

*Bowers Replies: Methodology and Subjects*

I appreciate the thought and care which Pasmore obviously has put into reviewing my 1973 *JABS* article. As you can imagine, I agree with some of his criticisms and disagree with others. Let me be more specific:

1. I heartily agree that the article would have been greatly strengthened by the presence of "hard" (criterion/performance) data. In many instances our files do contain such data; we have, until recently, been unsuccessful in obtaining the funding necessary to handle, refine, transform, and analyze them. As part of a new effort just beginning, it appears that this will indeed be possible.
2. I agree that our "No Treatment" sites are not Controls in a pure sense of the word. Perhaps a better term would have been "No Treatment Beyond the Questionnaire." This semantic confusion probably occurs because of my use of the term "treatment" to refer to some form of intervention activity over and above simple data collection. Beyond this, your point is very likely valid: those whose views were solicited and not used may well have reacted negatively.
3. The gain score issue is not a simple one. Despite what seemingly are clear injunctions against their use, I continue to use them, principally because no other procedure seems to attain quite the same meaning. My feeling, quite honestly, is that some of the writers have confused the issue by insisting upon a *stability* definition of reliability. In any case, we have more recently worked with *regressed* gain scores, with results that elaborate and refine what appears in the 1973 article. Hopefully, this will be published soon.
4. I agree that truly random assignment of change agents would be a methodological improvement. I'm afraid that it is simply not feasible, especially if one (a) has knowledge to indicate potential interactive effects between change agent and nature of site and (b) maintains a stance of concern for the well-being of client units. Even the "No Treatment" condition here—to which the sites involved were quite amenable—strained my ethics a bit.
5. Whether organizations, groups, or individuals should be the analytic unit is a question which we could discuss for some time. Probably all three levels need to be dealt with. Change basically occurs in the behavior of individuals, yet the group is typically the treatment unit in OD interventions. Finally, unless effects combine to an emergent change at the whole-organization level, one can't truly say that *organization* development has occurred.

DAVID G. BOWERS  
*Program Director  
Center for Research on Utilization  
of Scientific Knowledge  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan*