

10.

## THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

### Collective Bargaining, Labor Law, and Labor History

*by Harry Katz*

A department with remarkable depth and breadth, the Collective Bargaining, Labor Law, and Labor History Department has an amazing history and personality. This brief overview focuses on four key features that have distinguished the department: the breadth of interests among the department's faculty; the close interaction between theoretical and practitioner pursuits in the department; the central role exercised by members of the department in the ILR School's administration; and the long and continuing strong presence of the school's founders in the life of the department.

The intellectual interests of the department's faculty span labor history, law and dispute resolution, collective bargaining, and international and comparative industrial relations. Perhaps most noteworthy are the depth and breadth of the faculty's interests across those fields. One illustration of that breadth comes from exploring the following question: What field is Maurice Neufeld in? Is he a historian of American industrial relations or an expert on Italian industrial relations? Similarly, the work of Jean McKelvey combines in an original way the subfields of labor law, dispute resolution, and collective bargaining. The list goes on. Walter Galenson made (and continues to make) contributions to the study of history *and* comparative industrial relations. Milton Konvitz contributed as much to scholarly thinking in philosophy as he did to law. And others such as Kurt Hanslowe, Jim Gross, and Katherine Stone provided and continue to provide linkages between the fields of law and industrial relations. Not only did our department's faculty build bridges across the department's subfields; they also linked to other departments within the ILR School as Tom Kochan did with his connections to organizational behavior and John Burton did and Larry Kahn does between collective bargaining and labor economics. Our faculty also stretch the boundaries of their own disciplines, as Gerd Korman and Nick Salvatore do through their extension of the field of labor history into social history. Sarosh Kuruvilla typifies the continuation of such breadth with his eclectic interests in comparative industrial relations, organizational behavior, and union life. With similar eclecticism Harry Katz's research examines employer strategies and human resource issues as well as union wage policies and the consequences of work restructuring for union roles.

Our department is also noteworthy in the close relationship it has fostered between resident and extension activities. When one reflects on the careers of our department's faculty, a sharp distinction between resident and extension boundaries does not make sense. The amazing careers of Alice Cook and George Brooks belie any such distinction. Lois Gray, Jean McKelvey, Bob Doherty, and Ron Donovan, all in their distinctive ways, also moved continuously between practitioner and research activities. The creation of the Institute of Collective Bargaining in the 1990s extends this interaction.

In numerous ways students benefitted from the boundary spanning between theory and practice found in our department. George Brooks dazzled students in the way he brought the world of union politics into the classroom. Who else could pack the house at 8:00 A.M. for so long? Through their many contacts with the practice of industrial relations, our department's faculty maintain a tradition of bringing real-world experiences and the actors who are shaping the world of work directly into the classroom. Fortunately, some of the most famous of those visits are preserved on film. You are not an official member of our department family unless you have seen the videotape of the interview with Jimmy Hoffa conducted by several faculty members, including Clete Daniels and Roger Keeran.

While our department's faculty pursued broad and deep careers, they also found the time and commitment to play a central role in the administration of the ILR School. Keep in mind that the last four deans of the school—McKersie, Rehmus, Doherty, and Lipsky—were based in the Collective Bargaining, Labor Law, and Labor History Department. The current and previous associate deans in charge of extension, Ron Seeber and Lois Gray, also have links to our department. Our faculty's service to the school includes the long and devoted leadership Don Cullen gave to the *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, a leadership that helped foster its place as the leading journal in the field of industrial relations.

One cannot reflect on the history of our department without being struck by the long and continuing role the school's founders play in the life of the department. Jean McKelvey, Maurice Neufeld, and Milton Konvitz provide inspiration and guidance to us all through their tireless energy and forceful visions. They did not just create the school; rather, they inspire us all through what they do, what they say, and what they are. It is a legacy that lives on.

## The Department of Economic and Social Statistics

*by Isadore Blumen*

Long before separate departments were established in the ILR School, J.E. "Pete" Morton was recruited by the school's original faculty to teach economic statistics. The year was 1946 and Morton had made his reputation in pre-war Europe with his work on the theory of index numbers.

Also in 1946 Philip J. McCarthy, who had studied at Princeton under one of the earliest of a developing group of distinguished American statistical theorists, S. S. Wilks, left there to come to Cornell's Sociology and Anthropology Department to work with Professor Stephan. Professor Stephan was then conducting a project for the Social Science Research Council to compare the merits of area and quota sampling.

When, a year later, Stephan himself left for Princeton and Louis Guttman, one of the country's leading quantitative sociologists, left Cornell for Israel, McCarthy accepted a temporary faculty post in the College of Arts and Sciences as a replacement. It was from here that Pete Morton recruited him to the ILR faculty in fall of 1948. One year later, Isadore Blumen, who was completing his Ph.D. at the University of North Carolina in one of the few existing statistics departments, was brought into the group.

As part of this group of three, McCarthy developed his theoretical interests and reputation in sampling, participating in the analysis of problems of the ill-fated public opinion polls in the 1948 presidential election, working with various task forces on sampling for consumer price indexes and other government matters, and writing an unusually well-received pamphlet on sampling for the school's publications program.

Meanwhile, Blumen worked on statistical theory and model building in the social studies. When the Social Security Administration sought researchers to analyze their one percent sample of enrollees, McCarthy and Blumen used the opportunity to develop a mathematical model new to social studies. Their resulting ILR Press publication on labor mobility (with M. Kogan) (1955) has long been widely cited in the social sciences.

In 1956 Pete Morton's focus on work with governmental agencies led him to resign from the faculty to spend full time there. Because the field was rapidly expanding at this time, the demand for qualified statisticians was unusually strong and it was difficult to find highly qualified young statisticians with strong theoretical qualifications who were also interested in applications. The department therefore relied on visitors and senior appointments to maintain adequate teaching levels. A changing intellectual environment made it possible later to develop a young and extraordinarily active group of successors to McCarthy and Blumen, who retired in 1988 and 1990, respectively.

The department is now able to offer a full range of teaching, both from the purely subject matter perspective and to serve other departments in the school and the social sciences across the university. It plays a major role in the Cornell Statistics Center, for example, of which it was among the principal founders. Its staff is active in consulting within the school and the university. And it has a substantial international reputation for the research activities of its faculty.

## Labor Economics and Income Security Department

*by Bob Aronson and Ron Ehrenberg*

From its beginnings in the early 1920s until the close of World War II, the developing academic field of industrial relations was primarily descriptive and at least implicitly, if not overtly, reformist in outlook. The courses offered and the textbooks employed were primarily economic, and the typical locus of the so-called labor problems courses was in a department of economics. There was no credentialed field of industrial or labor relations.

The economics that embraced these courses, however, was institutional economics, rather than classical and neo-classical economics. Thus, faculty in these courses paid limited attention to analysis, drawing instead on a variety of academic sources that included history, sociology, psychology, government, and law as well as economics to describe the content of, and to explore remedies for, labor issues. The analysis of wage-employment relationships at firm and industry levels was typically covered in so-called principles courses rather than in labor problems or labor economics courses. Specialists in other academic branches of economics often questioned whether those teaching in the field of labor problems were really economists.

For the undergraduate or graduate student major in labor economics before World War II, the offerings at most colleges and universities were usually limited to a handful of courses. These included a basic course that covered trade union history, labor relations law and collective bargaining, job and income security, and wage determination, perhaps a broad course on protective labor legislation and the social insurances, and, depending on faculty interest and availability, perhaps specialized courses in labor law or international and comparative labor relations. It would have been unusual at either undergraduate or graduate level to find courses devoted exclusively to wage-employment analysis or labor market economics, as it later became known. Courses in personnel administration and management, later to become part of the broader field of industrial relations, were available but they were usually taught elsewhere, not in economics departments.

This was the legacy from which ILR's Department of Labor Economics and Income Security developed, and diverged. In the 1940s, before the ILR School opened, Cornell's program in the labor field had followed the pattern just described. Broad undergraduate courses in labor problems, trade unionism, labor relations law, and the social insurances were part of the curriculum of the Department of Economics, taught then by Royal Montgomery, co-author of a three-volume, near-encyclopediaic work, *Economics of Labor* (1938-45). A specialized course devoted to wage determination was not available, except in one year, but graduate students had a graduate seminar in labor economics. Montgomery continued to teach that labor curriculum until at least 1956.

**The First 25 Years** From the first, the ILR School required its undergraduates to take a specialized course on wage-employment relationships and analysis. In 1945-46, this was in addition to requiring them to take a two-semester course in basic economics given in the College of Arts and Sciences. This one-semester course, ILR 21, was required in the spring semester of the sophomore year. Its catalog description indicates an emphasis on labor problems, including employment, old age, and industrial hazards, analyzed in light of the basic wage and employment theories, presumably covered in the prerequisite economics course. The undergraduates were also required to take a course in social security in their senior year.

ILR 21 was usually taught by Jean McKelvey, a Radcliffe-Harvard Ph.D. in Economics, during the first three years. Her reading lists, which preview the direction labor market economics was to take in later years, indicate that wage-price-productivity relationships, hours of work, income distribution, and the problem of full employment were to be addressed. By 1948-49, however, McKelvey was shifting her teaching and research interests into collective bargaining and labor-dispute settlement. In the fall of 1946, Pete Jensen, an economist whose Ph.D. was earned at the University of California, Berkeley, taught the course. Jensen's principal teaching and research interests were in labor history and collective bargaining.

Soon after that, Robert Ferguson, a Ph.D. in Economics from Cornell, and Arnold Tolles, a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, assumed responsibility for the course. Tolles had been Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics in the U.S. Department of Labor before returning to academic life at the close of the war. Under his and Ferguson's influence the basic labor economics course took on a stronger microeconomic orientation. No elective courses in labor market analysis were offered at the undergraduate level in the first five years, however.

Two factors may have been responsible for the later establishment of a specialized course in wage-employment analysis. It may be that the ILR School thought that as a professional program its undergraduates should have more intensive training in wage analysis than would have been available in a conventional labor economics course such as that taught in Cornell's College of Arts and Sciences. At any rate, more attention was generally given to labor market theory in the post-World War II period. Lloyd Reynolds at Yale and Richard Lester at Princeton, for example, had both recently produced textbooks that gave more space to economic analysis while questioning the applicability of neoclassical theory to labor issues, even though they were basically members of the so-called institutional labor economics group.

Still, for undergraduate instruction in wage-employment analysis in the late 1940s it was necessary to select chapters from such textbooks and to supplement them by assignments from journals and monographs. Specialized texts in the economics of the labor market were still to come.

The teaching of income and employment security followed a more traditional path in the school's first five years. As noted, undergraduates were required to take such a course in their senior year. For graduate students, two courses—covering protective labor legislation and social insurances—were offered, thereby making social security available as a major or minor. In 1948, John W. McConnell, who had joined the ILR faculty in 1945 to develop and teach courses in human relations in industry—the precursor of the field of Organizational Behavior—took up the task of teaching about the social insurances, pensions, and protective legislation growing out of events in the labor market.

Until 1960-61, labor economics and social security were separate fields of graduate instruction. Thus, during the early 1950s, graduate students majoring in either labor economics or social security and protective legislation had two courses available in addition to whatever their particular committee might require. For labor economics majors those courses covered unemployment and wage determination.

By 1948 ILR required its undergraduate students to take several courses with economic content. One was the basic labor economics course. A second was a course in the development of economic institutions with a strong comparative dimension, which was taught by Gardner Clark, a Harvard Ph.D. in economics. Originally titled ILR 1, this was the precursor of Gardner's very popular freshman course. A third requirement was a course in business and industrial history taught by Bob Ferguson, which emphasized differences in product markets and technology. Other courses—accounting, business organization and management, and corporate finance—were also required, but they were not necessarily taught by faculty identified as labor economists or specialists in social insurance (although some of them actually were).

Academic years 1950-52 might be regarded justifiably as a watershed in the development of labor economics at the school, though departmentalization and merger with the social security field was still ten years away. Those two years saw the appointment of additional faculty trained in economics and the social insurances, changes in the labor economics curriculum including the introduction of undergraduate electives, and the establishment of advanced graduate courses and seminars.

Duncan MacIntyre, having completed his doctorate in public administration at Cornell, joined Jack McConnell in teaching the courses on social insurance, protective legislation, and private benefit plans. Robert Raimon, one of the school's first Ph.D. students in labor economics, joined the faculty in the fall of 1951. Robert Aronson came from Princeton with a research appointment to complete a plant shutdown study begun by the school's director of research, Leonard Adams, a pre-World War II Cornell Ph.D. in Economics with broad experience in government and a strong public policy orientation.

Largely on the initiative of the faculty, the economic content in the undergraduate curriculum increased. Bob Raimon introduced a course on the corporation and increased the emphasis on labor market theory in the basic

required course. Gardner Clark's required economic history course was extended to two semesters in the freshman year. Protective labor legislation became required in the junior year, and three undergraduate elective courses were offered: wage structures, wage trends, and health, welfare and pension plans. Fred Slavick's appointment a couple of years later added courses on the principles of insurance and strengthened the protective legislation and social welfare areas.

At the graduate level, the professional, MILR degree required the basic undergraduate courses, appropriately renumbered, in both subjects. Thesis degrees required a two-semester graduate seminar in labor market economics and seminars in protective labor legislation and current issues in social security. These developments essentially set the pattern of instruction for the two separate areas for the indefinite future, except for a few later changes in the undergraduate curriculum.

The merger into a single department, Labor Economics and Income Security, in 1960-61 made little change in the basic undergraduate and graduate curricula. Graduate students with thesis majors were expected to be knowledgeable in both subjects rather than one. But most other changes in course offerings after departmentalization, as before, resulted from changes in the department's faculty. George Hildebrand, a Cornell Ph.D. in economics, joined the ILR faculty in 1960. George's distinguished career had already included directorship of the industrial relations institute at UCLA, but later (in 1969-71) he became deputy undersecretary of labor, U.S. Department of Labor, with major responsibility for international labor relations. Walter Galenson left the University of California at Berkeley to join the department in 1966. Walter's teaching and research spanned comparative labor relations, labor union history, and the economics of labor markets. George and Walter together took over the graduate seminars in labor economics. Bob Aronson, having completed his tenure as editor of the *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* in 1963, became a full-time member of the department, offering courses on manpower (now human resource) policy and teaching the basic undergraduate and graduate courses in labor economics. In the spring of 1969, Lewis Perl, an ILR undergraduate who just completed his Ph.D. in economics at Berkeley, joined the department. Lew introduced an advanced undergraduate-graduate course on the economics of poverty.

From time to time during the school's first 25 years various individuals, already well-established, joined the department as visiting faculty members. In 1953 Edwin Witte of the Department of Economics at the University of Wisconsin, one of the architects of the social security law, came to teach the law of social security and protective labor legislation. Witte was later elected president of the American Economic Association. In 1958 Marion Folsom, former U.S. secretary of health and welfare, taught the social security courses. A few, including Walter Galenson and Vladimir Stoikov, came initially as visitors before accepting permanent appointments to the faculty. All these individuals enriched the course offerings of the department and brought new perspectives through informal contact both with students and the department's permanent faculty.

Focusing on the school's early mission—to prepare students for practitioner roles—the department did not initially emphasize the academic side of its graduate program. Consequently, Ph.D. enrollments were modest and well below its graduate faculty capacity. Of the 26 students who completed their Ph.D. degrees in our department during the school's first 25 years, about 16 entered and remained in academic careers, in some cases with great distinction, during most of their professional lives. Most of our M.S. recipients were practitioners whose primary goal was to upgrade their credentials, although some went on elsewhere for their doctorates.

Departmental research was exclusively a matter combining individual interest with opportunity. There was no departmental allocation of school research support and, consequently, no department research budget, although faculty members could request graduate student research assistants. Occasional outside funding made a leave of absence possible, though typically it was a sabbatic leave that gave faculty time to pursue research and writing exclusively.

It is difficult to summarize the department's research activity during this early period. In broad terms, it included Fred Slavick's work on retirement behavior and issues and Jack McConnell's interest in public policy with respect to old-age and income security. That interest led to a large Ford Foundation grant to study retirement programs and pensions, which became a virtual departmental project. Bob Raimon's long-term interest in wage relationships and wage behavior guided his research. Arnold Tolles studied the intellectual sources of wage theory and conducted case studies of worker displacement. Duncan MacIntyre worked on issues in health insurance. Bob Aronson explored the impact of technological and industrial change on labor markets, while Leonard Adams built on his first-hand experience to study the effectiveness of labor market institutions such as the public employment service and training programs.

In some cases research activity strayed far from the core of industrial and labor relations. Gardner Clark's work on the Soviet and Chinese steel industries and George Hildebrand's research ranging from a study of the Italian postwar economy to an analysis of manufacturing production functions, to studies of the arbitration process are examples of the breadth of faculty interest. Walter Galenson's studies of labor markets in developing countries likewise went beyond the conventional boundaries of labor economics and income security — if there were such!

Most department members made substantial administrative contributions to both the department and the school. After departmentalization, almost everyone took a three-year term as chair. Some such as Leonard Adams, who served as director of research until his retirement, and Bob Ferguson and Bob Aronson, both of whom were associate editors and editors of the *ILR Review*, served the entire school. Jack McConnell became dean of the Cornell Graduate School in 1955 and dean of the ILR School in 1959 before serving with distinction as president of the University of New Hampshire.



Many department members also made major public service contributions. For example, Bob Raimon assisted the New York Telephone Company (pre-NYNEX) with its wage survey program. Duncan MacIntyre served the Social Security Administration as an advisor. Leonard Adams was consultant to the U.S. Department of Labor on the public employment service. At the invitation of the Government of India and with the financial support of the Ford Foundation, Leonard was invited to set up a labor research institute. Although for political reasons the government was not ready at that time for such an initiative, Leonard was successful in assisting several private sector organizations in India to begin systematic study of labor-management relations. Bob Aronson spent a summer in Ghana as consultant on public sector wage policy to a newly-installed government. Several faculty members served as members of the mediator-factfinder panels of the New York State Public Employment Relations Board or testified before, or conducted special studies for, state and federal legislative bodies.

As the 1970s began, the cast of characters in the Department of Labor Economics and Income Security began to shift. Retirements and deaths and changes in interest and opportunity had thinned the ranks of the early members and the times reflected the establishment of labor economics as a distinctive and acknowledged field of study, ready for change.

**The Second 25 Years** By 1972-73 the department was an aging faculty, with no one under the age of 50. Concerned about making the transition to the next generation of scholars in a planned way, the department and Dean McKersie conducted an off-campus retreat to which they brought two distinguished labor economists from Princeton, Albert Rees and Orley Ashenfelter, to advise them. Together they drew up a list of young economists at other universities to try to hire.

Out of the resulting search process that occurred over the next two years, Ronald Ehrenberg, Robert Smith, and Robert Hutchens were added to the faculty. A series of deaths and early retirements created additional unexpected vacancies, and by 1978-79 these three had been joined by John Burton, Gary Fields, Olivia Mitchell, and Richard Butler. This group of seven formed the nucleus of the department over the next five years.

Under Ehrenberg's leadership, and with the full support of the older faculty, the orientation of the department shifted in a number of ways. At the undergraduate level, courses began to focus more heavily on the usefulness of labor economics for analyzing public policy issues. Ehrenberg and Smith wrote a text based on this theme, *Modern Labor Economics* (1980) for ILR's required sophomore labor economics course. It quickly became the best seller in the field nationwide and is now in its fifth edition (1994). Under the direction of Hutchens, Burton, and Butler, the focus of the required junior-level social insurance course shifted from an extensive discussion of program details to a course in which the key concerns of policymakers, including moral hazard, adverse selection, and

equity and efficiency, were discussed and then applied to analyze the wisdom of current program structures and proposed policy reforms.

A wide variety of new undergraduate elective courses were introduced by the faculty, including the Evaluation of Social Programs (Ehrenberg), Occupational Safety and Health (Smith), Work and Welfare (Hutchens), Women in the Labor Market (Mitchell), and Labor in Developing Countries (Fields). These courses stressed the usefulness of the tools of labor economists in a wide variety of problem areas. To reflect all these changes the department's name was formally shortened to Labor Economics in the fall of 1976.

These new faculty were, on average, also highly research oriented. In 1985 in recognition of his research productivity, Ehrenberg was appointed the first Irving M. Ives Professor. The stature of the department as a group grew until it became widely recognized as the second best group of labor economists in the country. Along with their research, the faculty revived the somewhat moribund Ph.D. program and worked hard to attract new students. Currently, in the mid 1990s, the department produces about three new Ph.D.s a year.

At John Burton's suggestion, a weekly labor economics workshop was started at which speakers from Cornell and elsewhere discussed their current work with faculty and students. That workshop, which continues today, has exposed Cornell students to the very best labor economists in the world.

The early 1980s saw the arrival of the two Georges: George Boyer and George Jakobson. Boyer converted the department's required freshman Development of Economic Institutions course from a comparative economic systems course to a course that combined European economic history and the history of economic thought. Jakobson, in addition to assuming responsibility for the social insurance course, brought needed econometric skills to the department. He regularly taught courses on the analysis of qualitative data and on longitudinal models and served on numerous Ph.D. committees.

The late 1980s and early 1990s saw a growing internationalization of ILR, with the Labor Economics Department helping to lead the way. With full department support, Gary Fields became one of the world's leading scholars on labor markets in developing nations and became director of ILR's International Initiative.

In an extraordinary coup in 1987, the department hired John Abowd, who has provided much of the subsequent leadership of the department. Abowd's considerable talents included conducting research at the frontiers of collective bargaining and compensation policies, which helped to integrate the department's intellectual interests with those of faculty in other ILR departments.

In 1991 the Institute for Labor Market Policies was founded, with Ehrenberg as its director. With support from both ILR and some outside foundations, the institute has sponsored two public policy conferences a year, each of which has led to some outstanding publications. One of these annual

conferences is held jointly with Princeton University, the acknowledged leader in our field.

The early 1990s saw the appointments of Maria Hanratty and Mark Rebick, two new Harvard Ph.D.s. They each added a new dimension to our faculty, with Hanratty focusing on health-related issues and Rebick on the Japanese labor market. Unfortunately, both left ILR to pursue other opportunities. Their departures, along with that of Olivia Mitchell, created openings in the department that due to budgetary problems could not all be filled. In 1994-95, however, the department attracted Francine Blau and Lawrence Kahn from Illinois. Blau, who became the first Frances Perkins Professor, is widely acknowledged to be the leading female labor economist in the nation, while Kahn is among the leading economists conducting research on human resource and collective bargaining issues.

Blau has another outstanding attribute; she is an ILR alumna. In spite of the professional orientation of ILR, with most of the undergraduate students going on to careers in law, human resources, or collective bargaining, the Labor Economics Department has always prided itself in its undergraduate and master's students who have gone on for Ph.D.s in economics at other institutions and become leaders in the field. In addition to Blau, these distinguished full professors include Jan Svejnar ('74) (Pittsburgh), Michael Wachter ('64) and Peter Cappelli ('78) (Pennsylvania), David Bloom ('76) (Columbia), Henry Farber ('74) and Alan Krueger ('83) (Princeton), and Laurie Bassi ('77) (Georgetown). Both Krueger and Bassi currently hold high-level government appointments, too. Lashean Richburg, a member of ILR's class of '94 who is enrolled in the Princeton Ph.D. program as we write this piece, may become the first underrepresented minority graduate of the school to be added to this list.

## **A Parent Department: Human Resources and Administration**

*by Frank B. Miller and Larry Williams*

As of 1958 the school adopted a departmental structure by creating four units: (1) Collective Bargaining and Trade Unions; (2) Economic and Social Statistics; (3) Human Resources and Administration; and (4) Labor Economics and Income Security. The first department chair of Human Resources and Administration was Bill Whyte, who had a national reputation as a sociologist knowledgeable about union-management relations. His personal stature, plus the fact that so many young faculty in both the Collective Bargaining and Human Resources Departments were "homegrown" and had thus been exposed to the total field as grad students, made cordial interdepartmental relations natural in the beginning.

In this period the department grew by a combination of hiring our own graduates and those of other schools and movement through the system. Leonard Sayles and George Strauss, both of whom had Ph.D.s in Labor Economics from M.I.T., were early hires who moved on to Columbia and Berkeley, respectively, after completing a major local union study here. Another early hire, Lois Dean, left with her husband when he moved from Cornell's Sociology Department to another post. But a new cadre of behavioral scientists were soon recruited, including social and industrial psychologists Larry Williams, Leo Gruenfeld, Ned Rosen, Bert Brown, and Paul Breer and sociologists Bill Friedland and Jay Shulman. They joined sociologists Henry Landsberger and Harry Trice, and industrial psychiatrist Temple Burling.

Two additional new faculty members, Bill Frank and Bill Wasmuth, were hired partly to teach appropriate courses in the personnel industrial education program in our department and partly—in fact largely—as faculty for the extension division.

At about this time the department was feeling stretched by its expansion and by the need to select a more-encompassing name to reflect its new, wider breadth of interests. It chose Organizational Behavior, a term first introduced in the March and Simon's book, *Organizations* (1958), thus becoming one of the first, if not *the* first, to adopt this now-popular nomenclature.

The ebb and flow of faculty in the Organizational Behavior Department continued. Faculty members Bill Friedland, Paul Breer, and Henry Landsberger left while Gerry Gordon and Howard Aldrich arrived. The next wave of hiring brought in Tove Hammer, Bob Stern, and Sam Bacharach. At this time, too, there was a significant increase in doctoral training, which continued throughout the sixties.

The 1960s represented a time of extensive involvement for the department in international research (Landsberger in Chile; Rosen in England; Gruenfeld in Italy; and Whyte and Williams in Peru). Whyte and Williams focused in their Peru studies on industrial relations and community development. They collaborated with Jose Matos Mar in the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP), which became their research base in Peru, and worked with J. Oscar Alers and Giorgio Alberti, an Italian who had gotten his Ph.D. degree at ILR. Alberti became a mainstay of the joint Cornell-IEP program, which led Peruvian students in surveys and anthropological studies and produced many publications. Developed as it was during a time of political tension between the United States and Peru, this 13-year international collaboration may have set some kind of record.

By the late 1960s, however, when the department had about 20 affiliated faculty members and was the largest ILR department by far, it began to suffer from internal strains. Problems of deciding on and staffing for undergraduate and graduate courses and reaching consensus on recruiting new colleagues grew more difficult; but the heterogeneity of department members, in terms of their training and their perceptions about departmental mission, became the major problem.

At first, out of respect for Whyte's leadership, group loyalties tended to outweigh diversity of interests, disciplinary background, and definitions of what the "departmental identity" should be. In the context of the ILR School, the department chairmanship was (and is) a chore that adds little to the incumbents' *joie de vivre*. So after getting us launched, Whyte was allowed by his colleagues to surrender the office. He was followed by Felician Foltman, who served two three-year terms. Then, in 1967, at peak strength numerically, the department faced a new election for the chair. To the surprise of outsiders, there appeared to be two candidates for the position, each with a nucleus of support. The two factions had actually formed around competing ideas of how the department should evolve.

The then-current dean, Dave Moore, concluded that internal frictions had to be high for two people to volunteer for so burdensome an office. His solution was to ask Frank Miller, then director of the Office of Resident Instruction, to come back to the department and, if elected, serve as chair as a "peacemaker." Miller assented, and the dean's prediction that he would be elected proved correct. The peacemaker part was more troublesome.

The original department had little chance of eliminating internal stresses by choosing a new chair, because tensions did not arise from interpersonal conflicts. Faculty who identified themselves with behavioral science disciplines (psychology, social psychology, sociology, and anthropology) wanted to identify the department in this light as they sought to recruit new members and attract graduate students. Members who identified themselves as students of the personnel or training function in work organizations had comparable needs. The "home-grown" members of the department (Landsberger, Foltman, Miller, and Risley) and some of the discipline-based people (Rosen, Trice, and, of course, Whyte) were initially willing to compromise and live together under the combined department rubric, however complicated it was. When Miller left on sabbatic leave in January 1968, the balance seemed in fact to favor joint existence. When he returned in September, however, the decision to form two departments had become a fait accompli. The need to have a more focused mission, and to recruit like-minded colleagues and graduate students, appealed to the majority of members in what would become two departments.

Miller continued to serve as chairman of the combined department until the start of 1970-71, when the amicable divorce became final. At the end, the new Manpower Studies Department had nine members, four of them part time and one a visitor. The old department, which retained the name Organizational Behavior, also had nine members, all of them full time.

## The Organizational Behavior Department

*by Larry Williams*

When launched on its own, the new Organizational Behavior (OB) Department melded psychologists and sociologists dedicated to developing a

behavioral science study of organizations, particularly those involved in industrial relations. Their meeting ground was a commitment to social psychology. Although psychologists and sociologists had their own academic literature, it was not difficult for a sociologist to understand a psychological article or for a psychologist to understand a sociological article. Thus, when an interdisciplinary pair worked together, they could readily share the academic literature relevant to their research problems. That interdisciplinary sharing was especially marked in the combinations of Robert Stern and Tove Hammer and of Larry Williams and Bill Whyte.

Members of the new OB Department shared a commitment to doing basic research, but some felt that a project could be basic and applied at the same time: "basic" in the sense that it involved a search for uniformities in organizational behavior and "applied" in the sense that it also intended to provide practical guidance to people in organizations. There were other department members who were concerned that too much attention to practical problems would contaminate researchers' scientific interests.

This basic-applied research issue arose when some of the department members moved, early on, into studying employee ownership. A grant to finance what was called the New Systems of Work and Participation Program was awarded to Bill Whyte. This originally focused on the Jamestown Area Labor-Management Committee (JALMC), whose creation was facilitated by Lieutenant Governor Stan Lundine, and then on the sudden emergence of worker buyouts designed to save jobs when plants were threatened with closing.

Whyte continued his involvement with JALMC for several years, particularly with graduate student Christopher Meek, who went to live in Jamestown and became a research associate. Bob Stern and Tove Hammer soon joined Whyte and Meek in studying worker buyouts. In the early eighties, they teamed up with Reed Nelson to publish *Worker Participation and Ownership: Cooperative Strategies for Strengthening Local Economies* (1983). Lieutenant Governor Lundine, who had led in the creation of the JALMC, contributed a foreword to the book, which focused on the JALMC and emerging forms of worker ownership.

While these activities and the publications arising out of them established the Organizational Behavior Department as a leading authority on employee ownership and labor-management cooperation in the 1970s and 1980s, they also blurred the line between basic and applied research. Specifically, what happened was that when Tove Hammer and Bob Stern went to Waterlou, Iowa to ask union leaders for permission to interview their members on the Rath Packing Company Board of Directors, the union leaders asked the professors in turn to report on *their* studies of worker buyouts. Their report so impressed the bargaining committee that Union President Lyle Taylor asked Hammer to serve on the board of directors, representing the workers and the union. With Stern's and Whyte's encouragement she accepted the challenge and became a participant observer on the board of directors of what was then one of the largest worker buyout cases. The union relied heavily on guidance from both Hammer and Ralph Helstein,

former president of the United Packing House Workers. Hammer served for several years until the buyout finally failed and Rath went out of business. Her experience gave her an inside view of the struggle of a union and workers to save jobs and create a more participative environment.

Bill Whyte went on in the late 1970s to extend applied research into the halls of Congress by establishing an informal network that helped create and encourage passage of the Small Business Employee Ownership Act, which President Carter signed into law in 1980. This legislation cleared one hurdle in the struggle to extend employee ownership.

Meanwhile, Harry Trice was pioneering in a study of the effects of alcohol and other drugs on the workplace, thereby launching an interest that would bring him and the school national attention. With co-author Paul Roman, Trice published *Spirits and Demons at Work: Alcohol and Other Drugs on the Job* (1972), which quickly became a classic in the field. Continuing in this vein, Trice developed an interest and expertise in employee assistance programs (EAPs), especially concerning the success of EAPs in dealing with alcoholism and drug-abuse problems. Trice earned international respect for his work, and in 1994 he received special recognition for it from the American Sociological Association.

R. Brinkley Smithers, one of the nation's strongest advocates of the prevention and treatment of alcoholism, recognized Trice's expertise and awarded him a series of research grants to further his studies. Later Trice and then Sam Bacharach and Bill Sonnenstuhl were instrumental in getting the R. Brinkley Smithers Institute for Alcoholism Prevention and Workplace Problems established at the ILR School. This institute has sponsored significant alcohol and drug-related research activity, parts of which have focused on the trucking and airline industries.

Meanwhile, Bacharach developed recognized expertise in bargaining behavior, which culminated in the publication of two books, each co-authored with Ed Lawler: *Power and Politics in Organizations: The Social Psychology of Conflict, Coalitions, and Bargaining* (1980) and *Bargaining: Power, Tactics, and Outcomes* (1981). Lawler joined the department in 1994, bringing with him both the *Journal of Social Psychology* and his own small group laboratory.

From the mid 1960s on, while first international and then national studies were occupying much of the Organizational Behavior faculty's interest, the department was experiencing consistent growth in its doctoral student population. This growth peaked in the 1970s and early 1980s when the department led the country in producing Ph.D.s in the field, with as many as four or five new Ph.D.s going on the job market in a single year. Among those who got their graduate training in the OB Department at ILR are many who have gone on to leadership positions in academia, including John R. Kimberly (Ph.D. '70), who is the Henry Bower Professor at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School; Janice M. Beyer (Ph.D. '73), who became a president of the Academy of Management and is currently the Rebecca L. Gale Regents Professor in Business at the University of Texas; David Whetten (Ph.D.), who was a chaired professor at the University of

Illinois until the early 1990s when he moved on to the University of Utah; Craig Pinder (Ph.D. '75) who is now at the University of British Columbia; Howard Garland (Ph.D. '72), who is the Chaplin Tyler Professor and chair of his department at the University of Delaware; and Leonard Greenhalgh (Ph.D. '79), who is chair of his department at the Amos Tuck School of Business Administration at Dartmouth. Others, who earned their Ph.D.s at ILR before the school split into specific departments but who have assumed prominent positions in the field of organizational behavior, include Chris Argyris (Ph.D. '51) now at Harvard, Jim Belasco (Ph.D. '67) now at San Diego, Paul Roman (Ph.D. '68) now at Tulane, Joe Alutto (Ph.D. '68) now dean of the College of Business at Ohio State, and Craig Lundberg (Ph.D. '66) now at Cornell's School of Hotel Administration.

Throughout the 1970s, the department focused on the integration of its faculty with other behavioral science departments on campus. In a short time, in fact, nearly every member of the department had membership in one or more social science graduate fields in keeping with the department's focus on disciplinary teaching and research.

In terms of personnel, the late 1970s and early 1980s were marked by Bill Whyte's retirement from teaching but certainly not research and writing, the departure of Gerald Gordon and Howard Aldrich, and the appointments of Pamela Tolbert and Steve Barley. International research was then at a minimum with only Tove Hammer continuing her work with colleagues in Norway and Bill Whyte concluding his work on Mondragon. The 1990s represented a renewed interest in change and technology and the future of work, while the department lost Steve Barley to Stanford Engineering and started to adjust to a new austerity budget.

## **Evolution of the Human Resources and Administration Department**

*by Frank Miller*

### **Departmental Beginnings (Frank Miller, Chair, 1970-76)**

Reading 1970s departmental reports in the 1990s engenders two main impressions. First, we were preoccupied with trying to increase the number of full-time faculty members to the critical mass required to do the job expected of us. We were grateful to get substantial help from extension stalwarts like Bill Frank and Bill Wasmuth (and later on, Jennie Farley); but having to depend on the continued tolerance of their bosses made for insecurity, "big time."

The second impression is of how totally dependent we felt on annual state appropriations for the school as *the* source of financial support. ILR had had reasonably good treatment from Albany for most of the 1945-68 period, and it was not in our culture to consider the department as an independent vehicle for capturing support from non-state sources. One reason for our being so oblivious



to this kind of opportunity (or so it now seems) was the fact that most of the senior members of our department were ILR-trained Ph.D.s. We began our careers in a school that was too small to have departments. When departments did appear on the scene, they seemed to us to be convenient, but minor, additions to school life. Our main loyalties were directed at the school, not the department, and although this had some costs, it also had some advantages.

Felician Foltman, for example, was the most generous contributor to extension activities the resident teaching faculty ever had, as well as being department chairman. Robert Risley, who served two years as deputy industrial commissioner of the state, was acting dean of the school on two occasions, associate provost of Cornell, and director of extension—all major contributions to the school. Frank Miller was director of resident instruction for twelve years, department chair eight years, and graduate field representative five years—all useful school contributions but none programmed to maximize departmental autonomy.

The first title for the new break-away department, Manpower Studies, reflected a shift of interests from the original amalgam inherited from the founding faculty, Personnel Administration and Industrial Education. The new mixture consisted of the traditional personnel activities at the level of work organizations and a new social policy concern, the major work-training efforts undertaken by the federal government to make "hard-to-employ" citizens employable. It was fitting that Felician Foltman, the last remaining ILR professor to specialize in Industrial Education and Training, was the one to introduce his department to the remedial job-training programs that were the heart of the U. S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration. A member of the National Apprenticeship Council, Foltman was consulted early and often by the Kennedy and Johnson administration officials responsible for launching and coordinating federal manpower programs. Foltman argued persuasively that the department's real mission was to teach and research about the national social-policy issues of making people employable, as well as the work organization's problems of selecting, training, compensating, and motivating its own labor force.

Hence, the name Manpower Studies, seen as having a macro and a micro side, was borrowed from the vocabulary of contemporary Washington and applied to our fledgling department. (Shortly after the department got this label, it began offering a new course, Women at Work, founded by Alice Cook and Frank Miller and continued by Jennie Farley. From this experience, the inherent sexism of our name became the source of substantial embarrassment to then-chairman Miller.)

During this period, we hired a number of people including William Wolf, an established scholar, and Lee Dyer, a brand-new Ph.D. from Wisconsin. Shortly before I retired from the chair, Wolf took me aside to say, in effect: "Isn't there some way we can get Dyer introduced to people at nearby big companies? We have to help our young people make contacts for research and consulting, or they'll never stick around. We owe it to them and to ourselves." I agreed and we did use contacts to get Lee acquainted with nearby industries, the most important of which turned out to be Corning Glass.

The striking thing about this episode was the fact that it never occurred to me that the department had any such responsibility or interest. The fact that Wolf's remarks were a kind of epiphany demonstrates the limits of vision imposed by a constricted definition of what departments could or should be. Unfortunately, this understanding came at the end of my tenure as department chair. Fortunately, the next regular chair was to be my enlightener, Bill Wolf.

### **Building the Launching Pad (William Wolf, Chair, 1976-79)**

The first thing Bill Wolf did after being voted into the department chair was to move the furniture around in the secretarial work space. An industrial engineer before joining academia, he explained that work flow, communication, and visitor reception would be improved by the change. This was emblematic of his take-charge approach and his urge to improve on the status quo. The next thing he did was change the name of the department from Manpower Studies to Personnel and Human Resource Management "to more closely indicate its field of specialization."

After an earlier stint as a visiting professor at ILR, Wolf joined the faculty in 1970, bringing with him a national reputation as a scholar in the fields of personnel and management theory. The author of several books in these subjects and biographer of the Harvard guru of managerial performance, Chester I. Barnard, he was about to become president of the American Academy of Management.

Having taught in business schools at Chicago, Washington (Seattle) and Southern California, he had a fairly sophisticated understanding of the ecology of academic departments. Ithaca's geographical isolation from major centers of business activity struck him as a handicap that called for energetic compensatory measures. And he had plenty of energy for the task.

One of Wolf's major goals was to showcase the school's faculty to leaders in the business world, with an eye toward improving the faculty's opportunities for research and consulting contacts and publicizing the school as a resource for practitioners. He arranged for ILR to co-sponsor the regional meeting of the American Society of Personnel Administrators, although he viewed this only as performing a useful service function, not as serious department building.

Much more serious was his next effort. As soon as Dean Robert McKersie promoted a Founders Fund to honor the earliest cohort of ILR faculty members and to gather proceeds to sponsor new courses designed to bring prominent union and management practitioners to campus, Wolf designed a Founder's course, Top Management of the Personnel Function. This course was meant to allow him to invite a series of top personnel executives to Ithaca to address the students. As a concomitant benefit, these practitioners were introduced to departmental faculty members and got better acquainted with the school's resources.

Wolf's ultimate goal was to promote an annual colloquium in which small groups of prominent personnel executives would meet with ILR professors to discuss major topics of concern to their occupational specialties. Although that goal was not met during the period of Wolf's chairmanship, he did see it inaugurated shortly after he stepped down. His idea that the department could be defined as a marketable entity to the practitioner community was a significant contribution of his term of office.

All this time, Wolf was publishing, teaching, and participating in appropriate national organizations. (His only shortcoming was his California prejudice against the gloomy weather that plagues Ithaca and environs from time to time. He retired early and withdrew to the Pacific Coast where he presumably enjoys the earthquakes, forest fires, and other natural advantages of the garden spots he so frequently extolled.)

### **The Take-Off Period (Lee Dyer, Chair, 1979-83, and George Milkovich, Chair, 1983-85)**

This section handles the tenure of the next two chairs, Lee Dyer and George Milkovich, as a single chapter of the department's history. To explain why, we should jump ahead to an excerpt from an annual report of one of their successors, Robert Risley, which cites a 1986 story from *Human Resource Reporter*, referring to the result of their current reader survey.

To the question: "Which universities do an outstanding job in training future HRM professionals?" Cornell was among the top ten institutions cited. In response to the question, "Which academicians do you consider to be the best and brightest 'stars' in ILR or related fields?" Lee Dyer and George Milkovich were among the leaders named.

When Reggie Jackson came to the New York Yankees from Baltimore, he remarked: "I didn't come here to earn a star. I brought my star with me." Lee Dyer came to ILR in 1971, just after receiving his Ph.D. from Wisconsin. It is fair to say that he earned his star at ILR. One of Dyer's early contributions to ILR was to help recruit George Milkovich, who arrived in 1980 already a star of sorts, having established his reputation after several years at Minnesota (long a leader in our field) and more briefly at the University of Buffalo. Dyer and Milkovich had already worked together as colleagues when George was a visiting associate professor at ILR in 1974-75. After Milkovich returned to Minnesota, they taught similar courses in which Minnesota and Cornell grad student teams competed in tackling the same personnel management computer games. It was during Dyer's first year in the chair that Milkovich was recruited.

With the arrival of Milkovich, the department had two relatively young tenured graduates of prestigious Midwestern graduate schools where departments were traditionally important collectivities that both enhanced and were enhanced by the career excellence of their members. In Dyer's second annual departmental report, he made the statement: "[D]espite many obstacles, the department has

managed to assemble the talent and to generate the intellectual synergy needed to reach its objective of becoming one of the country's major sources of innovative personnel and human resource research." Clearly, the department was aiming for stardom.

Dyer's next annual report goes beyond this already significant expression of intent to present a formally agreed-to statement of purpose, to wit:

"the goal of our department is to become nationally recognized by our peer institutions and constituent groups as a leading producer of:

- Innovative and high quality research
- Well-trained students for positions in business, government and academia
- Up-to-date technical assistance for professionals in the field.

While some immediate progress was made on all these fronts this year, considerable time and effort were expended in sowing seeds that we hope will lead to even greater results in coming years."

This opening paragraph serves as the framework of a collective commitment to achieving excellence, a goal which is attainable only if it is articulated. As a written charter, it provides the department with a reminder of, and an incentive to work toward, its common aims. It is repeated as the lead paragraph in subsequent reports by Dyer and in those of his immediate successors, Milkovich and Risley, and recurs in some form in reports of more recent chairs.

Along with the formal statement, the concluding allusion to "sowing seeds" was especially prescient. Reviewing the years from 1979 on, one is particularly impressed by how much time is required to get results and how much patience it takes to stick with the complex program of development envisioned by Dyer and Milkovich.

Naturally, a major element in that program was the recruitment of young faculty. On the personnel front, John Boudreau arrived in 1981, having completed his doctorate at Purdue, another Midwestern source of prime talent. He was joined the following year by Sara Rynes, who took her Ph.D. at Wisconsin and taught for a year at Minnesota before joining us. So, by 1982 we had four relatively young scholars trained at excellent departments in the upper Midwest. It's worth noting their geographic pedigrees because this is the heartland of superior land-grant university systems (those which turn out scholars comfortable with that blend of academic excellence combined with an orientation to public service that characterizes *Cornell* at its best).

While we're discussing public service, justice requires us to pay some attention to the other, smaller wing of the department, which was devoted to public policy issues. Early on, this was the province of an older generation of

faculty members—Felician Foltman, a leading scholar of apprenticeship training, Robert Risley, an expert on public personnel administration especially at the state level, and Frank Miller, who studied federal-state manpower training programs, particularly in rural areas. Because the remedial job-training effort faltered under the Nixon and Carter administrations and became moribund under Ronald Reagan, this had ceased by the late 1980s to be an academic growth area. In the '70s, though, we were able to attract Vernon Briggs, a labor economist with a national reputation in apprentice and other publicly regulated job training-programs and a leading expert on immigration policy. He was joined in the '80s by another economist, John Bishop, who has done interesting research in the important area of school-to-work transition.

While we are fortunate to have two strong scholars dealing with these important matters, until and unless public attention can be captured once again, the growth possibilities seem to lie in the private sector, in what was traditionally "Personnel" but has now pre-empted the label "Human Resource Studies."

In any case, the synergy to which Dyer referred involved Milkovich's appearance and, augmented by later recruits Boudreau and Rynes, led to the collective determination to make the department itself into a star and not just a location where individual stars might appear. Naturally, for the "constellation" to gain recognition, there must be individuals who twinkle brightly enough to attract attention. It is instructive to see how this symbiosis developed in the annual reports.

For example, early on we note that "right now the two best selling personnel texts in the country are co-authored by members of our department." [*Personnel: A Diagnostic Approach*, by Glueck & Milkovich (1982) and *Personnel / Human Resource Management*, by Heneman, Dyer, Schwab, & Fossum (1989). [Editor's note: The latest edition of Milkovich's text, called *Human Resource Management: A Diagnostic Approach*, is co-authored by Milkovich and Boudreau.]]

Appearances before congressional committees by department members, most frequently Foltman and Briggs on matters concerning apprenticeship and immigration, were duly noted. Editorial board service on relevant academic journals was listed collectively for the department, rather than individually. It is clear that department members were urged to serve in this fashion and that such service was seen as redounding to the advantage of the department.

Although "doing good" was seen as instrumental to the welfare of the department, "doing well" apparently became a major preoccupation when state-supplied dollars declined as a proportion of school budgets. The entrepreneurial spirit that characterized schools of business in other land-grant institutions was less conspicuous in Cornell's state-supported colleges. Fortunately, the concentration of departmental recruits from other graduate schools helped to offset that lack. Even so, finding the key to private sector funding did not come easily.

One breakthrough in the 1982-83 academic year, mentioned wistfully in earlier reports, was the acquisition of computer hardware for the department. To start with, this was first and foremost an academic asset:

For competitive, as well as pedagogical reasons,...much of our teaching...now involves courses requiring the use of computers, and this year we have developed a course devoted entirely to the study and use of computer-based personnel information systems. When this course comes on stream in the fall it will be the first of its type in any U.S. industrial relations or business school. The introduction of additional computer work in our courses has meant an increase in the need for hardware and for support of personnel trained in computer sciences. This support has been forthcoming and is invaluable.

The support mentioned here came from the dean (Charles Rehms), indicating the priority given to bringing the school into the computer age. As for the department, the report continued: "We are now working with a couple of computer manufacturers in an attempt to get ourselves included in their equipment donation programs....the outcome...is uncertain." Dyer's fourth and final report concluded with a graceful expression of satisfaction with the direction the department was heading, tributes to the dean, the new chair, and the members, and the caution that: "we face many challenges, some of them unique to our field, School, and location, and some endemic to higher education itself."

Milkovich began his first report (1983-84) by repeating the department's goals and clarifying the context in which they were made: "The basic structure of our course offerings to MILRs and undergraduates was established in 1981-82 and remains in effect." In other words, a great deal of the time and effort spent in '81-'82, examining and planning what the department was about, focused on teaching as a central and organizing theme.

After describing new courses (some of them computer related, but including Briggs's contribution to the university's new Common Learning Program ("Science, Technology and the American Economy"), Milkovich set goals for the following year as they related to courses. Included in this teaching forecast was the continued effort to seek support from a computer company "through a grant of micro computers for educational and research purposes."

Again, the service of department members as members of editorial review boards was described and quantified. He noted three books published or accepted, Dyer's *Human Resource Planning* (1985), his own *Compensation* (1993), and one by Vernon Briggs (with Ray Marshall and Allan King) (1984) *Labor Economics: Wages, Employment, Trade Unionism and Public Policy* (a reminder of the "macro" side of the department's public policy interest).

Milkovich mentioned, as Dyer had, the continuation of the Colloquium for Personnel Executives, Bill Wolf's brainchild, then in its fifth year. Also noted was the fact that, that year, "five of us will be actively participating in the annual

program of the Academy of Management and the IRRA, giving us a solid presence in the foremost professional organizations in our field."

By the following year, the hoped-for contract with a computer company finally came to fruition with IBM agreeing to a grant for "personal computers, software and related services." Clearly, departmental faculty were waiting for this opportunity. Dyer and Milkovich offered a new course in Human Resource Planning, Milkovich and Rynes one in Compensation, and Boudreau one in Staffing, all geared to computer use. Boudreau also designed another new course, Personal Computer Application in Human Resource Management, which, as "unique in the field, has generated inquiries from other universities, employers and public agencies."

Professors in other ILR departments also received support from the IBM contract, including George Jakubson in Labor Economics and Ron Seeber in Collective Bargaining. IBM's grant soon began to elicit additional payoffs, too. Milkovich and Boudreau each got grants from Cornell's Hatfield Fund to design new ways "to improve undergraduate education through economic analysis."

Over the years, IBM has renewed the original grant. As a result, ILR undergraduate and graduate students have grown substantially in computer literacy with the double advantage of making them better educated and more employable. By 1989 ILR and its related institutes and divisions were able to open up an adult education facility: the Executive P.C. Education Laboratory on campus. The lab provides continuing education to human resource practitioners "who missed the personal computer revolution when they were in college." At the time it opened the facility contained 20 new IBM PC-2 computer work stations linked through a network.

Included under "Looking Ahead" items in Milkovich's final report was one: "Continue efforts to resolve issues related to the configuration and direction of the HRS wing of the Department." As a matter of linguistic and historical interest, "the HRS wing" was being distinguished from the larger "Personnel" wing, and referred to the study of public policy issues, by that time associated primarily with Vernon Briggs. Now (ten years after the report was submitted), human resource management is widely used to mean personnel management in both popular usage (what Fortune 500 companies call the department that used to carry the "Personnel" label) and in academic parlance.

It is made clear from the rest of the report that the problem with the "HRS wing" relates to its falling out of public favor, rather than to the quality of scholarly work done on its behalf. The "public opinion" which determines what areas of academic investigation are interesting and deserve support from foundations or government agencies at any given time consists of judgments by politicians, bureaucrats, and "philanthropoids" as well as academics. The problems of preparing youth for useful employment in a competitive environment, particularly if they are not headed for college, engaged our attention in the '60s and early '70s. Without having been "solved" or mitigated since then, they seem to have lost much of the appeal they once had. This is a source of frustration and

bewilderment for departmental faculty members, whatever their individual teaching/research interests.

At any rate, of the five books proudly listed as produced by department members, two—*Immigration Policy and the American Labor Force*; and *Immigration: Issues and Policies*—were written by Briggs. (The other three were by Dyer, Milkovich, and Rynes and Milkovich.)

Among other noteworthy accomplishments mentioned was the fact that "This year Sara Rynes and John Boudreau won the Dunhill-American Society for Personnel competition with their proposal to study recruiting practices among the Fortune 500." Finally, to show that all good things come to an end, Milkovich predicted that in the coming year the department would:

Redeploy our efforts by reducing our involvement in the V.P. Consortium...and examine other options to more effectively interact with the...professional community. The V.P. Consortium required a considerable investment on the part of our department with insufficient payoffs within the School.

The "other options" proved quite rewarding as the department moved to the next stage of its development.

#### **Attaining Orbit (Robert F. Risley, Chair, 1985-89)**

Bob Risley was one of those good citizens, always willing to pitch in to help the university, the school, or the department. So, in the critical year 1985-86, he agreed to take over the chair of the Personnel and Human Resource Studies (P/HRS) Department, allowing Milkovich to concentrate on carrying out the department's game plan. (Dyer was on sabbatic leave, and Milkovich faced a heavy load of special chores as a host of earlier investments began to pay off. It was up to George to keep all those plates spinning, each atop its slender pole on a crowded and confusing stage.)

Risley's first report as chairman repeated the departmental goals statement at the outset and went on to put the department into context, noting:

The enlarged scope of the personnel/human resource function in major [work] organizations. The changing nature of the P/HR functions in organizations and its increased involvement in organizational planning and decision-making requires a greater understanding of broad areas of management and finance. The newly added undergraduate requirement for a course in accounting and finance is in response to this need....department courses have also been enriched by bringing to campus outstanding practitioner leaders to discuss their work. During the...year...18 such practitioners participated in courses.



He described the reasons for increased computer utilization within the departmental curriculum, noting the installation of "communication link(s) to the Human Resource Information Network" that give students in many ILR classes access to "such topics as expatriate compensation, affirmative action and gain sharing." Related additions to computer technology "enhanced the graphics/presentation capabilities of students and faculty."

Turning to graduate education, he noted:

increased recognition of the department's research and the quality of its faculty by those in other Universities, is seen as an important factor in obtaining more (and better) graduate students....competition...for the best...students is keen and the department is concerned about developing better financial support, including business...financed fellowships to help attract them.

To indicate departmental successes thus far, he cited Bonnie Rabin, an ILR grad student, who got national recognition from the American Society for Personnel Administration via a \$5000 "1986 Outstanding Master's Thesis Award," as well as Gloria deBejar's award from the Academy of Management for the Outstanding Research Paper in their Personnel-Human Resource Division. He also described the departmental M.S./Ph.D. Workshop, in which faculty and graduate research projects are reviewed and discussed at different stages of their development.

He continued by mentioning various achievements of departmental faculty, including Milkovich's "Outstanding Research Paper of 1986" acclaimed by the National Academy of Management; newcomer Barry Gerhart's grant from the National Academy of Science's National Research Council to study gender-based pay discrimination; and the continued recognition accorded Vernon Briggs as a contributor to Cornell's Common Learning Program, as well as his designation as a "distinguished visiting fellow" for a week-long teaching visit to New Mexico State University.

In his second annual report, Risley's theme revolved around the achievements and recognition accorded the department and its individual members. It noted that Boudreau and Rynes were granted tenure and promoted to associate professor in the same year they were "unanimously elected to the Personnel/Human Resource Research Group, a new organization of 25 leading young researchers" in the field. It also noted that John Bishop, recruited as an associate professor in the public policy area, came with research and teaching interests—"education and training to prepare people for employment" and "programs designed to employ disadvantaged"—that provide a "bridge between the department's concerns" for P/HR management at the organization level and "human resource policy issues."

That year saw the creation of the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies (CAHRS), which institutionalized an ongoing relationship between the school and leading business organizations whereby research projects would be

proposed, financed, carried out, and publicized for the mutual benefit of P/HR practitioners and scholars. IBM, already a sizable benefactor in the arena of computer technology, was a major contributor to the inception of CAHRS "by providing a loaned executive, Dick Jacobs, to serve as the Center's Executive Director." From that point on, the center was destined to play a major role interacting with, and facilitating, departmental research and practitioner training objectives. Of course, good things come at a price, and along with the advantages of the center went claims on the time and energies of the department's leading lights.

Meanwhile, other major departmental developments took place. The Army Research Institute awarded a five-year, \$980,000 grant for a research project entitled "Effects of Cost Benefit Information on Human Resource Management Decisions" to a team of three—John Boudreau as principal investigator with Sara Rynes and Lee Dyer as co-investigators. Add this to the Gerhart-Milkovich team working on Gerhart's National Academy of Science grant, and we have the central core of the P/HRS research faculty—two senior stars, Milkovich and Dyer, two rising stars already tenured, Boudreau and Rynes, and the latest addition, Gerhart, moving fast with a good display of momentum and competence. Tribute was paid to Dean Doherty for his support both to the project to increase computer competency and to setting up the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, which Risley noted they "expect will be of great importance in the department's efforts for national recognition."

The IBM PC Education Project was showing the tangible payoffs that can accrue to a complex departmental undertaking. Risley appraised its results in various ways. First, he noted that in 1984 when the IBM PC lab opened, 30 different ILR students used it to assist their individual projects in many courses; by 1987, there were 400. Next, he noted that, according to placement director Karin Ash, the computer skills acquired by ILR students made them attractive to job recruiters. Ash observed that many firms rely on these alums to bring them up to date on computer applications to P/HR decisions, which "gives [them] an important competitive edge [toward] faster penetration into the upper echelons of HR decision making." Finally, on the faculty side, Risley noted that Boudreau and Milkovich published a book of HR computer exercises in 1988, and a team led by Sara Rynes (with Gerhart, Boudreau and Milkovich) "developed software to be used by the American Compensation Association" in their professional development program for members. He also noted the growing interest by "other schools" asking how they can set up similar projects, and that IBM had begun similar projects, with other colleges—"clearly a...result of our success." Finally, IBM continued to "keep our facility at the cutting edge" with a supply of late models of equipment to a lab he blithely called "probably still the most advanced of its kind."

He noted that CAHRS, at the end of its first full year of existence, had enrolled its full complement of 35 member firms, each contributing \$10,000 for support. The amount of faculty time required to pull off this phenomenal achievement (it was anticipated it would take 3-5 years to accomplish) was duly

noted, as was Lee Dyer's appointment as faculty director. The department was on its way to stardom!

Any discussion of departmental history that mentions Robert Risley has to reiterate how much he contributed to his department, school, and university, and to marvel at how much he gave in time, energy, and wisdom at an age when retirement loomed, and he had already "paid his dues" many times over.

**Flying High (John Boudreau, Chair, 1989-92, and Barry Gerhart, Chair, 1992-present)**

Examination of the department's last two regimes suggests that it has achieved the goals it set for itself back in 1980-81: (1) "Innovative, high-quality research; (2) Well-trained analytical students... (3) Research-based technical support for practicing professionals." John Boudreau's first annual report declared that "The Department *maintained* its national and international leadership in scientific research," and proceeded to describe impressive achievements in this area. It also reported extension workshops conducted by Gerhart and Boudreau to develop computing skills in HR managers, and seminars for top-level HR Vice-Presidents:

to provide hands-on experience with computer tools, and to design computer applications in their organizations. These efforts inspired IBM to establish a new personal computer laboratory in Extension dedicated to professional education.

The spillover effects of this achievement included a \$1 million facility for Cornell's School of Hotel Administration, along with the \$2 million ILR Extension facility.

IBM was also inspired to expand its academic support to other leading universities in the field, bringing the school psychic income the following year when it hosted the first-ever IBM PC Education Forum. This event allowed ILR to play teacher to professional colleagues from prominent industrial relations and human resource management programs. Among the "students" were most of our major competitors: Michigan State, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Purdue, Rutgers, and others. (Contemplating this picture of ILR pre-eminence among its peers, we may be tempted to cry: "God! Is this a great country, or what?" But that would be mean-spirited. Let us resist such temptations, right?)

Moving on to the second of what Boudreau called "two unique institutional systems" that support the department's thrust toward excellence, CAHRS, he noted that building on the major contributions made by two human resource executives, Richard Jacobs ('87-'88) and Martin Kennedy ('88-'89), the department was able to recruit Dr. Albert Brault, a highly valued HR practitioner from Kodak, to a more permanently defined position as Executive Director.

Boudreau described CAHRS as providing "leading edge research to improve HR management practices, enhance the performance and equitable treatment of employees, and promote organizational effectiveness," and in the process, tapping

"desperately needed new research resources for the ILR School," such as funds to support grad student research assistantships, research associates, and faculty summer salaries. A major source of support for internal departmental faculty research projects, Boudreau noted CAHRS also benefits other departments. In its previous BiAnnual Report, for example, of the 24 people identified as CAHRS supported researchers, only 14 were HRS-connected faculty members, research associates, and grad students. Of the rest, nine were members of other ILR departments, and the tenth was an ILR Extension associate. In this regard, CAHRS resembles the IBM PC Education Project in that although created by departmental needs, once in place it has brought spillover benefits to other ILR faculty and, of course, the school, and even the university as a whole.

An important new emphasis in this stage of departmental development was its expanded presence in international aspects of the field. The increased importance of multinational corporations (including their running American operations and our running overseas operations) made such a change inevitable. Although we had had Australian visiting professors from the '60s through the '80s, our first true comparative focus came with Visiting Scholar Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla's course, International Human Resource Management, in '90-'91. (He is now a senior research associate with CAHRS.)

Major international impetus came in 1991 when Vladimir Pucik came into the department. Formerly at the University of Michigan Business School, Pucik had extensive teaching experience in Japanese universities and had done HR research in Central Europe. Author or coauthor of three books and fifteen refereed articles, he wrote an amazing fourteen book chapters, most of them about Japanese HR practices at home or overseas. Four of his publications were written in Japanese, including "Key Issues Facing Perestroika in Eastern Europe" and "Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and the Role of Japan." A pair of his articles in *Japanese Trade and Industry* were entitled "American Managers, Japanese Bosses" and "Japanese Managers, Foreign Bosses." Obviously, the department's sophistication in international HRM matters was enhanced by his arrival.

The department's commitment to international matters was too serious to give its foreign affairs franchise to one person, however. Other faculty were quickly employed in two parallel ventures. Relations with major Central European universities—Charles University in Prague and Comenius University in Bratislava—were established under the Central European Human Resource Education Initiative, funded by the Mellon Foundation. By its third year, the initiative had involved as teachers all then-current department members but Bishop and Briggs.

The second venture, which is offered through CAHRS, combines an annual five-day International HR Executive Development Program, held in Ithaca, and several "offshore" programs. Annual three-day Executive Education Seminars have been offered in Tokyo, Singapore, and Hong Kong since 1993, and in Kuala Lumpur since 1994. A Korean group came to Ithaca in 1995 for a similar week-

long program. The seminars involve all the major department members who have HRM interests.

It is worth noting that the contribution of CAHRS to HRS achievements is not one-sided. Pucik as director of international programs joined Dyer, academic director, and Milkovich, research director, in devoting substantial time and effort to the operation of CAHRS. Increasing cooperation between ILR Extension and CAHRS reflects a symbiotic relationship powered in large part by HRS faculty effort. By adding Pucik to the team of Dyer, Milkovich, Boudreau, and Gerhart, the department retrieved the critical mass it had enjoyed on the HRM front before Sara Rynes left.

In 1993, by the way, the department had adopted a new name, Human Resource Studies, reflecting the fading of the term "Personnel" from fashion. That lobe of the department's brain is now called Human Resource Management, or HRM, to distinguish it from the macro or Human Resource Policy (HRP) side.

So today's department has arrived at the goals set under the game plan jointly conceived in 1982 by Milkovich and Dyer. It ranks at or near the top of a large number of university or college groups with similar assigned responsibilities. Its texts, articles, book chapters, and papers receive respect from their peers. Its graduate and undergraduate students are sought after. It commands attention from its professional constituencies in business and industry, academia, and government.

As time goes by, its members continue to achieve awards and prizes. Milkovich now holds the M.P. Catherwood Professorship. Dyer is a Fellow in the new National Academy of Human Resources. Barry Gerhart and Timothy Judge have become members of the Personnel/Human Resource Research Group. Milkovich and Gerhart won the 1991 scholarly achievement award from the Academy of Management's HR Division. Gerhart has joined Dyer, Milkovich, and Boudreau in the winners' circle of best-selling text authors with *Human Resource Management: Gaining Competitive Advantage* by Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart and Wright (1994). Judge has just been named recipient of the 1995 McCormick Award for Distinguished Early Career Contributions by the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Theresa Welbourne is one of Cornell's Clark Professors of Entrepreneurship. The reputation of the department's present members and of its resource-rich environment helps attract new talent despite the handicap of Cornell's statutory salary structure.

On the other side of the department's jurisdiction—social policy—Professors Bishop and Briggs continue to teach, publish, and testify in a way to attract favorable attention from *their* public and academic constituencies. It is clearly the case that the department and the school have a symbiotic relationship. The well being of the department is nourished by the school as the well-deserved tributes to recent deans in annual department reports attests. Similarly the school flourishes to the degree that departments do a good job.

Many of the problems now faced by the school and the department are caused by the increased demand for time and attention generated by past success. Those problems are formidable, but preferable to ones generated by obscurity and mediocrity.