DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 069 HE 019 450

AUTHOR Cameron, Kim S.
TITLE An Empirical Investigation of the Multiple Constituencies Model of Organizational Effectiveness.
INSTITUTION National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 82
CONTRACT 400-80-0109
NOTE 49p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrators; Department Heads; Donors; *Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Effectiveness; Organizational Theories; Outcomes of Education; Participant Satisfaction; Private Colleges; State Colleges; Student Development; Trustees

ABSTRACT

The multiple constituencies model of organizational effectiveness was investigated in 1980-1982 with 29 four-year colleges and universities in the Northeast United States. A performance profile for individual organizations and a preference profile for different constituencies of the organizations were obtained, using the same dimensions of effectiveness for both types of profiles. Each of the 29 institutions was found to hold unique performance profiles. Five unique preference profiles were found among seven major constituencies (faculty department heads, student affairs administrators, financial administrators, academic administrators, general administrators, trustees, and representatives of major funders). Comparisons of each institution's performance profile with the preference profiles of the seven constituencies revealed that some institutions satisfied multiple constituencies whereas others did not, and some constituencies tended to be satisfied more often than others. It was found that the most effective organizations tended to satisfy multiple constituencies, whereas the least effective organizations tended to satisfy no constituencies. In addition, some organizations were highly effective even when they satisfied no major constituencies. (SW)

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE MULTIPLE CONSTITUENCIES MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

by

Kim S. Cameron

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, CO 80302

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE MULTIPLE CONSTITUENCIES MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Kim S. Cameron
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(303) 497-0368

December, 1982

The research reported here was supported by a contract (#400-80-0109) from the National Institute of Education.

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE MULTIPLE CONSTITUENCIES MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

A variety of definitions of organizational effectiveness have been proposed by organizational researchers (Cameron and Whetten, 1983; Cameron, 1983). These definitions have guided research efforts by indicating which criteria are most appropriate when assessing effectiveness. For example, the most popular definition--known as the goal model--considers organizational effectiveness to be the extent to which an organization accomplishes its goals. This definition identifies the relevant criteria of effectiveness to be the explicit goals as well as an indicator of goal accomplishment in each organization (Bluedorn, 1980; Campbell, 1977; Etzioni, 1975; Hall, 1980; Price, 1972; Scott, 1977; Steers, 1977). Problems with this definition, however, are that organizational goals are difficult to identify, goals are often contradictory, goals of and goals for the organization are difficult to separate, goals may be harmful to society or to the organization, organizations may be successful when goals are not accomplished, and so forth. Despite these problems, however, the goal model has guided more effectiveness research than any other model. The major alternative to the goal definition of effectiveness is the system resource model (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967). Research using this model views organizations as effective to the extent to which they acquire needed resources. Criteria of effectiveness advocated by this definition are flexibility, adaptability, degree of competitive advantage, coordination with outside agencies, and so forth (Molnar and Rogers, 1976; Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1982; Seashore and Yuchtman, 1967). Criticisms of this

definition include the inability to identify optimal resource acquisition, time frames, and resource priorities, the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness not being distinguished, non-resource acquiring activities being devalued, and so forth (Bluedorn, 1980; Cameron, 1978; Kirchoff, 1971; Price, 1972; and Scott, 1977). Debates about the superiority of one of these models over the other continue in the literature (Molnar and Rogers, 1976; Scott, 1977).

More recently, another definition of effectiveness has begun to gain popularity because it avoids the problems of the goal and system resource models. Most writers refer to it as the multiple constituencies model (Connolly, Conlon and Deutsch, 1980; Keeley, 1978; Miles, 1980; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978; Zammuto, 1982). It defines effectiveness as the extent to which an organization satisfies its strategic constituents (or stakeholders). Writers differ regarding which constituencies are the most important to satisfy (for example, Pfeffer and Salancik favor the most powerful constituencies, Keeley favors the least advantaged constituencies, Zammuto favors the most heterogeneous constituencies), but all agree that the preferences of the organization's constituencies are the most appropriate criteria of effectiveness. This model avoids the problems of specifying and assessing organizational goals as well as the problems of identifying and assessing optimal resource acquisition. Unlike the goal and system resource models, however, empirical research has not yet been conducted using the multiple constituency definition. Some investigators have included multiple groups in their studies, but none have set out to test the basic definition of the multiple constituency model (i.e., effective organizations satisfy the preferences of important constituencies).

Aside from its relative newness, there is at least one major reason why the multiple constituency definition is rarely used to guide research, and why the goal and system resource models are used more frequently. It is that preferences of constituencies are difficult to assess in a valid and reliable way. Nisbet and Wilson (1977) and Slovic and Lichtenstein (1971) each concluded after reviews of the empirical literature, for example that individuals are not good at either identifying or explicating their preferences. That is, whereas constituencies actually hold preferences regarding organizational performance, it is very difficult for researchers, and even for the individuals themselves, to determine what those preferences are and what is their relative importance. Just asking people for their preferences is not likely to produce valid responses, as evidenced by a variety of empirical investigations. This phenomenon was discussed by Argyris and Schon (1978) who suggested that individuals hold two different kinds of theories or cognitive maps in their minds. One kind is called theories-in-action, which are used to guide behavior. The other is called theories-in-use, which are theories that remain completely mental and are used to interpret the world. According to Argyris and Schon, theories-in-action are seldom cognitively mapped, so that it is very difficult to identify them by merely asking an individual to describe them. Observable behavior is the primary source for identifying the theories-in-use held by other people. Similarly, the preferences that guide constituencies to make a judgment that an organization is effective (i.e., theories-in-action) are best analyzed by observing actual judgment behavior rather than asking for a list of preferences. Researchers of organizational effectiveness have not yet done that with multiple constituencies.

One way to address this preference problem confronting research using the multiple constituency definition is to use a judgment analysis methodology (Hammond, Klitz, and Cook, 1978; Hammond, Rohrbaugh, Mumpower, and Adelman, 1977; Huber, 1974; Hitt and Middlemiss, 1979; Rohrbaugh, 1979; Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971). This methodology accepts the assumption that individuals have a difficult time identifying their own preferences and explicitly ordering them in order to map their judgments. Individuals called upon to identify their preferences and to use them in judging organizational effectiveness are often unable or inaccurate in their attempts (Hoffman, 1960; Slovic, 1969). Constituency preference profiles, like cognitive maps (Bougon, Weick, and Binkhorst, 1977), therefore, are best identified by analyzing the actual judgments of effectiveness made by the constituency. So that, by analyzing a large number of individual judgments of effectiveness for organizations, a profile of preferences can be constructed that identifies which preferences are most important in accounting for the effectiveness judgments. This methodology is described in more detail in a later section.

Research Questions

The purpose of this paper is to report an investigation of the multiple constituency model of effectiveness. The preferences of multiple constituencies were assessed in this research in order to determine which preferences were most important to which constituencies, and the extent to which organizational performance satisfied those preferences. Three major research questions guided this investigation. First, what preferences are held by the several strategic constituencies of an organization, and how do those preference profiles differ from one another? Second, when

comparing organizational performance to the preferences of the various constituencies, is one constituency more satisfied than another? That is, does the organization's performance profile match one constituency's preference profile more closely than it matches others? Third, if certain constituencies are more satisfied than others by the organization's performance, are they the most powerful constituencies, the least advantaged constituencies, or others?

Investigating these three questions makes it possible to address some of the most important issues surrounding the multiple constituency perspective. In addressing these issues, this research aims to determine to what extent the multiple constituencies model is valid and useful for assessing effectiveness in organizations. For example one issue is, to what extent do different constituencies actually hold different preferences of effectiveness for organizations? Several researchers have found that the judgments of effectiveness of different groups have had low or negative correlations with one another (Dubin, 1976; Friedlander and Pickle, 1968; Whetten, 1978). Others have found that different individuals value some criteria more than others when making personal judgments of effectiveness (Hitt and Middlemiss, 1979; Rohrbaugh, 1982). No research, however, has assessed and compared the preferences of multiple constituencies with the actual performance of organizations at the organizational level of analysis.

Another important issue in the multiple constituency perspective is, do organizations actually try to perform so as to satisfy the preferences of certain constituencies, or does organizational inertia help maintain a pattern of performance regardless of constituency demands? Miles and Cameron (1982), Miller and Frieson (1979), Miles and Snow (1978) and

others have found evidence for an inertia in the kinds of performance displayed by organizations. This inertia has been called by different names such as strategic competence, organizational saga, and performance stability. These forces of inertia are relatively strong, and organizations have been found to persist in certain kinds of performance regardless of some relatively severe pressures for change (see, for example, Miles and Cameron's account of the performance patterns consistently displayed by various tobacco firms). To date no research has investigated this relationship between constituency preferences for effectiveness and organizational performance. It is not clear if organizations operate independent of, or in spite of, the preferences of strategic constituencies, or if they operate primarily in response to those demands.

A third issue, which constituency is most important to an organization in judging effectiveness, has been alluded to above. Pennings and Goodman (1977), Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), and others have suggested that the constituency perceived to be the most powerful is the most likely to influence organizational performance and to validly judge effectiveness. Keeley (1978) relied on Rawls (1971) theory of justice in claiming that the least advantaged (or least powerful) constituency is the most likely to influence and validly judge effectiveness. Van de Ven and Ferry (1978) advocated still another view when they pointed to organizational members (as opposed to external constituencies) as the most important constituency. Zammuto (1982) advocated the most heterogeneous set of constituencies as the appropriate ones. No empirical research has addressed this issue of which constituency is most appropriate, however, so these points of view all are based on the authors' own biases or

suppositions. Which constituency's preferences are most closely allied to organizational performance is still a matter of speculation.

In the section below, the methods used for investigating these issues are described, followed by a report of the results of the study. The final section of the paper discusses the implications of this investigation for the multiple consituency definition of effectiveness, and implications are drawn for future research on the effectiveness construct.

METHODS

Organizational Sample

Twenty nine institutions of higher education in the northeast United States were selected for study. All are four-year schools, although seven offer only bachelors degrees, five offer masters degrees, and 17 offer doctorates. Eleven of the schools are publically supported and 18 are private. Institutional age ranges from approximately 30 years to over 200 years. Faculties are unionized in 19 of the schools with 10 being non-unionized. Undergraduate student enrollments range from just over 1000 to just over 10,000 with the average being 4200 students. Confidentiality was promised to each institution, so names of schools are not included in this report. All data were collected from these institutions during the 1980 academic year.

Respondent Sample

In each of the 29 institutions, members of seven different strategic constituencies provided data. These seven groups are generally acknowledged to be members of the dominant coalition of the institutions of higher education (Cameron, 1978). They are (1) faculty departmert

heads, (2) student affairs administrators, (3) financial administrators, (4) academic administrators, (5) general administrators, (6) members of the board of trustees, and (7) representatives of major funders. Faculty department heads comprised the largest group in the sample with 40 percent, while major funders comprised only five percent of the sample. Fourteen percent of the sample was trustees, 12 percent was general administrators, 10 percent was academic administrators, seven percent was financial administrators, and 12 percent was student affairs administrators. In all, 1240 individuals participated in the study representing a response rate of approximately 60 percent of those contacted.

Instruments

Each respondent was requested to complete two different instruments. These questionnaires were mailed together to each individual along with a stamped return envelope. The first was Cameron's (1978) instrument designed to elicit descriptions of the respondent's own institution. Individuals were asked to provide descriptive information, not evaluative judgments, regarding the extent to which their institution prossessed certain characteristics. These characteristics were found in previous research to be indicative of institutional effectiveness (Cameron, 1978, 1981), although respondents were not instructed that they were rating effectiveness. They were only told that they were to describe the characteristics of their institution. Three examples of the 57 items are presented below to illustrate the descriptive nature of this first questionnaire.

"How many faculty members and administrators at this college would you say serve in the community in government, on boards or committees, as consultants, or in other capacities?"

"Estimate what percent of the graduates from this institution go on to obtain degrees in graduate or professional school."

"Approximately what proportion of the undergraduate courses offered at this college are designed to be career-oriented or occupation-related as opposed to liberal education, personal development, etc.?"

This questionnaire assesses nine separate dimensions of organizational effectiveness, and these dimensions are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The result of this questionnaire is a performance profile for each institution at the organization level of analysis (i.e., each institution receives a score on each of the nine dimensions indicating the extent to which the institution is effective on each dimension). Past research using this instrument has found that it possesses external as well as internal validity regarding effectiveness (Cameron, 1978), and it was for that reason that it was used in this investigation.

The second instrument was designed using the "policy capturing" or "judgment analysis" methodology (Hammond, McClelland, and Mumpower, 1980; Rohrbaugh, 1982; Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971). The basic premise of this method is that preference profiles or judgment policies can be identified by analyzing how individuals actually judge effectiveness (see Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971; Slovic, Fischhoff, and Lichtenstein, 1977). The procedure used is as follows. Individuals are presented with

Table 1 Nine Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education

DIMENSION	DEFINITION
1. Student Educational Satisfaction	The extent to which students are satisfied with their educational experiences at the institution.
2. Student Academic Development	The extent of the academic growth, attainment, and progress of students at the institution.
3. Student Career Development	The extent of occupational preparedness of the students, and the emphasis on career development provided by the institution.
4. Student Personal Development	The extent of student development in nonacademic, noncareer oriented areas, and the emphasis on personal development provided by the school.
5. Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction	The extent of satisfaction of faculty members and administrators with their employment at the institution.
6. Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty	The extent of professional attainment and development of the faculty, and the emphasis on development provided by the institution.
7. System Openness and Community Interaction	The extent of interaction with, adaptation to, and services provided for the external environment by the institution.
8. Ability to Acquire Resources	The ability of the institution to acquire needed resources such as high quality students and faculty, financial supports, etc.
9. Organizational Health	The extent to which the internal processes and practices in the institution are smooth functioning, viable, and benevolent.

descriptions of the performance of a number of organizations and asked to make evaluative judgments as to how effective each organization is (see Rohrbaugh, 1982). The characteristics of the organizations (or in this case, the levels achieved on the criteria of effectiveness) are mixed randomly. An analysis of those judgments allows for the identification of the effectiveness criteria that account for the most variance in the judgments of effectiveness made by the individuals. Quantitative analysis of these judgments relies on multiple regression, where the different levels of the effectiveness criteria for each organization are regressed on the respondent's judgment of effectiveness for each organization. Preference profiles, or weightings of the relative importance of the different criteria of effectiveness for each person, result from this analysis.

In this study, individuals were presented with the effectiveness profiles of 25 different (hypothetical) institutions. Each institution had a particular score on each of the nine dimensions of effectiveness identified in the Cameron (1978) instrument (low, medium, high levels were presented on the dimensions). These dimensions were defined and illustrated at the beginning of the questionnaire. Respondents were instructed that the dimensions had been found in previous research to be indicative of organizational effectiveness in higher education, and their task was to judge the effectiveness of each of the 25 institutions presented on the questionnaire. Judgments were made on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) according to the institution's level of performance on a combination of the nine dimensions. Figure 1 illustrates this procedure.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

The difference between this questionnaire and the first one completed by the respondents is that this questionnaire asks for evaluations and preferences, the first one asked for objective descriptions. In this questionnaire, individuals' responses were based on what they liked or valued, in the first questionnaire they did not express likes or values.

In summary, respondents produced two kinds of data from these two questionnaires. First, they responded to 57 items that described the performance characteristics of their own institution. These characteristics group together into nine dimensions of effectiveness. Second, they complete a judgment task that produced profiles of their own preferences (i.e., which criteria of effectiveness they most preferred). One section of the first questionnaire also asked for information regarding respondents' perceptions of the relative power and importance of several constituencies as they affected the performance of the institution. These ratings were used in analyses to be explained later. Ratings in a Likert format were received for students, faculty, top adminstrators, alumni, trustees, major funders, and legislators.

Analyses

Analyses of the first questionnaire relied on two separate procedures. First, psychometric tests were conducted to insure that the nine dimensions of effectiveness possessed high reliability and internal consistency. Past research indicated that nine separate dimensions should emerge from the questionnaire (Cameron 1978, 1981, 1982), but evidence for the dimensions had to be uncovered in this study as well. Second, analysis of variance and multivariate analysis of variance were conducted

Figure 1 An Example of the Judgment Task Given to Respondents on the Second Questionnaire

---

INSTRUCTIONS: In this questionnaire, we are asking that you make judgments about the overall effectiveness of 25 colleges and universities.... We have presented the "performance profiles" of these institutions based on their scores on the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness [defined above]. In order to judge the effectiveness of each institution, you will need to pay particular attention to the scores of each dimension. Some dimensions of performance may be more important to you than others in determining your overall evaluation, so please note the different scores on each dinension before making your judgment.... Please rate each school on a scale of '1' (ineffective) to '7' (highly effective).

Highly effective			Somewhat effective			Ineffective
(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

Student Educational Satisfaction
Student Academic Development
Student Career Development
Student Personal Development
Faculty & Administrator Satisfaction
Professional Development & Quality of Faculty
System Openness & Community Interaction
Ability to Acquire Resources
Organizational Health

RATING OF EFFECTIVENESS, SCHOOL 23: _____

Student Educational Satisfaction
Student Academic Development
Student Career Development
Student Personal Development
Faculty & Administrator Satisfaction
Professional Development & Quality of Faculty
System Openness & Community Interaction
Ability to Acquire Resources
Organizational Health

RATING OF EFFECTIVENESS, SCHOOL 24: _____

---

to examine the extent to which different constituency groups differed from one another in their ratings of effectiveness. The main effects of the institution on ratings of effectiveness also were examined to insure that constituency ratings were sensitive to performance differences among the institutions. These analyses were designed to produce descriptive performance profiles for each of the sample institutions.

The second questionnaire was analyzed using three separate procedures. First, multiple regressions were run for each of the seven constituency groups across all institutions to determine if the groups held different preference profiles relative to effectiveness. This was followed by separate regressions being run for the seven constituencies in each of their own individual institutions. By regressing the levels of the dimensions of effectiveness on the overall judgments given by the respondents, a preference profile was identified. That is, the dimensions of effectiveness that were most important to the various constituencies in judging effectiveness (i.e., the most preferred criteria) were specified. Examining the R^2 for the regression equations also allowed for determining to what extent these criteria (nine dimensions) accounted for a large portion of the variance in judgments. Small R^2's indicated that criteria other than the nine dimensions were important in accounting for the effectiveness judgments of these constituencies.

The second analytic procedure was aimed at determining whether individuals within the various constituency groups held similar preferences for effectiveness or not. The purpose was to determine if these respondents could be treated as members of separate constituencies or if they would have to be treated as individuals. If group members did not hold similar preference profiles, the multiple constituencies model

could not be tested with these data because constituencies could not be treated as identifiable groups. Reliability analyses were conducted, therefore, to determine the internal consistency of the preferences of the seven groups, and MANOVA was performed to determine if the groups differed significantly from one another.

The third analysis of this questionnaire was a comparison of the preference profiles of the seven major constituencies with the performance profiles of the institutions. Because constituency preference profiles are in the form of beta weights and organizational performance profiles are in the form of mean ratings, however, direct comparison was impossible. Therefore, a rank ordering was calculated for the dimensions of effectiveness that were most preferred by the different constituencies as well as for the dimensions on which the institutions scored highest on the first questionnaire. Rank order (nonparametric) correlations were then computed to determine the extent to which institutional performance profiles matched the preference profiles of the different constituencies. Since the multiple constituency definition of effectiveness indicates that effective organizations satisfy strategic constituencies, this analysis permits the identification of which of the constituencies are most satisfied (i.e., which constituencies' preferences are most closely matched by institutional performance), as well as the identification of the extent to which <u>any</u> of the constituencies are satisfied (i.e., does the multiple constituencies definition make sense for these institutions?). A rating of the relative power and importance of the various constituency groups on the questionnaire allowed for a determination of whether the most powerful, least powerful, internal,

external, or other constituencies are most satisfied by the organizations' performance.

Comparing institutional scores on the nine dimensions of effectiveness with the preference profiles of the different constituencies is justified because the data provided by the respondents on the first questionnaire (descriptions) is qualitatively different from data provided on the second questionnaire (values or preferences). Respondents described the characteristics of their own organization on the first questionnaire. On the second questionnaire they specified which of the dimensions of effectiveness they most preferred.

RESULTS

Questionnaire 1

The same nine dimensions of effectiveness emerged from this study as have emerged in past research. Internal consistency reliabilities for these dimensions ranged from .72 to .92 with a mean reliability coefficient of .82. Factor analysis (orthogonal rotation) of the 57 questionnaire items also resulted in the dimensions loading on their own factors.[1] Average intercorrelation among the nine dimensions was .42 indicating that, whereas the dimensions are conceptually distinct, certain of the dimensions do vary together in ratings of effectiveness (see Cameron [1981] for an analysis of the interdimensional covariance). These results indicated that the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness have adequate internal consistency reliability and discriminant validity to be used as the basis for the institutional performance profiles. An examination of the mean scores of each of the 29 institutions across the

[1]Results of the factor analyses are not described here in detail in order to conserve space, but they are available from the author.

nine dimensions showed that each school had a unique profile of effectiveness scores, and no school scored high (or low) on all the dimensions of effectiveness.

When the ratings of each of the seven constituencies were analyzed by means of MANOVA and ANOVA, it was found that some significant differences were present among these groups in their ratings of the nine dimensions. Table 2 presents the results of these analyses where both institutional and group membership effects were investigated. Significant effects were found on all dimensions for the institution factor (indicating that the institution being rated made a difference in the ratings obtained).

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Percent of variance accounted for by institution ranged from .16 to .49 (mean R^2 = .32) indicating that this was a powerful factor in determining the ratings that were given. Of the total variance accounted for by the two factors in the ANOVA models, the institution factor accounted for an average of 70 percent of the variance.

Significant effects also were found on six of the nine dimensions for the group membership factor. The percent of variance accounted for by group membership, however, ranged from .00 to .04 percent (with an average of .015 percent), indicating that it was not a very important factor in the ratings given to the institutions. What was more important for the testing of the multiple constituencies model is that the differences among the groups of constituencies were not large enough to affect the rank orderings of the dimensions. That is, when the dimensions of effectiveness were rank ordered for each of the seven constituencies based on their ratings of these institutions, all constituency ratings held the

Table 2 The Effects of Institution and Constituency Group Membership on Ratings of Organizational Effectiveness

MANOVA	Institution		Group		Interaction	
	d.f.	F	d.f.	F	d.f.	F
	252,6396	6.91*	45,3730	2.47*	1188,6690	1.06

Dimension of Effectiveness***	Total R^2	Institution F	Institution R^2	Group F	Group R^2	Interaction F	Interaction R^2
1	.52	14.63*	.42	5.13*	.02	1.01	.08
2	.56	18.57*	.45	6.81*	.02	1.07	.09
3	.45	8.57*	.30	0.91	.00	1.23	.15
4	.38	7.31*	.24	0.61	.00	1.16	.14
5	.41	7.51*	.28	4.15*	.02	1.09	.11
6	.48	11.59*	.37	0.45	.00	1.15	.11
7	.31	4.73*	.16	3.53**	.02	1.01	.13
8	.58	19.46*	.49	6.74*	.02	1.09	.07
9	.38	6.17*	.21	7.89*	.04	1.12	.13

* $P < .001$
** $p < .01$
*** Numbers of dimensions of effectiveness are the same as those in Table 1.

same rank order. This makes it possible to use a rank ordering method in comparing institutional performance profiles with constituency preference profiles.

The MANOVA results confirmed that, across all nine dimensions combined, both institution and group membership effects are significant in influencing ratings of effectiveness. No signif'cant interaction effect occurred between these two factors on any single dimension (ANOVAS), or when considering all dimensions together (MANOVA), however, indicating that institution and group memberships influenced ratings of effectiveness independently.

These two analytic procedures--psychometric tests of the nine dimensions of effectiveness, and MANOVA and ANOVAs of the different constituency ratings--revealed, first, that institutions score uniquely on nine dimensions of effectiveness, and second, that different constituency groups rate effectiveness differently, but that these differences do not affect institutional performance profiles (i.e., rank orderings of the nine dimensions are identical). These performance profiles for the institutions can now be used in comparison with the preferences of the various constituency groups in investigating the multiple constituencies model of effectiveness. That model suggests that different constituencies hold different sets of preferences for the organization, and when organizational performance matches those preferences, the organization is said to be performing effectively. If organizational performance differs from a constituency's perferences, ineffective performance is a more likely outcome. The investigation of this phenomenon is the aim of the analyses of the second questionnaire.

Questionnaire 2

Preference profiles were obtained for each of the constituency groups by means of a "policy capturing" or "judgment analysis" methodology. Again, this methodology regresses the different levels of the various criteria used in the judgment task (independent variables) on the judgments or ratings given by the individual (dependent variables), which produces a regression equation that weights each of the different criteria in terms of its importance or value in the respondent's judgments.

In this analysis, the judgment criteria were the nine dimensions of effectiveness presented at different levels of performance (e.g., low, medium, high). Individuals rated the effectiveness of institutions holding different profiles of performance on those nine dimensions. Table 3 reports the results of the analyses where the preference profile of each constituency is presented in rank order form (i.e., the dimension most valued by the constituency is listed at the top; the least valued dimension is listed at the bottom).

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The table shows that, by and large, the constituency groups differed in the extent to which they valued the various criteria of effectiveness. The General Administrator group (e.g., Presidents) and the Board of Trustees member group, however, had identical rank orderings, as did the Academic Administrators (e.g., Provosts) and the Academic Department Heads groups. The other groups differed somewhat more in their profiles, as indicated by the rank order correlations among the seven group profiles. They ranged from .36 to 1.0. All constituencies held the four dimensions composed of student development criteria to be of higher importance than

TABLE 3 Preference Profiles for Seven Constituency Groups in the Form of Rank Orders of Nine Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness

General Administrators		Academic Administrators		Financial Administrators		Student Affairs Administrators	
Dimension	Beta*	Dimension	Beta	Dimension	Beta	Dimension	Beta
1***	.497	2	.568	1	.530	2	.536
2	.475	1	.472	2	.522	3	.472
3	.373	6	.394	3	.424	9	.409
6	.371	3	.384	5	.341	4	.405
4	.343	4	.289	4	.307	6	.301
5	.276	5	.278	6	.285	1	.271
8	.216	8	.198	8	.200	5	.166
9	.125	9	.097	7	.121	8	.104
7	.117	7	.079	9	.093	7	.016
$F = 30.31^{**}$		$F = 35.88^{**}$		$F = 44.14^{**}$		$F = 35.79^{**}$	
$R^2 = .87$		$R^2 = .89$		$R^2 = .91$		$R^2 = .89$	

Faculty Department Heads		Board of Trustee Members		Major Funders	
Dimension	Beta	Dimension	Beta	Dimension	Beta
2	.565	1	.521	3	.561
1	.459	2	.495	4	.477
6	.411	3	.424	2	.396
3	.406	6	.357	1	.317
4	.309	4	.348	6	.284
5	.249	5	.254	5	.240
8	.190	8	.185	8	.166
9	.118	9	.086	9	.013
7	.065	7	.079	7	.006
$F = 37.65^{**}$		$F = 35.29^{**}$		$F = 14.06^{**}$	
$R^2 = .89$		$R^2 = .89$		$R^2 = .76$	

* Betas > .12, $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

*** Dimension numbers refer to the dimensions listed in Table 1.

the dimensions comprising more organizationally related criteria (i.e., Organizational Health, or System Openness and Community Interaction). Which student dimension was held as most important, however, differed among groups (for example, General Administrators valued [1] Student educational satisfaction most highly, Academic Administrators valued [2] Student academic development most highly). In general, this analysis shows that there are five major preference profiles held by these seven groups. The high R^2 statistics for each group (ranging from .79 to .91) indicates that the nine dimensions of effectiveness used as criteria for judgment account for the large majority of the variance in these groups' preferences regarding effectiveness.

The identification of different preference profiles among these major constituencies led to the question, to what extent do individuals within the various constituency groups hold similar preference profiles? Are the differences in preference profiles due to group differences, or do preferences vary randomly among individuals? Can individuals be treated as members of constituencies, or must they be analyzed individually? Reliability analyses were conducted on the preference profiles of each of these constituency groups to determine the internal consistency of each group. Judgments of effectiveness for the 25 separate cases served as data for the analyses. Table 4 indicates that the internal consistency reliability coefficients are high for each group, and the MANOVA indicates that significant differences exist among the groups in the preference profiles.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

(Unfortunately, follow-up contrasts between groups is not possible with

Table 4 Internal Consistency and Discriminant Validity of the Preference Profiles of Seven Different Constituency Groups

CONSTITUENCY	Alpha Value
General Administrators	.82
Academic Administrators	.86
Financial Administrators	.78
Student Affairs Administrators	.85
Faculty Department Heads	.87
Board of Trustee Members	.91
Major Funders	.81

MANOVA Source	d.f.	F Value	Significance
Constituency Group Membership	150,2350	2.18	.0001

multiple dependent variables. However, in 18 of the 25 cases being rated by the different constituencies, group membership had a significant effect on the judgments.) These results suggest that treating these constituency groups as separate entities in the remainder of the analyses is entirely appropriate. The different groups hold unique preference profiles compared to one another, yet the individuals within each group hold similar profiles.

The third and most important analysis for testing the multiple constituencies model of effectiveness is one where comparisons were made between the actual performance profiles of the 29 institutions and the preference profiles of the seven constituency groups in each school. This was done after rank ordering the dimensions on which the institutions performed, highest to lowest, and rank orderings the dimensions that each constituency most preferred, from highest to lowest. Rank order correlations were then computed for each of the 29 institutions comparing their individual performance profiles to the preference profiles of the seven constituencies within each institution. Table 5 presents the results of these correlations.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

When all members of a particular constituency group failed to judge the effectiveness of all 25 cases, that group was dropped from the analysis. That is, the preference profiles of only those groups in each institution that judged all 25 cases were included in this part of the analysis.

In order to conclude that an institution's performance profile matched a constituency's preference profile, some decision had to be made

Table 5 Rank Order Correlations Between Performance Profiles of 29 Institutions and the Preference Profiles of 6 Constituency Groups Within Each Institution

School Number	General Admin.	Academic Admin.	Financial Admin.	St. Affai s Admin.	Dept. Head	Trustees	Funders
1			.000	.383	-.450	-.233	.200
2	.350	-.033	-.017	-.067	.383	.151	.233
3	-.603	-.046	.226	-.209	.000		
4	.450	-.333	.033	.400	.217	-.517	.350
5	-.050	.483	.150	.383	-.133	-.217	.533
6	-.083	-.533	.067	-.083	-.183	-.083	-.067
7	.250	-.183	.250	.517	.233	.483	
8	-.050	.483	.150	.383	-.133	-.217	.533
9	.733	.667	.283	.633	.567		.017
10	-.084	.167	.300	.250	.283		.300
11	.417	.550		.650	.183		-.067
12	.050	.183	.050	-.267	.100	-.200	.283
13	.250	.583	.417	.150	.067	.033	.243
14	.352	.084	-.117	.134	.092	.210	.059
15	-.467	-.100	-.233	.283	-.050	.350	.000
16	-.083	.067	-.050	.033	.317	.017	
17	.533	.317	.117	.000	.133	.233	.267
18	.150	.383	.517	-.267	.100		
19	-.017	.033	.267	-.033	.217	-.200	
20	-.267	.167	.100	.017	-.250	.383	
21	.017	-.033	.250	-.017	-.100	.100	
22	.033	.467	.033	.517	.267	.017	.417
23	.033	.467	.033	.517	.267	.017	.417
24	.634	.600	.317	.100	.550		
25	.150	.167	-.283	.167	.183	-.083	.017
26	-.033	-.300	.267	-.150	.183	-.116	
27	.150	.217	.250	.460	-.050	.500	
28	.150	-.033	.600	.550	.567	.417	.500
29	.500	.517		.717	-.183		.300

regarding the magnitude of the correlation coefficient to be accepted. A coefficient of .4 was used because its statistical significance was $p<.1$. (Because of a small number of cases [i.e., N=9], correlations of $r<.6$ were needed to reach the .05 level, and only six of the 192 correlations in Table 5 reached that level.) Moreover, the .4 level appeared to be the dividing line between high and low correlations.

Two major findings relative to the multiple constituencies model of effectiveness emerged from these analyses. First, some schools tended to satisfy multiple constituency preferences while other schools satisfied no constituencies. That is, correlations between the performance profiles of some schools and the preference profiles of several of their constituency groups were high, but for other schools the correlations were low or negative for all groups. To find out which schools tended to satisfy multiple constituencies and which did not, an overall score across all nine dimensions of performance effectiveness was computed for each school. This represented a summary (mean) performance rating for each institution. A comparison between the fourteen schools that satisfied no constituencies and the seven schools that satisfied multiple (three or more) constituencies revealed an interesting finding. The schools that satisfied multiple constituencies all were in the top half of the total sample in their overall performance effectiveness, while those schools that satisfied no constituencies all were in the lower half of the sample in overall performance. A comparison of the mean performance score of the satisfier schools versus the nonsatisfier schools resulted in a significant performance difference at the $p<.05$ level. That is, schools that satisfied multiple constituencies performed at significantly higher levels on the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness than did

schools that satisfied no constituencies. Moreover, in comparing the top ten schools in performance effectiveness with the bottom ten schools, nine of those schools satisfied multiple constituencies while eight of the schools in the bottom ten satisfied no constituencies. The implication is that high performance schools satisfied multiple constituencies; low performing schools satisfied no constituencies.

The second major finding referred to the constituencies that were most satisfied by the institution's performance (i.e., the second major research question). In Table 6, the total number of high positive correlations are recorded between the seven constituency groups' preference profiles and their own institution's performance

---

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

---

profile. This table suggests that the groups most likely to be satisfied are Academic and Student Affairs Administrators, followed by General Administrators (each of which are internal groups). The external constituency groups (i.e., Truestees and Major Funders) as well as Faculty Department Heads were less likely to be satisfied by institutional performance profiles. This result held even when dropping out those institutions that had one or more constituencies missing from the analysis.

Given this difference in the extent to which different constituencies were satisfied by institutional performance, the third research question became particularly relevant. That question, which of the constituencies tended to be most satisfied--the most powerful, the least advantaged, internal groups, external groups, or others--followed directly from the Table 6 results. On the first questionnaire (i.e., the questionnaire that

Table 6 Total Number of High Positive Correlations Between a Constituency Group's Preference Profile and Their Institution's Performance Profile

Constituency	Total Number of High Positive Correlations
General Administrators	6
Academic Administrators	9
Financial Administrators	3
Student Affairs Administrators	9
Faculty Department Heads	3
Trustees	3
Major Funders	5

produced descriptions of effective organizational characteristics), a rating was produced for the relative power and influence of nine major constituencies as they affected institutional performance. Unfortunately, those groups do not match exactly the seven constituency groups used on the second questionnaire, but there is enough overlap to provide an answer to this third research question. The constituencies that were rated on the first questionnaire according to their relative power are listed in Table 7 along with their mean ratings (on a 1 to 7 scale) and rank orderings.

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

Note that Top Administrators is a category that comprises four of the constituencies used in producing preference profiles, namely General, Adademic, Financial, and Student Affairs Administrators. When comparing the rank orderings of the constituencies used in both questionnaires on the basis of their relative power and the extent to which they are satisfied by institutional performance, it becomes evident that the most powerful constituencies are the most likely to be satisfied by institutional performance effectiveness. In this case, Top Administrators are both the most powerful and the most likely to be satisfied. Major Funders, on the other hand, are next most likely to be satisfied even though they are rated as the least powerful of all the nine constituencies. Faculty and Trustees are both less satisfied and less powerful than are Administrators, but they are more powerful than Major Funders while being less satisfied. Therefore, in terms of research question 3, these data suggest that both the most powerful and the least powerful constituencies tend to be satisfied most often. Major funders

Table 7 Ratings of Relative Power and Influence of Different Constituencies Compared to the Preference Satisfaction of Those Groups

CONSTITUENCY ON QUESTIONNAIRE 1	MEAN RATING OF RELATIVE POWER	RANK ORDER OF RELATIVE POWER	CONSTITUENCY ON QUESTIONNAIRE 2	RANK ORDER OF PREFERENCE SATISFACTION
Top Administrators	6.020	1	Academic Administrators Student Affairs Administrators General Administrators	1
Faculty	5.391	2	Faculty Department Heads	3*
Trustees	5.070	3	Trustees	3*
Students	4.538	4		
Accreditation Teams	4.244	5		
State Legislature	3.652	6		
Alumni	3.518	7		
Federal Government	3.309	8		
Major Funders	3.196	9	Major Funders	2

* Equal number of high positive correlations.

are not satisfied as often as are the top administrator groups, but they are satisfied more than other groups rated as being more powerful.

One reason for this result might be the surprisingly low power rating given to Major Funders. Often the importance and power of this constituency is rated as very high (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), so the discrepancy in the power-satisfaction result might be due to confusion in these power ratings. It also is possible, of course, that organizations pay attention, as Keeley (1978) suggested, to the least powerful or least advantaged constituency in mapping out their performance.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has been the first attempt to investigate empirically the multiple constituencies model of organizational effectiveness. Up to now the model has been a product only of proposed theories (e.g., Connolly, et al., 1980; Keeley, 1978; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Zammuto, 1982), and not of empirical results. Because more and more authors are beginning to discuss the multiple constituencies model when they consider effectiveness, it is important that some investigations be made of its validity. Cameron and Whetten (1983) pointed out that the multiple constituencies model is not necessarily the best nor the most legitimate model of effectiveness available because no <u>one</u> model can possibly be appropriate in all circumstances, for all organizational types, for all purposes, on all levels of analysis, and so forth. A variety of models and definitions of organizational effectiveness are needed so that the most appropriate model can be found for different conditions. Under some circumstances, for example, the goal model may clearly be the most useful. Under others, the system resource, internal processes, or Competing Values

models (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1982) may be best. In still others, the multiple constituencies model may be the appropriate model for defining and assessing effectiveness. But no one model is universally appropriate, and critical investigation is needed in order for the appropriateness of any of these models to be justified. Investigating the validity of the multiple constituencies model has been the major purpose underlying this study.

To test the multiple constituencies model, two separate steps were required. First, a performance profile had to be obtained for individual organizations, and second, a preference profile for different constituencies of those organizations had to be generated. The performance profile and the preference profiles had to be based on the same criteria of effectiveness so comparisons among profiles could be made.

Performance and preference profiles in this study were based on the nine dimensions of effectiveness found by Cameron (1878) to be indicative of organizational effectiveness. Each of 29 institutions were found to hold unique performance profiles based on these dimensions, and five unique preference profiles were found among seven major constituencies. Comparisons of the performance profiles for each institution with the preference profiles of each of its seven constituencies revealed that some institutions satisfied multiple constituencies whereas others didn't, and some constituencies tended to be satisfied more often than others.

Three major conclusions can be reached from these results regarding the multiple constituencies model of effectiveness. First, <u>the most effective organizations tend to satisfy multiple constituencies, whereas the least effective organizations tend to satisfy no constituencies.</u> No

causal relationships are identifiable in these data, of course, but it does appear that a relationship between constituency satisfaction and effectiveness is present. Institutions that possess characteristics of effective performance tend to be those that perform in ways that are consistent with constituency preferences. Several of the advocates of the mutliple constituencies model of effectiveness have suggested that organizational outcomes must be satisfying to constituencies in order for the constituencies to judge the organization as effective. In this research the extent to which organizations produced satisfying outcomes was not assessed, and instead the possession of characteristics indicative of effectiveness was the focus. This study emphasized the nature of the organization and its performance rather than the legitimacy of its outcomes. This difference is pointed out because, whereas these results provide support for the multiple constituencies model, they do not provide conclusive proof, nor are they comprehensive in their test of the model.

Another caution relative to this conclusion also should be made clear. In no institution was any one constituency completely satisfied. That is, a correlation of 1.0 was not produced by any preference-performance comparison. No correlation coefficients were over .72, in fact, and only one reached that level. In all, relatively few constituencies were satisfied in any one institution. One school's performance was correlated highly with five of the seven constituencies' preferences, one other school's performance was correlated highly with four of the seven constituencies' preferences, but the remainder of the 27 schools satisfied three or fewer constituencies. Almost half of the schools satisfied no major constituency at all. Therefore, whereas it appears that effective organizational performance and constituency

satisfaction are related, there still needs to be further evidence produced before this conclusion is a firm one.

A second general conclusion is, some organizations are highly effective even when they satisfy no major constituencies. This statement points out the exception to the rule asserted in conclusion 1. That is, some organizations possess characteristics of highly effective performance even though constituency preferences are not consistent with that performance. Cameron (1980) pointed out examples of this condition among liberal arts colleges and churches, and this study uncovered another example. One school in this sample (school #21) was third highest in overall effectiveness (i.e., in its mean on the nine dimensions combined), and highest in the sample on two of the nine individual dimensions of effectiveness. Yet, the correlations between its performance profile and the preference profiles of its constituencies ranged from .25 to -.10, with a mean correlation of .04. A special sense of mission or a secure resource base may make this condition possible (Clark, 1970), so that the institution can operate consistently in spite of contrary demands. On the other hand, this imbalance in preferences and performance may be only a temporary condition that may not last indefinitely. Constituency preferences may eventually change to be more consistent with organizational performance, or the performance profile may change to match constituency preferences. Cameron and Whetten (1981) found empirical evidence for the former phenomenon in one study of organizational life cycles, and Quinn and Cameron (1983) found evidence for the latter phenomenon in another life cycle study. Because the current study used only cross sectional data, no evidence is available to determine if an incompatibility between organizational performance and constituency

preferences can exist over the long term, so this conclusion presents an important question for which additional research is needed.

The third conclusion is that the most powerful constituencies are, by and large, the most frequently satisfied by an organization's performance. This study's findings tend to support the arguments of Pennings and Goodman (1977) and Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) that groups that wield the most power, or that are the most important in their potential impact on effective organizational performance, are the most likely to be satisfied by an organization. According to these authors, organizations seek to satisfy the preferences of these powerful groups first in order to guarantee long term organizational survival. By implication, these powerful constituencies also are the most appropriate groups to assess an organization's effectiveness.

In contrast, Keeley (1978) argued for the least advantaged or the least powerful constituencies as being the focus of effective organizational performance. His notion is based on a social justice ethic (Rawls, 1971) where organizations are viewed as trying to minimize the regret of low power constituencies. Some support, although limited, is provided by these data for this point of view as well. The least powerful constituency, as rated by the 1240 respondents, was the Major Funder constituency. This group was the second most satisfied constituency, following the three major top administrator groups that were all subsumed by the Top Administrator category. Preferences of Major Funders appeared to be more compatible with institutional performance more often than were the preferences of several other more powerful groups. On the other hand, relatively few institutions satisfied this constituency group compared to the total number of institutions in the sample, so it is not clear to what

extent least advantaged constituency preferences are critical factors in organizational performance. In general, more support was available for the most-powerful-constituency viewpoint than for the least-powerful-constituency viewpoint, although the results do are not unequivocal. Additional research is needed to address this issue.

Suggestions for Future Research

The exploratory nature of this study does not permit conclusive answers to the issues surrounding the multiple constituencies model of effectiveness. Some supportive evidence has been found, but a number of weaknesses of this study, as well as a number of inconclusive findings create the need for more empirical research using this definition of organizational effectiveness. For example, a broader array of constituency groups would provide a more clear perspective of the extent to which organizations satisfy multiple constituencies. The constituencies assessed by Friedlander and Pickle (1968) in their study using the system resource model of effectiveness, for example, while fewer than the number of constituencies used in this study, represent a more diverse array. Such diversity would be an improvement in multiple constituencies investigations.

In addition, objective or secondary indicators of organizational performance also would help broaden our understanding of the validity and applicability of the mutiipie constituencies model. The performance assessment used in this study consisted of descriptions of organizational characteristics indicative of effective performance. Perceptual bias is always of concern in such assessments, even though the instrument used was designed specifically to guard against it, and the questionnaire's results have been found to correlate positively with more objective indicators of

effectiveness. Even so, objective indicators of organizational performance would eliminate the concern about the potential of a perception-perception bias. Obtaining indicators of effective organizational outcomes also would be useful inasmuch as several multiple constituency authors focus on the acceptability of outcomes as the major indicator of effectiveness.

Another suggestion for future research is to broaden the organizational sample used. This study was limited to a sample of institutions of higher education, and the apporopriateness of the multiple constituencies model may vary depending on the type of organization being assessed. It is conceivable, for example, that in private sector organzations involved in marketing consumer goods, the model would be more appropriate than in a governmental regulatory agency. Again, more diversity in research settings would enhance our understanding of the model.

Finally, combining into one study a comparison of different models of effectiveness would begin to bring about a cumulative literature on effectiveness as well as to begin to map out the conditions under which different models of effectiveness are most appropriate. Since the appropriateness of a definition of effectiveness for an organization depends on such a variety of factors (i.e., purpose, domain, time frame, referent, and so on; see Cameron [1980], Cameron & Whetten [1983], and Goodman, Atkin, & Schoorman, 1983]), an investigation of which model is most appropriate in various conditions is a critical need at present. The non-cumulative and confusing state of the effectiveness literature to date has resulted from authors claiming that their own model is universally applicable, and the only one that should be used. Research that helps

identify when one model is more valid than another would help resolve many of the conflicts among various points of view and lead to a substantially enhanced understanding of the construct of effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C., and Schon, D. Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Bluedorn, A. C. Cutting the gordian knot: A critique of the effectiveness tradition in organization research. Sociology and Social Research, 1980, 64, 477-496.

Bougon, M.; Weick, K.; and Binkhorst, D. Cognition in organizations: An analysis of the Utrecht Jazz Orchestra. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1977, 22, 606-639.

Cameron, K. S. Critical questions in assessing organizational effectiveness. Organizational Dynamics, 1980, 9, 66-80.

Cameron, K. S. Domains of organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities. Academy of Management Journal, 1981, 24, 25-47.

Cameron, K. S. The effectiveness of ineffectiveness. In Barry Staw and Larry Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior. Vol. 6, Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1983.

Cameron, K. S. Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1978, 23, 604-632.

Cameron, K. S., and Whetten, D. A. Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. New York: Academic Press, 1983.

Cameron, K. S., and Whetten, D. A. Perceptions of organization effectiveness across organizational life cycles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26, 525-544.

Campbell, J. On the nature of organizational effectiveness. In P. S. Goodman and J. M. Pennings (Eds.), New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Clark, B. R. The distinctive college. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

Connolly, T., Conlon, E. M., and Deutsch, S. J. Organizational effectiveness: A multiple constituency approach. Academy of Management Review, 1980, 5, 211-218.

Dubin, R. Organizational effectiveness: Some dilemmas of perspective. Organization and Administrative Sciences, 1976, 7, 7-14.

Etzioni, A. A comparative analysis of complex organizations. Revised Edition. New York: Free Press, 1975.

Friedlander, F., and Pickle, H. Components of effectiveness in small organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1968, 13, 289-304.

Goodman, P. S.; Atkin, R. S.; and Schoorman, D. On the demise of organizational effectiveness. In K. S. Cameron and D. A. Whetten (Eds.), Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. New York: Academic Press, 1983.

Hall, R. H. Effectiveness theory and organizational effectiveness. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1980, 16, 536-545.

Hammond, K. R.; Klitz, J. K.; and Cook, R. L. How systems analysts can provide more effective assistance to the policy maker. Journal of Applied Systems Analysis, 1978, 5, 111-136.

Hammond, K. R.; McClelland, G. H.; and Mumpower, J. Human judgment and decision making: Theories, methods, and procedures. New York: Praeger, 1980.

Hammond, K. R.; Rohrbaugh, J.; Mumpower, J.; and Adelman, L. Social judgment theory: Applications in policy formation. In M. Kaplan and S. Schwartz (Eds.), Human Judgment and Decision Processes: Applications in Problem Settings, New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Hitt, Michael A., and Middlemiss, R. Dennis. A methodology to develop the criteria weightings for assessing subunit effectiveness in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 356-374.

Hoffman, P. The paramorphic representation of clinical judgment. Psychological Bulletin, 1960, 47, 116-131.

Katz, D., and Kahn, R. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley, 1978.

Keeley, M. A social justice approach to organizational evaluation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1978, 22, 272-292.

Kirchoff, B. A. Organizational effectiveness measurement and policy research. Academy of Management Review, 1977, 1, 347-355.

Miles, R. H. Macro organizational behavior. Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear, 1980.

Miles, R. H., and Cameron, K. S. Coffin nails and corporate strategies. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Miles, R., and Snow, C. Organizational strategy, structure, and process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Miller, D., and Friesen, P. H. Momentum and revolution in organizational adaptation. Academy of Management Journal, 1980, 23, 591-614.

Molnar, J. J., and Rogers, D. C. Organizational effectiveness: On empirical comparison of the goal and system resource approach. Sociological Quarterly, 1976, 17, 401-413.

Nisbet, R. E., and Wilson, T. Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. Psychological Review, 1977, 134, 231-259.

Pennings, J. M., and Goodman, P. S. Toward a workable framework. In P. S. Goodman and J. M. Pennings (Eds.), New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Pfeffer, J., and Salancik, G. R. The external control of organizations. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Price, J. L. The study of organizational effectiveness. Sociological Quarterly, 1972, 13, 3-15.

Quinn, R. E., and Cameron, K. S. Life cycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness: Some preliminary evidence. Management Science, 1982, 27.

Quinn, R. E., and Rohrbaugh, J. A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational effectiveness. Management Science, 1983.

Rawls, J. A theory of justice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Rohrbaugh, J. Operationalizing the competing values approach. Public Productivity Review, 1981, 5, 141-159.

Scott, W. R. Effectiveness of organizational effectiveness studies. In P. S. Goodman and J. M. Pennings (Eds.), New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Seashore, S. E., and Yuchtman, E. Factorial analysis of organizational performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1967, 12, 377-395.

Slovic, P., and Lichtenstein, S. Comparison of Bayesian and regression approaches to the study of information processing in judgment. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1971, 6, 649-744.

Slovic, P. Analyzing the expert judge: A descriptive study of a stockbrokers decision processes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 255-263.

Slovic, P.; Fischhoff, B.; and Lichtenstein, S. Behavioral decision theory. In M. R. Rosenzweig and L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology, Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1977.

Steers, R. M. Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view. Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear, 1977.

Van de Ven, A. H., and Ferry, D. Measuring and assessing organizations. New York: Wiley, 1980.

Whetten, D. A. Coping with incompatible expectations: An integrated view of role conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1978, 23, 254-271.

Yuchtman, E., and Seashore, S. E. A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 891-903.

Zammuto, R. F. Assessing organizational effectiveness: Systems change, adaptation, and strategy. Albany, NY: SUNY Albany Press, 1982.