rights movement, and the rise of cynical self-interest in American society. About the only US company that issued a social report in the era that followed was Ben & Jerry's!

Recently I was sitting in the overflow area of a conference on social reporting by Brad Googin's Center for Corporate Citizenship. Near to me were a couple of Carter-era proponents of social accounting and several subject matter experts I hadn't seen since the '70s. We smiled at each other and began to laugh. Our time had come — again.

I am currently a member of industry-academic action groups that have to do with work-family balance, corporate citizenship, sustainability, and branding. In each forum the business people aren't sure how to address the issues at hand. And the academics have lots of ideas on what ought to be done, but very little sense of how to do it. The #1 agenda item in each forum is how to create (and sustain) organization change.

But eyes glaze over during stories on Royal Dutch Shell transformation on social performance, or with references to the family friendly policies of Sweden or France. The scale of these efforts are daunting to the practitioners who want mostly to gain allies and advance their agenda with "small wins." Eyes brighten with references to Deb Meyerson's work on "tempered radicals" and to "little things that make a big difference" ala The Tipping Point.

One other forum I've been with is the Executive Committee of the ODC Division — where, funny thing, I'm what passes for a practitioner. Now ODC has lots of new non-US members and many doctoral students who have day-jobs but aspire to be scholarly practitioners. They, plus a new generation of academic committee members, proposed a new vision for ODC and a change in the domain statement. It caused a bit of an uproar.

One camp, including many who led the charge to add "and change" to what was formerly known as the OD division, was not pleased. For them, "old" OD is dead. But "change management" is very much alive, and remains an area for serious research and scholarship. Unstated, but understood, is that a sober mission gives ODC members more scientific status in the academy, a seat, directly or by proxy, in executive offices, and access to more interesting work and money as speakers or consultants. And, frankly, it better fits the mission of most business schools and the interests of many students and companies.

The other camp wants to re-emphasize human warmth and love, stretch the ODC domain to cover nature and sustainability, and speak to world peace and probably hunger. My bet is that this more inclusive, value-laden pitch will win out. Its time has come, again, albeit in a new way. Funny thing.

References

Bennis, W. G. (1970, July). A funny thing happened on the way to the future. *American Psychologist*, 25, 595-608.

A MULTILEVEL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL TIES AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE: CHINESE PRIVATE ENTERPRISES DURING MARKET TRANSITION by Wubiao Zhou, Cornell University

2003 Best Student Paper Award

Linkages between social networks and firm performance have commanded substantial scholarly attention (see reviews in Podolny and Page, 1998; also see a book edited by DiMaggio, 2001). This body of research stresses the benefits of inter-firm ties in fostering organizational learning, enhancing legitimacy and status, increasing trust, reducing risks, etc. (Podolny and Page, 1998). Interpersonal ties, however, are less stressed in this body of research except that such ties, especially personal relations among entrepreneurs or managers, are said to play a role in developing inter-firm ties (Uzzi, 1996).

Another body of research on social networks has an emphasis on interpersonal ties. However, this line of research mainly stresses the importance of personal ties on labor market outcomes (Granovetter, 1973, 1974; also see reviews in Lin, 1999). Only very few works in this body of research have examined the effects of interpersonal ties on firm performance (Bian, 2002; Nee and Su, 1996; Xin and Pearce, 1996). Based on the practices of developing countries such as reforming China, these works emphasize the importance of cultivating interpersonal ties between entrepreneurs or managers, especially those in weak firms, and key actors in the environment for doing businesses. However, significant as the benefits of interpersonal ties are for firms, it is also important to study the costs and constraints of using personal ties for firms. Otherwise we would observe that firms everywhere will take using interpersonal ties as a dominant strategy in doing business.

Thus, this paper first conceptualizes the potential benefits, costs and constraints of using purposive interpersonal ties in doing businesses for firms under institutional deficiencies, and then directly examines these benefits and costs in both static and dynamic ways. Following Lin (2001), I argue that the main benefit for firms of using purposive interpersonal ties in doing businesses is access to the resources, which are crucial for the survival of the firm but in the control of key actors in the environment. However, these benefits are highly conditional on the institutional environment, and to access these resources through interpersonal ties are by no means for free. The costs attached to using interpersonal ties in doing businesses range from opportunity costs to investment costs. These costs, together with improvement in institutional environment, will drive firms to reduce using interpersonal ties in doing businesses.

I examine these benefits and costs by using the National Longitudinal Survey of Chinese Private Enterprises 1995 data and a supplemental dataset on provincial characteristics in China. The

Chinese private enterprises case is appropriate for this study because (1) Chinese private enterprises have encountered severe institutional deficiencies during reform era (1978-), which make using interpersonal ties popular among private entrepreneurs in doing businesses; and (2) there exists high provincial heterogeneity in institutional development during market transition in China, which makes it possible for examining the dynamic effects of using interpersonal ties on firm performance.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in this paper are:

Hypothesis 1. In reform-era China, a significant proportion of private firms will use purposive interpersonal ties in doing businesses.

Hypothesis 2. In the mid 1990s China, private enterprises may still be better off by using interpersonal ties in doing businesses than by relying solely on market mechanisms, and it is those firms using both interpersonal ties and market mechanisms that will do best with regard to firm performance, other things being equal.

Hypothesis 3. Other things being equal, private firms in reform-era China which use interpersonal ties in doing businesses will incur high investment costs in cultivating and maintaining social connections with those who control economic powers or have access to these economic powers, especially comparing to the firms relying solely on markets.

Hypothesis 4. In reform-era China, the degree of marketization level in a province has a negative effect on the firm performance of private enterprises using interpersonal ties. That is, the economic performance of firms using interpersonal ties will decrease as the marketization level increases, other things being equal. On the other hand, the degree of marketization level in a province will have a positive effect on the firm performance of private enterprises using formal markets. That is, the economic performance of firms using formal markets will increase as the degree of marketization level increases, other things being equal.

Hypothesis 5. In reform-era China, the importance of the private sector in a province has an inverse "U" shape effect on the firm performance of private enterprises using interpersonal ties. That is, the firm performance of private enterprises using interpersonal ties will increase as the importance of the private sector increases when the private sector is still trivial to the provincial economy; however, it will decrease as the importance of the private sector increases when the contribution of the private sector passes a threshold, other things being equal. On the other hand, the importance of the private sector in a province will have a positive "U" shape effect on the firm performance of private enterprises using formal markets. That is, the firm performance of private enterprises using formal markets will decrease as the importance of the private sector in a province increases before the latter reaches a threshold; however, it tends to increase as the importance of the private sector in a province increases after the latter passes a threshold, other things being equal.

Results

Empirical results from fixed effect models and Hierarchical Linear Models provide strong supports to these hypotheses. Thus, we can conclude that purposively cultivating and maintaining interpersonal ties is a common, profitable, but also costly way for Chinese private firms to obtain crucial resources for businesses under severe institutional deficiencies. Though purposive interpersonal ties provide social capital for access to crucial resources for institutionally weak firms, such ties also bring about opportunity costs in information losses and investment costs in

cultivating and maintaining such ties. Because of the existence of these costs, institutionally weak firms will not keep using purposive ties in doing businesses forever. As institutional environment improves, formal markets and other formal ways based on formal rules will be used more extensively by these firms based on cost-benefit calculations.

References

Bian, Y. (2002). *Social capital of the firm and its impact on performance: A social network perspective and analysis*. In Tsui, A. S., & Lau, C. (Ed.), *Management of Enterprises in P. R. China* (pp. 275 - 298). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

DiMaggio, P. (2001). Ed. *The twenty-first-century firm: Changing economic organization in international perspective*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Granovetter, M. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360 -1380.

_____. (1995[1974]). *Getting a job: A study of contacts and careers*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1999). Social networks and status attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 25-50.

Nee, V., & Su, S. (1996). Institutions, social ties, and commitment in China's corporatist transformation. In McMillan, J., & Naughton, B. (Ed.), *Reforming asian socialism: The growth of market institutions* (pp. 111-134). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Uzzi, B. (1996). The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 674 - 698.

Xin, K. R., & Pearce, J. L. (1996). Guanxi: Connections as substitutes for formal institutional support. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1641 - 1658.

Appendix VIII

Winners of Outstanding Paper Awards

1999

Best Division Paper

“The de-development of contemporary organizations” Paul Nutt and Robert W. Backoff

Best Practice Related Paper

“Creating conversations for change: Lessons from history learning projects” George L. Roth

2000

Best Division Paper

“Reframing change in organizations: The equilibrium logic and beyond.” Georg Schreyögg and Christian Noss

Best Practice Related Paper

Beyond the single intervention study: A collaborative research project to investigate organizational culture.” Alannah E. Rafferty and Mark A. Griffin

Best Interactive Paper

“Studying organizational change: A change response model with readiness factors.” Christina J. Kennedy and David J. Gonsiorowski

2001

Best Division Paper

“Organizational identification during major change: The dynamics of dissociation and re-association” Samia Chreim

Best Practice Related Paper

“Excessive change: Unintended consequences of strategic change” Inger Stensaker, Christine Meyer, Joyce Falkenberg and Anne Cathrin Haueng

Best Interactive paper

“Linking high involvement environments to the organizational life cycle: A descriptive and prescriptive approach” Mark A. Ciavarella

Best Student Paper

“The efficacy of appreciative inquiry in building relational capital in a transcultural strategic alliance” Monty G. Miller, Stephen P. Fitzgerald, Joanne C. Preston, and Kenneth L. Murrell.

2002

Best Division Paper

“Emotional filtering in strategic change” Quy Nguyen Huy

Appendix VIII (continued)

Winners of Outstanding Paper Awards

Best Practice Related Paper

“Team level antecedents of team members network building in innovation projects”
Martin Hoegl and K. Praveen Parboteeah

Best Interactive Paper

“The efficacy of appreciative inquiry in building relational capital in a transcultural strategic alliance” Monty G. Miller, Stephen P. Fitzgerald, Joanne C. Preston and Kenneth L. Murrell

2003

Best Division Paper

"Planning on spontaneity: Lessons from jazz for a democratic theory of change," Frank J. Barrett and Mary Jo Hatch

Best Practice Related Paper

"Moral purpose and organizational resilience: Sandler O’Neill & Partners in the Aftermath of 9/11/2001," Steven F. Freeman, Larry Hirschhorn, and Marc Maltz

Best Interactive Paper

"Seattle’s experience music project: On color language and framing of organizational reality," Anat Lechner and Leslie Harrington

Best Student Paper

"A Multilevel Analysis of Network Effects: Chinese Private Enterprises during Market Transition," Wubiao Zhou

Appendix IX

Income Statements for ODC Division 1999-2003

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT & CHANGE

STATUS REPORT

JAN 1, 2003-DEC 31, 2003

FISCAL YEAR 2003

**RESERVE &
ALLOCATION**

BALANCE FORWARD JAN. 1, 2003	\$ 4,440.93
DIVISION ALLOCATION JAN. 1, 2003	\$ 20,093.00
TOTAL OPERATING FUNDS AVAIL. JAN. 1, 2003	\$24,533.93

**REVENUE
BY QUARTER**

JAN-MAR APR-JUN JUL-SEP OCT-DEC

CONTRIBUTIONS/DONATIONS		600.00	700.00		\$1,300.00
TICKET SALES					\$0.00
EVENTS					\$0.00
AWARDS	250.00				\$250.00
REVENUE OTHER					\$0.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$250.00	\$600.00	\$700.00	\$0.00	\$1,550.00

**EXPENSE
BY QUARTER**

AWARDS		129.96	631.44		\$761.40
INTERIM MEETINGS					\$0.00
PRINTING/PRODUCTION		595.44			\$595.44
POSTAGE			13.80		\$13.80
BOOKS & PERIODICALS					\$0.00
TRAVEL		1882.50			\$1,882.50
AUDIO VISUAL			113.00		\$113.00
PERSONNEL					\$0.00
GENERAL ADMIN					\$0.00
FOOD & BEVERAGE		1204.29	5657.59		\$6,861.88
TRANSPORTATION					\$0.00
EXPENSES REIMBURSED					\$0.00
CONTRIBUTIONS/ENDOWMENTS			300.00		\$300.00
EXPENSE OTHER		185.00			\$185.00
TOTAL EXPENSE	\$0.00	\$3,997.19	\$6,715.83	\$0.00	\$10,713.02

FUND NET \$15,370.91

Appendix X

ODC Division Report Survey Results

(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=neutral, 5=slightly agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree)

Comparison of 1998 and 2003 Surveys

	1998 Mean/SD N=52	2003 Mean/SD N=408
I feel I can have a real influence on the Division's policies (#1)	4.30/1.68	4.11/1.57
The division spends too much of its money on social events (#2)	4.33/1.31	2.92/1.23
The division's leaders are very responsive to its member's concerns and interests (#3)	4.62/1.36	5.14/1.26
Access to ODC leadership positions is controlled by a self-perpetuating elite group (#4)	3.78/1.62	3.49/1.50
Generally speaking, the division's program at the Academy Meeting is both interesting and useful (#5)	4.92/1.47	5.52/1.25
The division's pre-conference activities provide members a valuable service (#6)	4.94/1.65	5.41/1.27
The ODC Division should focus on developing events at times other than the annual Academy meeting (#7)	5.19/1.38	4.61/1.65
The ODC Division needs to be more internationally focused (#8)	Not asked	5.02/1.53

Appendix X
ODC Division Report Survey Results continued
(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=neutral, 5=slightly agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree)

	1998 Mean/SD (N=52)	2003 Mean/SD (N=408)
The division needs to spend more money on things that would help its members professionally (#9)	4.33/1.31	4.79/1.33
The ODC Division should invest more time in teaching and learning issues (#10)	5.25/1.12	4.88/1.40
The ODC Division should invest more time in OD and change research (#11)	5.14/1.42	5.48/1.19
The ODC Division should invest more time in practitioner OD and change issues (#12)	5.56/1.37	5.26/1.43
The division should invest more time in working with broader societal and public policy issues (#13)	4.85/1.50	4.35/1.63
The division should invest more time in the development of new ODC scholars (#14)	5.40/1.36	5.08/1.30
The division should take a more active role in shaping the Academy's future (#15)	5.45/1.18	5.34/1.21

Appendix X
ODC Division Report Survey Results continued
Frequencies by Item

Q#1	Q#2	Q#3	Q#4	Q#5	Q#6	Q#7	Q#8	Q#9	Q#10	Q#11	Q#12	Q#13	Q#14	Q#15
24	51	2	31	4	2	18	10	4	8	2	8	16	2	1
68	122	11	98	9	6	49	25	19	20	8	17	55	12	8
106	170	25	155	24	21	89	55	43	58	16	43	118	37	19
204	293	111	246	71	76	158	137	160	130	73	99	199	126	94
289	301	189	292	137	138	244	215	243	228	174	191	273	224	187
335	303	290	318	285	237	321	298	311	318	289	296	334	316	295
352	302	335	321	357	357	365	372	349	356	367	374	371	371	359

