

CONTENTS

President's Message	1
Official Divisional Business	
Minutes of Winter Executive Committee Meeting.....	3
Minutes of Summer Executive Committee Meeting....	9
Announcements of Interest	
Sixteenth Annual Workshop in Industrial Psychology..	18
ABEPP Examination	22
Allport Memorial Fund	23
New Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize.....	23
SPSSI Membership Invitation.....	24
Recommendation for Increased Assessment.....	24
Other Announcements	25
Convention Program for 1968 APA Meeting Center Spread	
News from Academia	
The Cambridge Center for Social Studies	28
Monell Chemical Senses Research Center.....	29
Research Notes	
Interpersonal Perception in Employment Interview....	30
Invasion of Privacy*As Seen By Industrial Psychologists	39
ETS Research Bulletins Available	45
Professional Notes	
Salary Survey Returns Low	48
Fair Tests and Fair Employment	48
Battle for Criteria	54
Editor's Note	56
Division 14 Committee Structure Inside Back Cover	
Newsletter Staff	Back Cover

President's Message

One of the major areas in which the solutions to problems of industrial personnel management are sought today is that of labor union-management interaction. In industry after industry, procedures such as selection and training and dimensions such as productivity and morale are the subject of labor relations negotiations.

These are problem areas in which psychologists can make meaningful contributions. Except occasionally, incidentally and peripherally, however, the psychologist does not now participate in labor relations. Psychology is an integral part of almost every aspect of personnel management except collective bargaining. Psychology's contribution has been almost entirely in the form of research from the outside looking in. There is both the opportunity and the need for greater direct involvement by psychologists in the labor-management process. As Ross Stagner has observed, ". . . insofar as the psychologist is trained to deal with the irrational aspects of human behavior, he has a large potential role to play in the area of union-management relations, for few aspects of modern industry show so much irrationality--on both sides of the bargaining table." But even where irrationality is not involved, the insights and techniques of psychology are relevant, as in selection, safety, performance evaluation, and training.

To make its contribution to labor relations, however, psychology must first confront at least four limitations or barriers.

First, psychological techniques are neither accepted nor popular among many in labor unions. The "human relations" movement, employee counselling, and employee attitude surveying have all been viewed as anti-union in intent and in effect. Employee testing is generally opposed in favor of on-the-job trial for the most senior man. Where tests are used to select employees for upgrading, they are generally viewed with suspicion and hostility, and their use may have to be sustained repeatedly through the grievance procedure. As both union and management representatives become more sophisticated in the social sciences, hostile attitudes such as these may recede, but the psychologist must take them into account if he hopes to work effectively in labor relations.

A second limitation arises out of the complexity of the labor relations process, particularly in the mass production industries. Looking in from the outside, it is easy to be misled. For instance, in one major industry-wide strike it was proposed that letters be written to the heads of all the companies involved, calling them to task for failing to apply, at the level of first-line supervision, sound techniques of supervision and management. The theory was, roughly, that the strike endured because the workers didn't like their foreman. Looking at the situation from the inside out, however, it was clear that relationships at the work-group level were largely irrelevant to the strike. Public and private attitude surveys later showed this to be the case. Workers stayed out on strike out of loyalty to their national organization; psychological intervention at the plant level would have been a waste of time.

A third limitation arises out of the nature of the issues involved. To the extent that irrational components dominate the bargaining relationship, the psychologist can make a contribution by bringing to the debate realism, rationality, and maturity. But we must avoid the illusion that all differences in perception can be absolved by good will and good psychology. There are real, reality-bound conflicts of interest and of value in which one side or the other must and will suffer a loss in the real world. Such losses cannot be readily assuaged.

Finally, this last point suggests, in perhaps a more acute form than it occurs in other industrial applications of psychology, the ethical problem facing the psychologist. Participation in labor relations, as a counselor to union or to management, may involve, at a number of crucial points, commitment to some extent at least to the goals and values of the party counselled. To the extent to which his counsel makes a difference, it can affect not only the decision to hire or not hire one individual, but the futures of tens and thousands of workers. It is not always possible to dissociate from the consequences the contribution of the psychologist. It must be our hope -- and goal -- however, that the creation of greater understanding, freer communication, and an increase of rationality in labor relations will result in a benefit for the larger society as well as to our clients.

Phil Ash

Official Divisional Business

MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

January 12-13, 1968 Detroit, Mich.

Present: Ash, Boulger, Bray, Brenner, Dunnette, Jurgensen, Meyer, Parrish, Porter, Seashore, Smith

Absent: Bass, Henry, Keenan, McPherson, Perloff, Rundquist, Thompson, Uhlaner

Secretary-Treasurer Report: The Division 14 treasury showed a balance of \$292.81 at the end of December 1967. Comparable figures for the preceding two years were also presented, which showed that this year's balance was about \$1,200 less than the balance at the end of 1966. This amount was accounted for, however, by two unusual and non-recurring expenses in 1967, namely, \$825 for purchase and distribution to the membership of the "Casebook on Ethical Standards of Psychologists," and the \$350 expenditure to cover unliquidated expenses of the Division 14 social hour sponsored at the Washington APA meeting.

A long-term trend shows that the Division has been more active each year and therefore spending more money. However, this trend was taken into account when the assessment on the membership was raised last year to \$4.00. This increased assessment will come into effect for the first time this year, so the declining balance situation should be rectified.

The Cattell Fund showed a balance of \$3,011.95 at the end of December 1967. Approximately \$900 was spent over the last year in awards and other expenses incurred in administering the award program.

The ballots calling for nomination of candidates for Division 14 offices were mailed to the membership during the last week in December. A February 2, 1968 deadline was set for returning these ballots to the Chairman of the Elections Committee.

Education and Training Committee

Dr. MacKinney reported that the E and T Committee had organized into four sub-committees to pursue the following topics:

1. Guidelines for Master's Education in Industrial Psychology. This sub-committee will attempt to revise the "position paper" that Dr. MacKinney prepared last year, so that it might be acceptable to the Division 14 Executive Committee as an Official publication of the Division.
2. The teaching of psychology in non-psychology departments. Data from a survey made last year on this topic will be summarized and reported on later this year.
3. Liaison and communication between industrial and academic members of Division 14.
4. Further study of the Industrial Psychologist's job. This sub committee will give special attention to the investigation of why many psychologists in industry are not members of Division 14.

Election Committee

Dr. Seashore reported that the number of nomination ballots being received far exceeds the number received last year. Last year the nomination ballot was included in the winter issue of Newsletter. Because the number of ballots received last year was relatively low, the Executive Committee voted in its September meeting to send the ballot to the membership this year in a separate mailing. This seems to have had the desired effect of resulting in a greater number of returns.

Fellowship Committee

Dr. Bray reported in the absence of the Chairman, Dr. Rundquist. The Fellowship Committee has been devoting most of its efforts to the problem of how to judge qualifications of nominees for Fellowship status. Procedures used by other professional societies are being studied. Because of this project, little effort has been made to solicit the nominations of candidates for Fellowship. It was the consensus of the Executive Committee that the Fellowship Committee should put more effort into the latter activity.

Membership Committee

Dr. Meyer reported for the Chairman, Dr. Thompson, that the

Committee has had little work to do because of delay on the part of the APA office in Washington in sending to the Division the indications of interest in joining Divisions which are expressed by APA members at the time dues are paid. These indications of interest were received very recently, and appropriate instructions and forms were sent to the respective individuals. This should stimulate a large number of applications for Division 14 membership in the next few months.

Newsletter

Dr. Boulger, the Editor, announced that an edition of the Division 14 newsletter will be coming off the press and mailed within the next two weeks. He stressed the need for more materials from the membership for publication in future issues of the Newsletter.

Program Committee

Dr. Porter presented a list of topics which had been suggested for symposia or idea sessions for the 1968 APA meetings. These were discussed and suggestions made by members of the Executive Committee regarding criteria that might be used in making final selections from the many topics suggested. Dr. Porter also discussed some of the problems that are being encountered due to the fact that many different San Francisco hotels will be used for the APA program. Division 14 activities will be conducted largely at the San Francisco Hilton Hotel on Friday, August 30, Saturday, August 31 and Sunday, September 1. APA is scheduling program events starting at 8:00 a.m. each day. However, it was decided to start Division 14 programs no earlier than 9:00 a.m. (to insure reasonable attendance), even if it meant that two Division 14 programs might occasionally be scheduled at the same time. The Division 14 business meeting, presidential address, and social hour will be scheduled for Saturday afternoon August 31, from 3:00 to 7:00 p.m.

The question of whether Division 14 should continue to insist that 1800-word papers be submitted for the Proceedings by those who wish to participate in paper-reading sessions was again discussed, since it was felt that this requirement probably accounted for the relatively small number of papers submitted last year. The Executive Committee voted to continue to participate in the Proceedings this year, and based on the

results experienced, a decision will be made in September as to whether to continue participation in succeeding years.

Public Relations Committee

Dr. Bray reported for the Chairman, Dr. Uhlaner, who was unable to attend this meeting. A major activity of the PR Committee has been to revise the Division 14 publication, The Psychologist in Industry. The Committee decided to postpone the preparation of a final draft of this pamphlet until the special task force on "Effective Practice of Psychology in Industry," established by APA, has made its report. It was felt that material generated by that task force might be very appropriate for inclusion in the pamphlet.

The Committee has also been concerned with its possible role in influencing actions of Congress and agencies of the Federal government which might have implications for industrial psychology. One of the major issues now under consideration, for example, is whether or not it is desirable to establish a Social Science Foundation. The Executive Committee felt that this was so important an issue that it directed the President to appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the issues involved in the possible establishment of a Social Science Foundation. This ad hoc committee will be instructed to report back to the Executive Committee at its June meeting.

Scientific Affairs Committee

Dr. Triandis, the Chairman, reported that his Committee has drawn up a list of possible activities that might be undertaken to stimulate scientific contributions by Division 14 members. One such suggestion, for example, was the possibility of giving awards of some type to the best dissertations in Industrial Psychology each year. Another was the suggestion that members be encouraged to submit such items as unpublished reports of research, descriptions of data, or bibliography, to TIP for publication. A third suggestion was that the Division might videotape talks by prominent industrial psychologists for circulation to colleges and universities--especially those that do not offer courses in Industrial Psychology. Several important suggestions were also made for programs that might be sponsored by Division 14 at APA conventions. Executive Committee members felt that these suggestions probably could not be implemented in time for this year's convention in San Francisco, but

that next year's Program Committee should endeavor to put into effect those ideas they deem appropriate.

The Scientific Affairs Committee has also prepared necessary materials for the annual Cattell Fund awards. In connection with this, Dr. Ash reported that he had sent to the Managing Trustee of the Cattell Fund a formal request that this award program be continued, since the five-year term of the original grant had expired.

Workshop Committee

Dr. Parrish reported that his Committee has drawn up a proposed program for the 1968 workshops to be held in San Francisco Hilton Hotel on Thursday, August 29, 1968.

Ad Hoc Scholarship Fund Committee

Dr. Brenner, a Co-Chairman of this Committee, reported that a survey of 63 Industrial Psychologists had been completed to determine sources of scholarship monies for graduate students in Industrial Psychology. A report of this survey was distributed to members of the Executive Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee is now planning to draw up action plans for stimulating the establishment of additional fellowships and grants for graduate students majoring in Industrial Psychology.

Other Items

The Executive Committee discussed several ideas presented "second hand" from ABEPP (Ed Henry who was scheduled to present the ABEPP thinking was unavoidably absent). One suggestion was that ABEPP create "Honorary Diplomates" for so-called "scientific psychologists" who have made significant contributions to the "practice of psychology." In the Industrial area, for example, this might be an Honorary Diploma to a J. P. Guilford, a Paul Horst, a Robert Wherry--psychologists who have developed tools and techniques which are now part of every Industrial Psychologist's kit. The consensus was that the conferring of honorary diplomas might have a detrimental effect on the overall ABEPP program, in that it might deter many industrial psychologists from going through the usual ABEPP examination procedure to achieve diplomate status. A second suggestion that currently eminent industrial psychologists might be influenced to apply through usual ABEPP channels if they knew that they would be examined by a "Blue Ribbon Examining

Panel" also received a rather negative reception. ABEPP under the presidency of Dr. Alfred J. Marrow is actively seeking suggestions for up-grading diplomate status and would welcome suggestions from the Division 14 membership. Several actions suggested by ABEPP Trustees will be published in forthcoming issues of the AP and comments are requested by President Marrow.

Dr. Meyer reported that he had been working with Dr. Norman Vincent who volunteered to conduct a salary survey for Division 14. Suggestions were solicited from Executive Committee members regarding items that should be included in the survey questionnaire.

A motion was passed to grant official "representative" status to any Member or Fellow of Division 14 who wished to attend the International Congress of the International Association of Applied Psychology to be held in Amsterdam on August 18-22, 1968.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on June 7-8, 1968 at Detroit.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert H. Meyer
Secretary-Treasurer

MINUTES OF SPRING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

June 7-8, 1968 Detroit, Mich.

Present: Ash, Seashore, Bray, Smith, Jurgensen, Perloff, Porter, Rundquist, Thompson, McPherson, Drucker (for Uhlaner), Parrish, Brenner, Henry, Meyer.

Absent: Dunnette, Bass, MacKinney, Boulger, Uhlaner, Triandis, Keenan.

Secretary-Treasurer Report:

The present balance in the Division 14 treasury of \$1,065.79 is unusually low for this time of the year. The comparable figure for past years has been much higher. At this same time in 1967, for example, the treasury showed a balance of \$4,273.07. The low balance in the treasury is due the continually increasing committee activities, increased cost of publishing the Newsletter, and some additional mailings that have been made to the membership.

The Committee discussed possible additional sources of income. The editor of the Newsletter was asked to investigate the possibility of selling advertising in TIP, for example. It was also suggested that we could transfer money from the surplus in the Workshop Fund to the Division 14 treasury in an emergency. A motion was passed to recommend to the membership that the assessment for Members and Fellows of Division 14 be increased from \$4.00 to \$5.00. The Secretary-Treasurer was instructed to prepare a notice of this proposed action to be published as a notification to the membership in the next issue of TIP.

The balance on hand in the Cattell Fund as of May 31, 1968 is \$2,570.98. Approximately \$440 has been spent from this fund since December 31, 1967 for printing and mailing the announcement and for meetings of the Committee.

Elections Report:

Nominees who confirmed their willingness to run for offices, and whose names will appear on the ballot mailed to the membership in June, are as follows:

President-elect

Bass, Bernard M.
Fleishman, Edwin A.
Owens, William A.
Perloff, Robert
Smith, Patricia C.

Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee

Albright, Lewis E.
Thayer, Paul W.
Vroom, Victor H.

Division Representatives to APA Council

Guion, Robert M.
MacKinney, Arthur C.
Naylor, James C.

The special mailing of the nomination ballot to the membership this year resulted in about three times as many nominations received as had been the case the previous year when the nomination ballot was included in one of the issues of the Newsletter. In view of this increased response, it was voted that the practice of mailing the nomination ballot separately should be continued in the future.

Education and Training Committee:

The Chairman, Dr. MacKinney, could not be present, but a detailed report of Committee activities was submitted. This report included the following items:

- (1) The paper entitled "The Master's Degree in Industrial Psychology" prepared by Dr. MacKinney has been published in the American Psychologist. This was not published as an official statement of the Division, but rather as a "trial balloon" to get a reaction from the membership regarding the possible accreditation of Master's programs by the Division. Future action on this issue will depend on the expressions of sentiment received from the membership.
- (2) Problems of communication and relations between academic and industrial members of Division 14 were considered by the E&T Committee at some length. As one program to improve such commu-

nication, the Committee proposes to start a "Research Information Exchange" in TIP, which would be intended to aid in matching the research interests of academic members with the research needs of organizations.

- (3) The perennial problem of determining why so many persons who would seem to be eligible for membership in Division 14 do not join has also been considered by the Committee. A sub-committee was asked to investigate ways of identifying such persons for survey purposes. If it seems feasible, a survey will be conducted to determine what sorts of jobs the non-members carry out, and why they have not chosen to affiliate with the Division.
- (4) The Committee discussed potential problems that may arise with the present trend toward the teaching of industrial psychology outside the Psychology Department in an increasing number of schools. No action was taken on this issue at the present time.
- (5) The problem of updating the education of industrial psychologists in anticipation of expected trends over the next twenty to thirty years was also considered by the Committee. It was suggested that a special invitational conference might be sponsored to consider likely future trends in the field. The Committee will consider this matter further and bring a more specific recommendation to the Executive Committee at the September meeting.

The Executive Committee discussed at some length item #4 of the E&T Committee report, the trend toward the teaching of industrial psychology in business schools, schools of industrial administration, and other non-psychology departments. Several members felt that they detected a trend toward decreasing emphasis on industrial psychology programs in this field in the smaller schools and non-psychology departments. The Education and Training Committee was instructed to investigate the possibility of acquiring some facts on this issue, perhaps through a survey.

Newsletter

Dr. Ash reported for the Editor, Dr. Boulger, who could not be present.

The Publication Board of APA is investigating the role of newsletters to determine whether or not they should be supervised by the Board, as are journals. If the content of newsletters is largely research study reports, they probably should be regarded as journals and the publications supervised by the Board.

An issue of TIP is now in press, which will include the program of Division 14 for the APA meetings in September.

Program Committee

Dr. Porter distributed copies of the Division 14 program for the annual APA meeting in San Francisco this September. Division 14 activities are scheduled from Friday, August 30 to Sunday, September 1. Twenty-three hours were allotted to the Division for papers and symposia, and additional hours were provided for invited addresses and other activities, such as conversation hours with Annual Review authors and journal editors, the business meeting and social hour, and meetings of the Executive Committee. Fourteen papers were selected for four hours of paper reading sessions (from a total of thirty-five papers submitted), and nineteen hours were allotted to ten symposia selected from a total of 19 submitted. The Program Committee suggested that a symposia or conversation session with Division 14 committee chairmen be considered as an activity in next year's program.

Public Relations Committee:

Dr. Art Drucker, reported for the Chairman, Dr. Uhlaner, who could not be present. Activities of this Committee have been confined to the revision of the pamphlet, The Psychologist in Industry, which is being re-written. A draft had been sent to members of the Executive Committee for their consideration ahead of this meeting. This draft was discussed at some length. The consensus was that too much emphasis was placed on the role of the psychologist as a member of management, and not enough mention was given to the contributions of industrial psychologists in academic institutions or to the role of the field as a science. It was suggested that the Public Relations Committee might consider preparing several small booklets by different authors, each describing some specialty of the psychologist in the world of work, rather than trying to include all fields of industrial psychology in one booklet. Executive Committee members were urged to send their suggestions and com-

ments to the Chairman of the Publications Committee regarding the present draft of the booklet.

Scientific Affairs

Dr. Ash reported for Dr. Triandis, who could not be present. A letter from Dr. Dael Wolfle, Managing Trustee of the Cattell Fund, was read to the Committee, which indicated that the Trustees of the Fund were very pleased with the way Division 14 has been administering the Award program. The continuation of this awards program was endorsed for another five-year period, with additional funds to be provided as needed.

Dr. Triandis submitted a written report to the Committee of the results of the judging of the Cattell Award proposals. The titles of the winning proposals were read, but the names of the authors are to be withheld until the announcement at the business meeting of Division 14 held in connection with the APA meetings this September.

The Executive Committee discussed at some length the possibility that there should be some kind of restriction to prevent the same persons from winning the award year after year. Winners of the Award, for example, might not be permitted to enter the contest for the following two or three years. The Scientific Affairs Committee was instructed to consider this problem and submit a recommendation to the Executive Committee at a subsequent meeting.

Membership Committee:

Acting on the recommendations of the Membership Committee, the Executive Committee voted to recommend to the membership thirty-four individuals for Member status in Division 14.

Only two applicants were rejected for membership, and a third will be asked to submit more information regarding his qualifications before the next meeting of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee also voted to recommend to the membership twenty individuals for Associate status in the Division.

Workshop Committee

Dr. Parrish, Chairman of the Workshop Committee, reported that the program of five workshops is fully organized, and will be held at the San Francisco Hilton Hotel on Thursday, August 29. Four of the sessions will be limited to 20 registrants each, and the fifth, a program to be led by Drs. Calvin W. Taylor, and Robert Ellison on "Patterns in Career Success," will be limited to 40 attendees. The program announcement will be mailed early in June to members of Division 5, 14, and 23 and to Chairmen of Graduate School Departments of Psychology. The program will also be published in the forthcoming issue of TIP. Arrangements are being made to invite a graduate student to serve as a reporter in each session, to provide a summary of the presentation and discussion to be mailed to attendees.

Fellowship Committee:

Dr. Rundquist reported that his Committee had spent most of their time over the past year in an intensive investigation of the problem of establishing criteria for Fellowship status. A survey was made of the practices of other professional associations with regard to awarding Fellow status. A questionnaire was sent to 74 associations and 60 replied. Great variations in practices were found, although the majority limited such status to a small percentage of their total memberships. Where more than about 20% of the membership were Fellows, the associations usually reported that Fellow status was not considered much of an honor. Based on the results of this survey, Dr. Rundquist recommended that Division 14 consider changing qualifications for Fellowship as follows: (1) require ten years of post doctoral industrial experience, rather than the present five; (2) require membership in Division 14 for three years, instead of the present two; (3) establish a limitation as to the percentage of membership that can have Fellow status, such as 20% or less; and (4) ask candidates to submit reprints or reproductions of what are considered to be their most valuable publications. The Executive Committee voted to defer action on these proposals until they could be studied in greater detail.

Only two candidates for Fellowship were considered, and only one of these was approved for recommendation to the APA Fellowship Committee and to the Division 14 membership. A former Fellow of the Division who had allowed his membership

in the Division to lapse some years ago asked to be reinstated as a Fellow in the Division. The Executive Committee voted to approve this action and to recommend to the APA and to the Division 14 membership the approval of such reinstatement.

Professional Affairs Committee:

Dr. McPherson reported that Committee activities have involved for the most part investigations of charges of violations of ethical standards. The Committee plans to hold a meeting on July 25 during which they will consider: (1) current cases concerning ethical standards violations, (2) plans for writing a Division 14 supplement to the APA Casebook on Ethical Standards, (3) plans for preparing statements in non-psychological magazines, such as management journals, concerning the ethical standards of Division 14, and (4) the collection of articles and other publications which deal with the issues involved with the use of tests in screening applicants for employment among minority groups.

Ad Hoc Scholarship Fund Committee:

Drs. Brenner and Henry, Co-Chairmen of this Committee, reported that a survey had been conducted of a selected list of "leading" industrial psychologists in business and academic settings to determine what scholarships or fellowships are now available, what additional scholarships are needed, how such a program should be administered, and related topics. A detailed, written report of the survey findings was submitted to the Executive Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee is now preparing a list of Foundations which should be contacted for scholarship grants. A training program for coaching Division 14 members to approach such Foundations with requests for grants will be developed. It is proposed that such scholarships be administered by Division 14. A detailed proposal for this program will be prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee for consideration by the Executive Committee of Division 14 at a future meeting.

Other Items

Dr. Ash reported that an Ad Hoc Committee had been appointed to consider the production of video tapes of lectures by industrial psychologists, but that the Committee did not have anything to report as yet.

Dr. Ash also reported that an Ad Hoc Committee had

been appointed to consider the production of video tapes of lectures by industrial psychologists, but that the Committee did not have anything to report as yet.

Dr. Ash also reported that an Ad Hoc Committee had been appointed to investigate what position Division 14 should take regarding the establishment of a social science foundation, but this Committee had nothing to report as yet.

Dr. Bray reported on the activities of the APA Ad Hoc Committee on Employment Testing of Minority Groups. This Committee has prepared several drafts of documents which are intended to serve as official statements of the APA on this subject. However, the Committee has not yet produced a statement that all members will approve. This issue was discussed at some length by the Executive Committee. Questions were raised, for example, as to what audience such a statement should be directed, and what the content and tone of the statement should be. The Ad Hoc Committee was asked to send each member of the Executive Committee the various drafts that have been prepared to date on this subject, so that Executive Committee members might not only have an opportunity to become better acquainted with the issues but also have an opportunity to influence the final statement by submitting their comments and suggestions to Ad Hoc Committee members.

The Executive Committee discussed a proposal submitted by Division 5 of APA to establish an Inter-Association Council on Tests Reviewing. It is proposed that an office be established to serve as a clearinghouse for information about all test published. This special Division 5 Committee plans to hold a meeting of representatives from various Divisions interested in participating in this activity. The Executive Committee instructed the President to appoint a representative of Division 14 to attend this meeting and to report back to the Executive Committee at one of its meetings to be held during the APA convention.

Dr. Meyer reported that the returns from the Division 14 salary survey to date were disappointing in that only 56% of the membership returned the completed questionnaire. Members are urged to send suggestions regarding analyses which they would like to see performed to Dr. Norman Vincent of the State Farm Insurance Company in Bloomington, Illinois. Norm is carrying out this survey for the Division.

Dr. Ed Henry reported on issues and problems that have been considered at length by the American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology relating to the certifications of industrial psychologists. While this certification program has been very popular among clinical psychologists, fewer industrial psychologists have sought certification than would seem desirable. Several proposals to stimulate interest in the program are being considered by ABEPP, such as making special awards to outstanding contributors among present members, reopening the "grandfather" provision from time to time, adding privileges for those who are certificated, and the like. Division 14 members are urged to send their ideas and suggestions on this issue to Dr. Alfred J. Marrow, who is now serving as President of ABEPP.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on Friday evening, August 30, at 6:00 p. m. in Room 113 of the San Francisco Hilton Hotel, in connection with the annual meetings of the APA.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert H. Meyer
Secretary-Treasurer

Announcements of Interest

Sixteenth Annual Workshop in Industrial Psychology

The Sixteenth Annual Workshop sponsored by Division 14 will be held Thursday, August 29 at the San Francisco Hilton Hotel.

The Sections and the discussion leaders are:

- I Patterns in Career Success: Calvin W. Taylor and Robert Ellison
- II Indirect Measures of Groups and Organizations: Eugene Webb
- III The Assessment Center in the Selection of Managers: Douglas W. Bray
- IV Methodology for Assessing Minority Selection Standards: John T. Dailey
- V Evaluation of Organization Change and Effectiveness: Stanley Seashore

Jack Parrish, Chairman and the Workshop Committee have certainly selected topics of timely importance and have been able to secure outstanding leaders for the Workshop Sections. As in the past, the Workshop leaders bring practical experience and examples from industry and government to bear upon the topics in addition to their strong theoretical backgrounds.

Since many of the readers of TIP may not have received the brochure prepared by the Committee, I have extracted some of the descriptive material from the brochure. The Section Patterns in Career Success will focus on professional career progression and career success. The relationship between academic achievements and success criteria, accomplishment and career performances and career ladders will be discussed.

The career patterns of various professions will be given. A comparison of one profession in fourteen western states, and medical career specialties will be included. Industrial organizations such as Dow Chemical Company, and military organizations will be included in the examples. Dr. Taylor, noted for his work in scientific creativity and the study of high level talent in professional careers, has initiated and supervised many research projects supported by the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, The Peace Corps, and the Richardson Foundation. Dr. Ellison, a member of the Institute

for Behavioral Research in Creativity in Salt Lake City, has worked on approaches to creativity and to professional career success in research projects sponsored by the Ford Foundation and industrial organizations.

The goals of Section II, Indirect Measures of Groups and Organizations, are:

1. How can we develop more innovative and appropriate measurement devices?
2. With any single measure suspect, how can a series of measures be integrated for greater validity?

The unhappy combination of the Hawthorne Effect and over-reliance on the operational definition has led to renewed interest in indirect measurement and methods to tie together fallible information.

To what degree can we better study organizational structure, group behavior, and environmental forces by unobtrusive measurement. Experience and suggestions for using (a) observation (b) secondary records analysis and (c) physical evidence will be offered. The emphasis will be on opportunistic experimentation as well as simple description, and on the "convergent validity" of a series of measures. The issues discussed will be those which are both salient and offer promise for experimental study when all procedural controls cannot be applied or when standard testing procedures are likely to boomerang.

Dr. Webb, Professor of Organizational Behavior at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business, has just completed a leave of absence year at the Institutes for Defense Analyses where he has been concerned with insurgent warfare and criminal research. His current work with Harold Leavitt on "off-shoot" organization, and the relations among environment, home office and offshoots, and his work on the sampling of unconventional groups is a follow-up to his earlier research on unobtrusive research measures.

Douglas W. Bray, Director of Personnel Research for AT & T, will lead Section III, The Assessment Center in the Selection of Managers. In addition to a description of the Bell system's experience with the assessment center as (1) a research tool, (2) a management selection method, and (3) a tool in the selection of salesmen, the workshop will include a "laboratory" period in which participants will run through a typical assessment of staff evaluation session. (The Assessment Center is

an outgrowth of Bray's Management Progress Study, a longitudinal study of the development of young men in management.)

The advantages of assessment in terms of predictive accuracy, management acceptance and the development of staff members will be highlighted. Methodological questions such as, clinical versus actuarial prediction will also be discussed.

Section IV, Methodology for Assessing Minority Selection Standards, focussed on methods for using and interpreting tests for minority selection, will be led by John T. Dailey. A fundamental new approach in which job applicants can be trained in the skills of nonverbal abstract reasoning, mechanical reasoning, and spatial visualization will be discussed.

Dr. Dailey, Special Assistant for Psychology, Office of Aviation Medicine, Federal Aviation Administration, was formerly Director of the Educational Research Project, the George Washington University and previously Program Director of Project Talent. He devoted his last four years at GWU to research on the teaching of basic vocational talents, and the development of devices to assess the ability of minority and disadvantaged group members to benefit from such education.

President-Elect of Division 14, Stan Seashore will lead Section V, Evaluation of Organization Change and Effectiveness which will be concerned with field experiments and quasi-experiments aimed at the induction and assessment of change in organizational effectiveness.

During recent years there has been an increasing number of efforts to apply the power of experimental strategies to the study of complex organizations. The meaning of "effectiveness" is the starting point for the identification of the variables to be measured. Alternate conceptions of effectiveness will be reviewed and their merits evaluated. The emphasis will be on a search for criterion variables compatible with humanistic values, and psychological and sociological theories. Single criteria, syndrome criteria and multiple criteria will be discussed.

A second unit of discussion will review the main elements of experimental design as they apply to field experiments with organizational systems. Practical difficulties of maintaining control over field conditions and methods of exploiting natural events will be covered. The joining of design elements into an overall plan for induction and assessment of changes over some

expanded time period will be reviewed.

Cases will be utilized to illustrate the foregoing items, and to explore the kinds of field problems involved in practice.

Dr. Seashore, Professor of Psychology and Assistant Director, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, has been involved as participant or director in a dozen major studies of organizational behavior, including two extended experiments in total organizations.

Enrollment to Section I is unlimited, but enrollment to the other Sections is limited to a maximum of 20 participants. Fee for APA-members is \$30 and \$40 for non-members. For information or enrollment, write:

Dr. Jack A. Parrish
28510 Cedarbluff Drive
Palos Verdes Peninsula
California 90274

* * * * *

ABEPP EXAMINATION

The American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology, Inc., is now accepting applications for admission to its 1969 examination. Applications will be reviewed as soon as supporting materials are assembled and candidates will be informed concerning admission. Final date for applications will be February 1. In meeting the postdoctoral experience requirement of 4 years, the Board will count experience to December 31 of the year in which the applicant wishes to register for written examination.

ABEPP has prepared a statement entitled Policies and Procedures, a pamphlet which gives specific information on requirements for candidacy, fields of certification, the nature of acceptable qualifying experience, and evaluative procedures, including written and oral examinations and policies governing these examinations. Requests for information should be addressed to: Noble H. Kelley, PhD, Executive Officer, American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901.

The following Diplomates served as readers of essay questions of candidates taking the written examination for the ABEPP Industrial Diploma in October, 1967:

Lewis E. Albright
John R. Boulger
Robert D. Dugan
John Gorsuch

Richard S. Melton
Paul F. Ross
John V. Zuckerman

ALLPORT MEMORIAL FUND ANNOUNCED

Gordon W. Allport, who died last October, was one of the original founders of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (Division 9 of the American Psychological Association), at Dartmouth College in 1936. He also served as the eighth President of the Society from 1943-44.

The Society would like to bring to the attention of your readers the Gordon W. Allport Memorial Fund now in existence at Harvard University. Persons wishing to donate to the fund should make out checks to the "Allport Memorial Fund, Harvard University," and send them to Professor R. Freed Bales, Wm. James Hall, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

NEW GORDON ALLPORT INTERGROUP RELATIONS PRIZE

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues is proud to announce the Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize to be awarded annually over the next five years. The new prize is made possible by a generous gift to the Society from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to honor the memory of the late Dr. Gordon W. Allport, a founder and past president of SPSSI.

The Prize, carrying an annual award of \$200, will be given "for the best paper or article of the year on intergroup relations"--a field about which Professor Allport cared deeply. All entries for 1968 should be sent in triplicate to the Society's Central Office by December 1, 1968 (P. O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106). Entries can be either papers published during 1968 or unpublished manuscripts; in the latter case, the winner will be expected to allow his article to be published in the JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES. Entries cannot be returned.

Entries will be judged each year by a committee of three consisting of the president-elect, the current president, and the president of the previous year of the Society. Originality of the contribution, whether theoretical or empirical, will be given special weight; and the winner will be announced in the Spring edition of the SPSSI Newsletter. The competition is open to non-members, as well as members, and graduate students are especially urged to submit entries.

APA DIVISION 9 IS NOT LIMITED TO SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGISTS

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), which constitutes Division 9 of the APA, is not limited to social psychologists. In the 1930's, when the Society was founded, social psychologists comprised the large share of those in the profession interested in applying psychological knowledge to social issues. This situation is obviously no longer true; indeed, many of its current members, including its Secretary-Treasurer, are not social psychologists. The Society would like to publicize the fact that all psychologists with such interests are warmly welcomed as members.

SPSSI is, perhaps, the most active of the APA's 29 divisions. It regularly publishes the well-known JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES (free to all members), prepares a quarterly Newsletter, and sponsors a wide variety of psychological volumes (all royalties from which revert to the Society). It has specialized volunteer committees who work collectively on a social issue; and it hopes to sponsor in the near future programs at regional psychological association meetings.

Minimum membership requirements for APA members correspond to APA requirements; in addition, graduate students and professionals in closely related disciplines are eligible for membership. Basic dues are \$3.50 per year with contributions from members on a voluntary basis.

Further information concerning the Society can be obtained by writing to SPSSI, P. O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,

Repetition With Variation

In the Minutes of the Spring Executive Committee appearing in this issue is a statement to the effect that a motion will be made to raise the assessment of Division 14 members one dollar from \$4.00 to \$5.00.

I am certain that Herb Meyer, Secretary-Treasurer of the Division, and other members of the Executive Committee can fully justify this modest increase. The purpose of this note is an attempt to insure that all members will know that this motion will be presented at the Division meeting in San Francisco.

Other Announcements

Paul A. Banas has been appointed Supervisor of Personnel Research, Corporate Headquarters, Ford Motor Company.

William D. Buel has joined the consulting firm of Byron Harless, Schaffer, Reid and Associates, Inc., of Tampa, Florida.

Saul W. Gellerman has recently opened his management consulting firm in Harrington Park, New Jersey.

Leonard V. Gordon is the Director of the newly established Program for Behavioral Research at the State University of New York at Albany.

Gerald Halpern is Director of Research Office, Collegiate Institute Board of Ottawa, Canada.

Harry Levinson, of the Menninger Foundation, is to be Thomas Henry Carroll Ford Foundation Distinguished Visiting Professor of Business Administration, Harvard Graduate School of Business, starting July 1, 1968.

Kenneth F. Thomson, formerly of the U.S. Navy Training Devices Center, is now Human Factors Consultant, Naval Air Test Center, Service Test Division, Patuxent River, Maryland.

Martin A. Tolcott, formerly with Dunlap and Associates, is now Program Manager, Eastern Division of Serendipity Associates, McLean, Virginia.

Robert W. Thomson is Director of Manpower Planning for the Bendix Corporation, Detroit, Michigan.

William A. Owens has joined the staff of the Department of Psychology at the University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia as Professor and Director of the Psychometric laboratory.

Donald Jewell will join the staff of the Department of Management at Georgia State College, Atlanta, Georgia, as Assistant Professor.

In addition, Drs. Owens and Jewell are planning to offer their services jointly as organizational consultants, with headquarters in Atlanta.

John A. Hornaday is now Chairman of the Division of Management, Babson Institute of Business Administration, Wellesley, Massachusetts. He would like to call special attention to the fact that his correct address as editor for Personnel Psychology manuscripts is: Drawer B, Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02157.

Dr. Ingo Ingenohl, ABEPP Diplomate in Industrial Psychology, has joined the faculty in the School of Business Administration at Babson Institute. Dr. Ingenohl teaches courses in organizational behavior and in measurement.

Dr. C. N. Allen has retired as professor of psychology after 41 years at Dartmouth College.

Felix M. Lopez has joined the firm of Drake-Beam & Associates as Senior Associate. Dr. Lopez will head up Drake-Beam's personnel research operation which is heavily engaged in projects related to minority group hiring.

C. J. Bartlett has recently been appointed Chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Maryland and Sanford N. Hotchkiss appointed to the same position at Youngstown State University.

These new appointments added to those mentioned in the previous issue of TIP (Jim Naylor, Art MacKinney and Bill Jaynes) brings the number of Division 14 members who are department chairmen to a total of five. Consequently, I believe it is appropriate to repeat the counsel of another Division 14 member who has had long experience as Chairman. When asked what advice he might have for a green department chairman, he replied: "Remember that you have to be a real S.O.B. a lot of the time."

The Division of Personnel Psychology of the New York State Psychological Association announces its officers for the 1968-69 year:

President:	Mildred E. Katzell
President Elect:	Douglas W. Bray
Secretary-	
Treasurer:	William C. Byham

NEWS FROM ACADEMIA

The Cambridge Center for Social Studies, an independent, interdisciplinary social science research community organized as a non-profit educational corporation and supported by grants and voluntary contributions, has recently been opened under the direction of Theodore V. Purcell.

The focus of this research community is on the interrelationship of value conflicts and the social sciences. Through consultation and research, the Cambridge Center works to identify the fundamental values underlying our culture and expressed in our social institutions, with effort to clarify the relevance of these values to modern social problems.

Recognized or not, values influence the decision-makers of our society. Although rapid change has challenged both traditional values and, indeed, the relevance of any value system, the decision-maker--in business, government, education, or religion--still faces alternative and frequently conflicting values. Choices are often made on the basis of an inadequate understanding of how values influence the decision-making process. Relating an abstract value system to specific and complex socio-economic decisions, involving business, urban problems, the family and the state, requires truly bridge-building research.

While the Center's research is conducted in several social areas, its constant effort is to investigate how values influence the types of research to be done, the choice of methods and the interpretation of findings. With a concern for the methodology of value study, some members study values in themselves, as social forces.

The members of the Center, mostly Jesuits, bring unusually broad backgrounds to such issues. All have advanced degrees and university teaching experience in economics, sociology, political science, psychology or business administration, in addition to philosophy and theology. All have had practical consulting experience in business, family welfare and government. The research of the Center is published in books, monographs, and articles in professional journals.

The Center endeavors to cultivate skepticism toward the overconfident use of both scientific methodology and value systems. It makes special effort to distinguish between the universal premises of values and their particularized culture-bound applications.

Convention Program

DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Lyman W. Porter, Chairman
Lewis E. Albright
Frank Friedlander
Robert M. Guion
Howard C. Lockwood
Felix M. Lopez, Jr.
John B. Miner

San Francisco Hilton Hotel

San Francisco, California

August 30 - September 1, 1968

Jay R. Galbraith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

The use of path-goal models in the design of organizational reward and penalty systems.

George B. Graen, University of Illinois: An instrumentality approach to path-goal models of work motivation: Some experimental results and suggested hypotheses.

Morton E. Spitzer, Prudential Insurance Company: Behavior, goal attainment, and job satisfaction.

Symposium - Measuring Managerial Effectiveness. Marvin D. Dunnette, University of Minnesota, Chairman.

2:00 - 2:50, Parlor 5 - Continental Ballroom

Norman O. Frederiksen, Educational Testing Service: Administrative performance in relation to organizational climate.

John P. Campbell, University of Minnesota: Assimulating simulation: Some suggestions for research on management effectiveness.

V. Jon Bentz, Sears and Roebuck Company: Discussant.

3:00 - 3:50, Parlor 4, Continental Ballroom

Invited Address and Response. Lyman W. Porter, University of California, Irvine, Chairman.

Timothy W. Costello, Deputy Mayor-City Administrator, City of New York: An Organizational Psychologist Looks at Change in Municipal Government--From the Inside.

Response: Warren G. Bennis, State University of New York, Buffalo.

The concept of values supplies a unique point of convergence for the different, specialized research projects of the Center. These projects cover the following areas: unemployment, equal employment opportunity, urban tax problems, family-population issues, arbitration, church-state relations and higher education.

The March 4, 1968 issue of Chemical and Engineering News reported that the University of Pennsylvania has received a million dollar grant from the Ambrose Monell Foundation in New York to establish and support an interdisciplinary research center which will undertake studies in the senses of taste and smell.

The new facility, which will be known as the Monell Chemical Senses Research Center, will be built later this year by the Science Institute, a subsidiary of the University's City Science Center. However, the research program will be initiated in April in temporary quarters.

The Monell Foundation Grant will provide \$500,000 for construction and \$100,000 per year for five years for operation of the center. According to terms of the grant, the Science Institute must obtain from unspecified sources at least \$500,000 for construction and over a five-year period, at least 1.1 million for operation.

According to Dr. Luther L. Terry, Vice President for Medical Affairs at the University, the center, which is the first of its kind in the US, will bring together physiologists, pharmacologists, and biochemists with a primary interest in the mechanisms and functions of olfaction and gustation. To this end, the interdisciplinary approach will involve studying receptor chemical interactions; mechanisms responsible for differential chemo-sensitivity; coding, editing, and transmission of chemical information in the central nervous system. In addition, the scientists will investigate the influence of drugs and genetic factors on chemical perception and the influences of the chemical senses on behavior.

RESEARCH NOTES

Interpersonal Perception in the Employment Interview: A Report of the 1965 Cattell Award Winners

Milton D. Hakel
and
Marvin D. Dunnette
University of Minnesota

The employment interview is the most widely used personnel selection technique. Undoubtedly, it is also the most widely misused personnel selection technique. Three years ago, we proposed a comprehensive study of the employment interview as a selection device. Our proposal was based on leads furnished by Edward Webster and his students in their insightful investigations at McGill University. This report summarizes our proposed research design and outlines how our plans have unfolded in the years since winning the 1965 Cattell Award. The final section of this report describes our plans for future research.

After receiving the 1965 Cattell Award, we revised the research proposal and submitted it to the National Science Foundation for funding. Our research is currently supported by NSF; but in addition we have received support and encouragement from psychologists, personnel managers and employment interviewers. We have been very pleasantly surprised by the wide interest engendered by this research. This acceptance may be due to a growing spirit of professionalism among personnel managers. At least we certainly hope that this is the case.

The 1965 Cattell Proposal

Building on leads furnished by Webster's brilliant series of research studies, we proposed a study of the stability, generality, validity, and modifiability of employment interviewers' stereotypes. Webster and his students observed that interviewers apparently make decisions by comparing job applicants with a stereotype of an ideal applicant. Initially, we advanced

plans designed primarily to investigate characteristics of these stereotypes, but later we broadened our perspective to focus on answering the following question: What factors affect the accuracy of behavior predictions based upon interpersonal perceptions and how may the accuracy of such predictions be increased? This broader research question is much more in keeping with the entire decision making approach advanced by Webster. Discussing the decision making approach, Webster comments, "There can be no question that the problems of reliability and validity are of fundamental importance to the interview, but there is an indirect as well as a direct approach to them. Until the factors which play a systematic role in determining the final decision of the interviewer are revealed, the limits of reliability and validity cannot be known." (Webster, 1964 p.2).

Our proposal to the National Science Foundation outlined a program of research for studying interpersonal perception and behavior prediction in the employment interview. The program was divided into two phases, the first which is currently being concluded.

Phase I called for the development of two sets of standardized research instruments, the first, a set of Applicant Description Q-Decks, and the second, a series of Job Behavior Scales. The Q-Decks will be comprised of 60 to 90 descriptive statements sampling the domain of information about job applicants processed during an employment interview. They will be used by interviewers for systematically recording their impressions of job applicants in both laboratory and field interview settings. The Job Behavior Scales, designed for describing job behavior in each of several occupations, will be used by interviewers, supervisors, and other observers to assess the accuracy (validity) of interviewer's impressions, decisions, and predictions.

Phase II of our research program consists of a series of laboratory and field investigations. We have already made some starts in these studies, but by and large they are yet to be done. They will be described more fully in the final section of this report.

Phase One: Instrument Development

Our research plans call for the development of two major sets of research instruments in each of several major occupational areas: managers, engineers, scientists, salesmen, secretaries and clerks, and nurses. The first sets of instruments are known as the Applicant Description Q-Decks and the second

sets are known as the Job Behavior Scales.

Applicant Description Q-Decks. The Applicant Description Q-Decks will be used by employment interviewers in both laboratory and field studies to describe the job applicants they interview. The advantage of Q-Decks and technique when properly used is that it allows an assessment of the internal consistency of each descriptive sorting. Demonstrations of consistent responding are prerequisite to examining differences between interviews or differences within a particular interviewer over a period of time. Analysis of one interviewer's descriptions of a group of job applicants will yield information on that interviewer's stereotypes of "personal constructs" and on the information he uses to make employment decisions. When this analysis is extended to many interviewers working in diverse settings and industries, information will be available on the magnitude of situational and individual differences in information processing and decision making in employment interview decisions.

To assure exhaustive coverage of all domains of information about job applicants, about 1200 short descriptive statements were gathered from several different sources and were edited into a standard format. This initial pool of items underwent several screenings by the staff to eliminate ambiguous objectionable and presumably irrelevant items. Also, we tried to minimize content duplication and overlap in these preliminary screenings. A total of 730 items was retained and sorted into classes based on content and format. The pool of 730 items is divided into three pools, the first of which is called Applicant Characteristics, and contains items such as "Has been married ten years", "Owns his own home", "Active in one outside group", "Is in heavy debt", "Mumbled", "Slouched in his chair", "Has bad breath", and so on. There are 310 items in the Applicant Characteristic sub-pool. The second sub-pool of 180 statements concerns Things the Applicant Said. This pool reports statements the applicant made during the interview and consists of items such as: "Says he likes writing reports", "Says he is very dependable", "Says he does not drink", "Says he is unhappy in his marriage", "Says he liked the Army" and so on. The final sub-pool contains 240 statements concerning Impressions the Applicant Created. Statements in this pool consist of descriptive statements such as "Sensitive to others' needs", as well as adjectives such as: "Trustworthy", "Loyal", "Courteous", etc.

Rather than reduce the size of this item pool further by staff judgements, it was decided that the entire pool should be presented to groups of employment interviewers for their

independent judgments. Since no one person could reasonably be expected to judge 730 items reliable, the pool was divided into four parallel sets of items and questionnaires were constructed for each of the four sets. Each questionnaire contained 250 statements, 160 items which were specific to that questionnaire and 90 items common to all four questionnaires. The item overlap between questionnaires was desired so we'd be assured of large sample data for at least some of the items and also to provide each respondent with the same item content following each page of instruction, thus balancing warm-up and serial order effects in all four item sets.

Three different forms, differing in the judgment the respondent is asked to make, were constructed for each of the four sets of items. Items will be selected for the Applicant Description Q-Decks on the basis of these three kinds of judgments. The first judgment, made in Form F, concerns the "Favorability" (or desirability) of the content of the 250 items in the set. The respondent judges the "goodness" of possessing each specific characteristic (Has two years of College) in the context of a particular occupational group such as secretary, engineer, management trainee, etc. This judgment yields estimates of the desirability of the item, the basic control variable in Q-Deck item selection.

In Form B, respondents estimate the relative frequency (base rate) with which the item characteristic appears among job applicants in each of the occupations being investigated. This relative frequency judgment is to guard against the Barnum effect in descriptions by screening out items that are so general that they apply to every job applicant and items that are so rare that they apply to no one.

In Form R, respondents indicate the importance of each item as a contributor to hiring decisions. This importance judgment is to estimate the relevance of each item to selection in the various occupations and will be used chiefly to exclude irrelevant items from the Q-Decks in each occupational group.

Concurrently with developing questionnaires, a great effort was put into building a large, diverse sample of interviewers. A large sample was needed especially because the items were to be judged in the context of specific jobs such as secretary, engineer, management trainee, or sales trainee. The need for a large sample is quite evident, concerning three forms and four different sets of items, each to be completed in the context of several different occupational areas.

Sixty-four hundred copies of the various questionnaires were distributed, chiefly to members of the American Society for Personnel Administration. About 3700 questionnaires were

returned and are useable. A general Q-Deck is being developed in each of six occupational areas: general management, management trainee, engineer, secretary, clerk-typist and general sales. These Q-Decks will be available for field use shortly. Far more importantly, however, a report containing all item data is forthcoming. This report and the data in it offers the possibility of tailor-making Q-Decks within each specific occupational context. We feel there is much to be gained by tailoring research instruments to the unique circumstances present in each situation. The entire pool and all item data will be available soon.

Job Behavior Scales. The second major set of research instruments being developed are the Job Behavior Scales in each of the several occupations under study. The scales will be used by interviewers to predict the job behaviors of applicants they hire and will be used by supervisors, co-workers and outside observers to describe the job behavior of job incumbents. These scales are crucial instruments in this research for they are the base on which the accuracy of interviewer's decisions and behavior predictions will be assessed.

The Job Behavior Scales in each occupational area are being developed according to the rationale outlined by Smith and Kendall (1963) for developing scaled-expectation rating scales. The observational system for recording job behavior can best minimize biases (halo, leniency, etc.) in observations by "selling" the observers on the desirability of completing their observations with care and also by developing scales anchored by behavior descriptions which are firmly defined and possess the same meaning for everyone asked to complete the scales. Smith and Kendall believe that the most effective way of achieving these goals is to involve the scale users in each step of scale development, taking great pains to maintain clearly understood behavior descriptions at each stage.

Our first endeavor has been to develop Job Behavior Scales for use in research, scientific and technical occupations. A series of conferences was held with 40 research administrators, most of whom have advanced degrees in science and engineering fields. Following Smith and Kendall's procedures (collecting nominations of critical traits, gathering critical incidents, editing the incidents, sorting incidents into traits and finally scaling the surviving incidents) yielded scales for nine qualities of research effectiveness: Research Opportunities, Planning and Organization, Technical Competence, Communication Skills, Working with Others, Acceptance of Organizational Responsibility, Self Starter, Persistence and Interpretation of Results. Each of these scales is defined by at least

six behavior examples, and field use of these scales is now underway. Experience gained in developing the research scales has been used to redesign and streamline the scale development procedures. We are currently working in managerial and clerical occupational areas to develop sets of Job Behavior Scales. These scales will be available shortly and a report is being prepared.

Phase II: Laboratory and Field Studies

Throughout this research program, we are committed to a multimethod, multisetting approach, and we will undertake studies in the field, in the laboratory and in simulated settings. Our research program is fixed on no single method, setting or point of view. Instead, we bring a diversity of research approaches to bear in seeking answers to the Riddle of the Interview.

While the bulk of our research is yet to be started, a few beginnings have been made. For example, a series of research studies is being carried out in cooperation with the Placement Office of the School of Business Administration of the University of Minnesota. The Placement Office has set aside time in each college recruiter's schedule so that they may participate in our studies. The studies so far have been concerned with stereotype accuracy (identifying vocational interests of Certified Public Accountants), order effects in personnel decisions, and contrast effects in making interpersonal evaluations.

To date, we have begun preparation for our laboratory investigations in two different ways. First, we have established a course in employment interviewing offered in the General Extension Division at the University of Minnesota. This course, has been offered during the last two years and class members, most of whom work as employment interviewers, have participated in pilot studies and have made suggestions about future research. This course was established in part, to provide a sympathetic and interested group of interviewers in the local area who would be amenable to participation in future research studies.

A second start toward preparing the ground for laboratory studies has been the establishment of a series of Workshops in Employment Interviewing. One workshop has already been held and several are scheduled for the coming year. The Workshops are offered to provide training in interviewing skills, but such workshops will be a major site for laboratory studies which we have planned. Research conducted during these workshops will examine such variables as knowledge of results and its effects

on decision accuracy, and variables which might influence interrater agreement. Experimental manipulations of the order of information and kinds of information presented to interviewers will be relatively easy to accomplish in the workshop training setting. The significant advantage of these workshops is that they will afford both a heterogeneous sample of interviewers and an opportunity to conduct studies concerning a wide range of research questions.

Our forthcoming laboratory and field studies are organized so that we may concurrently study three large classes of variables. The variables influencing employment interviewer's decisions can be organized into three broad classes. First: characteristics of the interviewer himself; secondly, characteristics of the job applicants; and thirdly, variables concerning the interaction situation. We seek to study each of these broad classes of variables and the interactions between them; thus, our typical experimental design will involve an interviewer interacting with a job applicant for the express purpose of learning as much about the job applicant as possible. Within this basic framework we will study a wide variety of factors such as those outlined below.

Job Applicants. Interviewers will seek to learn as much as possible about job applicants who will be presented in a number of different ways. These include 1) actual job applicants in real employment settings 2) job applicants who have been rehearsed to portray particular behaviors and to try to create certain impressions 3) standardized job applicants recorded on video tape 4) experienced employees for whom abundant job behavior information is already available for immediate "validation" of interviewer's impression and predictions and 5) synthesized job applicants described with file information consisting mostly of descriptive phrases drawn from our item pool developed in connection with the Applicant Description Q-Decks.

Interviewers. Our interviewers will include: 1) Employment interviewers, personnel men and supervisors and managers working in cooperating firms from whom we can obtain Q-Deck and Job Behavior Scale responses over a period of time ranging from the first interview with an applicant to various later points in time as the applicant gains experience on the job and becomes known to other observers in the firm, 2) Present and former students from the extension division course in employment interviewing taught by Hakel, 3) Company interviewers and personnel men who conduct interviews with students in the Placement Office in the University of Minnesota's School of Business Administration, 4) Company officials participating in the continuing series of Workshops on Employment Interviewing

conducted by Hakel and Dunnette, and 5) Students drawn from the Psychology Department Subject Pool and students in the School of Business Administration who express interest in taking part in our research. The students will be used when we are undertaking studies demanding large sample sizes or when a comparison group may be desirable for unraveling obscure results.

Interaction situations. The nature of the interaction between interviewers and job applicants will take many forms. Some of the patterns we intend to use are these: 1) Perhaps the simplest form of interaction will involve interviewers' examination of various synthesized job applicants. Here we can systematically study both the nature and the process of impression formation in general and also as dependent on a variety of interviewer characteristics. 2) Board interviews (that is, several interviewers in interaction concurrently with a single job applicant) will be used to study the extent and nature of differences and impression formed and predictions made by interviewers. In this way the "implicit personality theories" or "personal constructs" of interviewers may be examined. Moreover, by controlling the stimuli emitted by the job applicants (e.g., by using rehearsed applicants) we can study interview similarities and differences in impressions formed as a function of the job applicant's behavior during the interview interaction. 3) Multiple interviews (that is, several interviewers interacting in sequence with a single job applicant) will be used to extend the knowledge we gain from the board interviews. Board interviews will typically be conducted in the laboratory settings and multiple interviews in field studies, and thus, comparisons based on results obtained in the two designs will be particularly meaningful. Analysis will be made of the relative amounts of descriptive and predictive variance due to interviewers and to job applicants. Additionally, knowledge about differences between interviewers in the nature of their "implicit personality theories" can be taken into account. 4) Simple dyads will also be studied directly. Here again the advantages of a careful mix between laboratory and field studies is evident. At one extreme, we will obtain responses and observations from the natural setting of a series of real employment interviews between employment interviewers and job applicants. At the other extreme, we will obtain responses and observations from tightly controlled dyadic situations where the job applicants have been carefully rehearsed and the structure (e.g., highly patterned vs laissez faire) of the interview interaction, the content to be presented, and the sequence of presentation have been carefully predetermined and systematically altered.

We Need Your Help

We have undertaken this program of basic research to provide some answers to fundamental questions about the usefulness and importance of the employment interview. So far we have enjoyed a great deal of support from not only the National Science Foundation but from psychologists, personnel managers and managers in a variety of positions in industry. Nevertheless, because of the broad scope of this research program, we need your help in locating companies which might collaborate in field studies, in locating people who would aid us in the design of studies both in laboratory and field settings, and in the form of suggestions about ways in which we might proceed. This project will yield knowledge which will be useful in designing and engineering the employment interview of tomorrow, and will also lead to further professional and scientific development of personnel psychology. We need your help, and we urge you to share in the redevelopment of the employment interview as a personnel selection technique.

References

Smith, Patricia C. and Kendall, L. M. Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47, 149-155.

Webster, E. C. Decision making in the employment interview. Montreal: McGill University Industrial Relations Centre, 1964.

INVASION OF PRIVACY As Seen By Industrial Psychologists by Richard S. Barrett, Case and Company, Inc.

Recent discussions of the invasion of privacy have been typified by personal opinion, backed by anecdotal evidence selected by the writer to support his views. No one had surveyed in a systematic fashion the views of one of the most concerned groups, industrial psychologists.

Accordingly, in the middle of December 1967, a questionnaire was sent to the 978 fellows, members and associates of the Division of Industrial Psychology who lived in the Western Hemisphere. Of these, 475 or 48 percent returned questionnaires. Four hundred fifty-eight usable replies were received in time to be included in the tallying.

Since many of the respondents expressed interest in the results, I have prepared the following preliminary tabulations. (All figures are percentages.)

I extend my thanks to my colleagues who made this survey possible.

TABLE I

How are you as a psychologist involved in selection (not counting selection of your own staff)? Mark all that apply.

<u>58</u>	1. Evaluate individual applicants.
<u>81</u>	2. Build, research, or give advice on selection procedures (not including individual evaluation).
<u>31</u>	3. Teach, or supervise research by students.
<u>6</u>	4. Give opinion as a member of the staff of a governmental agency that regulates testing.
<u>14</u>	5. Take no part in selection.

TABLE II

Is it an invasion of privacy for the psychologist to get information of the type that co-workers -

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Opinion</u>	<u>Depends</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Response</u>
- learn in the regular course of work (Attitudes toward supervision, temper)?	<u>6</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
- generally learn through ordinary social contact (Family, social drinking)?	<u>13</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
- do not ordinarily learn unless they become close friends (Psychiatric history)?	<u>34</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

TABLE III

Mark the abuses of information collected during employment that occur often enough to be a matter of concern to the profession.

<u>61</u>	Information is improperly distributed to those who have no legitimate need to see it.
<u>66</u>	Raw scores, reports on personality tests, etc., are distributed to those who are not trained to interpret them.
<u>48</u>	Material is kept too long, and enters into decisions after it has become obsolete.
<u>44</u>	Damaging information is accepted without adequate verification.
<u>12</u>	Information is collected to satisfy voyeuristic interests.
<u>19</u>	Significant items of information are collected that should not be gathered in the first place.

TABLE IV

How serious is the invasion of privacy in selection?

24 Not at all 58 Moderate 10 Serious 1 Critical
 1 Depends 6 No Response

How well does the psychological profession control abuses of the invasion of privacy?

8 Not needed 41 Adequately 39 Poorly, improvement needed
 0 Depends 12 No Response

TABLE V

Acceptability of Instruments

	Acceptable in most every respect	Generally acceptable, some questionable features	Not acceptable because of invasion of privacy	No opinion	Depends	No response
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory	<u>17</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Activity Vector Analysis	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>
Edwards Personal Preference Schedule	<u>43</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Guilford-Zimmerman Personnel Inventory	<u>47</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Kuder Preference Record	<u>80</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
Thematic Apperception Test	<u>32</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Rorschach Test	<u>29</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Purdue Pegboard	<u>83</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale	<u>79</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Short Employment Tests	<u>77</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Polygraph Tests	<u>11</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11</u>
Interviews by Psychologists	<u>55</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
Interviews by Personnel Department	<u>58</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Interviews by Prospective Supervisors	<u>64</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Background surveys	<u>49</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
References from previous employers	<u>67</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>

TABLE VI

Acceptability of Types of Instruments

	Acceptable in most every respect	Generally acceptable, some questionable features	Not acceptable because of invasion of privacy	No opinion	Depends	No response
Previous earnings	<u>67</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Financial assets and liabilities	<u>25</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Relations with parents and siblings	<u>17</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Marital adjustment	<u>15</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
Sexual deviation	<u>11</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
Age	<u>77</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Racial or ethnic background	<u>25</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Religious beliefs	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Political beliefs	<u>9</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
School grades	<u>75</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Extra curricular activities	<u>75</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Address and telephone number	<u>91</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Tested intelligence	<u>66</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
General health	<u>80</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Digestion, 'nervous stomach'	<u>43</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Use of alcohol	<u>38</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Use of habit-forming drugs	<u>44</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Police Record	<u>44</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Psychiatric history	<u>23</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>

RESEARCH NOTES

The Educational Testing Service has provided the following listing of Research Bulletins for the period November 1967-April 1968.

- RB-67-52 Multiple-Choice Questions and Student Characteristics. Henry A. Alder, Julia A. Carlson, and Margaret G. Hermann.
- RB-67-53 A Description of Points of View in Esthetic Judgments in Terms of Similarity Dimensions. Stephen P. Klein.
- RB-67-54 On the Oblique Rotation of a Factor Matrix to a Specified Pattern. Michael Browne and Walter Kristof.
- RB-67-55 Relevance of Rater-Ratee Acquaintance in the Validity and Reliability of Ratings. Norman E. Freeberg.
- RB-67-56 Rationality and Achievement: A Comparison of the Atkinson-McClelland and Kogan-Wallach Formulations. Henry A. Alker.
- RB-67-57 "Test-Wiseness" on Personality Scales. Lawrence J. Stricker.
- RB-67-58 Desirability Judgments and Self-Reports as Predictors of Social Behavior. Lawrence J. Stricker, Samuel Messick, and Douglas N. Jackson.
- RB-68-1 Donations to the Needy: Correlates of Financial Contributions to the Destitute. James H. Bryan and Michael Davenport.
- RB-68-2 Estimation of Latent Ability Using a Response Pattern of Graded Scores. Fumi Samejima.
- RB-68-3 Progressive Matrices: An Experimental Developmental, Nonfactorial Analysis. Paul I. Jacobs and Mary Vandeventer.

- RB-68-4 An Exploratory Study of Word Associations of Negro College Students. Leon H. Belcher and Joel T. Campbell.
- RB-68-5 The Development and Evaluation of Several Programmed Testing Methods. Robert L. Linn, Donald A. Rock, and T. Anne Cleary.
- RB-68-6 The Nature of Essay Grades in Law School. Stephen P. Klein and Frederick M. Hart.
- RB-68-7 Variability of Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 Reliability Estimates. T. Anne Cleary and Robert L. Linn.
- RB-68-8 Estimating Item Characteristic Curves Without Knowledge of Their Mathematical Form. Frederic M. Lord.
- RB-68-9 Indirect Methods of Assessing Personality. Margaret G. Hermann.
- RB-68-10 Financial Aid Awards of High School Seniors in the Northeastern States as a Function of Socioeconomic Class. George A. Schlekat.
- RB-68-11 A Two Stage Decision Approach to the Selection Problem. Donald A. Rock, John L. Barone, and Robert F. Boldt.
- RB-68-12 The Role of Affect in Short-Term Memory for Paired Associates. Calvin F. Nodine and James H. Korn.
- RB-68-13 Personality Development and Concepts of Structure. Walter Emmerich.
- RB-68-14 The Factor Analysis of African Abilities and Attainments: Constructs Across Cultures. S. H. Irvine.
- RB-68-15 Transformations Which Render Curves Parallel. Michael V. Levine.
- RB-68-16 Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Model Inconsistency and Its Effect on Self-Sacrifice. James H. Bryan.

- RB-68-17 Criterion Scaling of Questionnaire Items for Regression Analysis. Albert E. Beaton.
- RB-68-18 Factor Stability of a Student Biographical Information Blank Over Several Grade Levels. Norman E. Freeberg and Donald A. Rock.
- RB-68-19 A General Approach to Procrustes Pattern Rotation. Gunnar T. Gruvaeus.

Copies of these bulletins may be obtained from Mrs. J. F. Matlack Division of Psychological Services, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

Professional Notes

Salary Survey Returns Disappointingly Low

Norm Vincent reports that only 55% of Division 14 members completed and returned the salary survey which was mailed April 10th. We had hoped for a return of at least 75% so we could be reasonably sure of having a fairly representative sample of our profession. Furthermore, since we intend to conduct the survey annually and develop longitudinal data, we wanted to start with a solid base.

Some questions have arisen concerning our request for your social security number on the survey form. In order to maintain meaningful longitudinal salary data it is necessary to keep a record of each individual's annual salary over a period of years; thus, we needed an identification number for each individual. The number must be unique, it must be remembered and used by the individual year after year, and it must preserve the anonymity of the survey. Social security numbers seemed to be a "natural" for these purposes. A further advantage of SS numbers is that it is not necessary for us to maintain a "key" to make certain each individual uses the same code number each year. However, if you object to using your SS number, simply create a nine digit number of your own, remember it and use it on the survey each year.

We have decided to hold up the analysis for a while to give you a chance to get your survey in. Please send it to:

Dr. Norman L. Vincent
State Farm Insurance Companies
112 East Washington Street
Bloomington, Illinois 61701

If you have misplaced the form, drop Norm a card asking for a new one.

A report of the results will be made at the Division 14 business meeting in San Francisco in September.

Fair Tests and Fair Employment
Jack Sawyer
Northwestern University

There appears to be wide consensus, in theory if not in practice, with the view reflected by Marvin Dunnette in the Summer 1967 issue of *The Industrial Psychologist*: That among applicants with equal expected job performance, tests should not reject higher proportions of those who are members of a minority group. In attempting to provide a procedure with which "everyone--Office of Federal Contract Compliance, test pub-

lishers, test users, Division 14 members, members of minority groups --- would be happy, "Dunnette proposes two essential features to determine whether hiring procedures comply with Executive Order 11426: (1) Determine whether an employer is hiring, from among applicants for jobs of each given level, approximately equal proportions of minority group members and of non-minority group members. If so, the employer is judged to be complying with the order, whatever his use of tests. (He might reasonably, for example, if he needs to hire 40% of all applicants, take the 40% of the whites who score highest, and the 40% of the Negroes who score highest.) (2) If he is not hiring equal proportions, though, he would be required to conduct a validity study to demonstrate the validity of the test that results in unequal proportions. Careful provisions are specified for conduct of the validity study.

The order of application of these two provisions creates a critical choice, with considerable ramifications for individual justice. Until proven otherwise, should the test be considered guilty or innocent? In judging persons, the American legal norm is to assume innocence until guilt is proven. Scientific theories, on the other hand, must continually survive attempts at disproof before they are accepted. The selection problem contains both elements, and one must choose. We can assume the test valid until proven invalid, or we can assume until proven otherwise that a man of one race is as good a potential job performer as a man of another race. We cannot, in practice, choose both.

Society appears to be reaching consensus that the latter is the proper null hypothesis, and science has usually agreed that the former is not. This strongly suggests specifying the order of these two features so that disproportionate hiring is prohibited unless a study has already been done. To have disproportionate hiring simply a signal to initiate a study would necessarily create an inequity. Good studies take time; an employer might very reasonably conclude that a two-year follow-up study was required. Meanwhile, for the individual, justice delayed is justice denied. The man looking for work cannot afford to wait.

Requiring that tests be proven before they are used in a way that rejects disproportionate numbers of minority group members is like testing the efficacy and side effects of a drug before using it. If the test is to be used before its efficacy has been demonstrated, then precaution should be taken against possibility of the particular detrimental "side effect" -- racial discrimination in employment--that society has chosen to consider it important to avoid. As Dunnette has indicated, many possible biases exist in validity studies, and good studies min-

imize these. But during the study procedure, the individual should be protected. He should not suffer while determinations are made. Equity requires this priority.

Now if test validation always precedes any disproportionate hiring, then the reward structure for the employer is somewhat altered. He has the burden of showing that a test is valid before using it in a way that rejects disproportionate numbers of minority group members. Tests are frequently employed, of course, prior to local validation--and with good reason. Previous experience often permits the judgment that the expected value of a test in a somewhat different situation is high enough to justify its use. This is highly appropriate; profitability is exactly the criterion a business enterprise should employ, and partially validated tests may meet it. In the area of potential racial discrimination, however, more rigorous standards are required, quite possibly calling for more stringent validation than an employer would have otherwise found necessary.

If such validation is more expensive, than an employer, before undertaking it, should consider whether he thinks that use of the test would in fact lead to disproportionate selection. If not, there is no point in the finer validation, since he is already meeting the Executive Order. If the further research would in fact document the validity of disproportionate rejection of Negroes, this simply means that Negroes, on the average, perform more poorly than whites. So, if "successful," the validation study will have been able to show the test's validity and the Negro's inferior job performance. It seems likely that, given enough effort, this could be done. It is unnecessary to enter the heredity-environment controversy to feel reasonably confident that--for whatever reasons--in most jobs, a randomly selected Negro would be expected to perform at a lower level than a randomly selected white. None of the hundreds of studies, by itself, nor all of them together, control for all possible biases, but the fact remains that in gross performance as typically evaluated and not controlling for anything, Negro performance is generally lower. But in a given instance, this is only presumption, and any minority group member acting in his self-interest--as may increasingly be expected--should insist upon specific demonstration that the bases of discrimination were "justified" in lower job performance. So studies would be called for to document lower Negro performances, in every firm of 50 or more employees--a particularly unappealing prospect.

Requiring that the employer hire proportionate numbers until validity is demonstrated also changes the reward structure in another way. If an employer is hiring equal proportions of

Negroes, he will need, if he believes Negroes to have less aptitude for the job, to institute training programs to compensate for this. This, I suggest, is a much better long run use of resources. Suppose in fact that an applicant is truly less promising. Why not invest the resources that would be spent in documenting this unhappy situation to help remedy it? Substitute for studies that document Negro inferior job performance training programs that help eliminate the disparity. The most productive goal, for both individual and institution, is not to demonstrate past deficiency, but to develop future ability.

Recent issues of the Cross-Cultural Social Psychology Newsletter, edited by Harry Triandis, had announcements that will be of interest to members; a publication edited by Fred Wickert, and an appeal from Don Campbell. The following items are excerpted from that Newsletter.

Wickert, F. R. (Ed.) Readings in African Psychology from French Language Sources. East Lansing (Michigan): African Studies Center, 1967. Pp. 381.

Anyone planning psychological or related behavioral science research in ex-French Africa should consult this volume for English translations of the cream of French-language writings in this area. Some of the research reported, especially on applied topics and research methodology, is quite good. Other items may not say much for the quality of some of the work done in Africa. Nevertheless, the materials are now collected and made generally accessible.

Triandis, Harry C. and Vassiliou, Vasso. A comparative analysis of subjective culture. Technical Report No. 55, October, 1967, Urbana, Illinois: Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory, University of Illinois.

THE BATTLE FOR CRITERIA

Leroy N. Vernon

The Vernon Psychological Laboratory

For a group of people who want to be known as highly creative, psychologists have displayed a most pedestrian and unimaginative approach to the problem of finding criteria to be used in validation. Study after study loosely identifies the objective of some business enterprise, devises or discovers some test scores or items which looks as though they might be predictive of "success", and then uses for its criterion the expressed opinions of certain individuals, usually of superior echelon status. We lament about the usual findings which are that different raters do not agree with each other very well, we can usually demonstrate that the raters do not agree with themselves very well, we make only feeble efforts to control the information operative in the rater's mind at the time of rating or to define the concepts and terms used in rating, and then we come out unhappy because our presumed predictors are not more successful at predicting these uncertainties.

Just possibly, the self-image of ourselves as creative people gets in our way. It may cause us to invent a criterion when we could discover one. Judgments are continually being made and actions taken in the conduct of business which classify men, often with more certainty than ratings; they are often judgments made "in the heat of battle" with the outcome of the battle hanging on the decision.

One obvious illustration of the kind of criterion I am talking about is the decision to fire a man because of unsatisfactory performance on the job. Another action significant of success is promotion of a man to a job of higher echelon. These decisions are not taken lightly, and while they are liable to the errors of all human judgment, it is reasonable to believe that in businesses which succeed in a competitive economy these decisions will be more right than wrong. A population of men fired for inadequacy on the job contrasted with a population of men promoted from that job could hardly fail to provide the opportunity for the discovery of validity. A criterion like this is not invented, - it is discovered.

A story may illustrate what is meant here by the discovery of criteria. A psychologist, talking to the President of a large corporation, is urging upon him the desirability of more

of what Odiorne calls "innovative personnel practices". He points out the fact that the average age of their top twenty-five executives is high and raises question as to whether adequate replacements are available. To answer the question the President reaches in his credenza and pulls out a carefully prepared review of his organization (highly confidential), in which he lists the incumbents and his own first choice replacements for his top seventeen jobs.

Here is criterion material of high quality. If these men are set off against a population representative of the company as a whole, or against a population representative of contemporary management trainees, or a collection of management failures (if such can be found), the search for predictors will not stumble for want of a criterion.

One factor militating against effective validation research is the mobility of psychologists. Long range prediction could be tested in many situations with longitudinal studies which are impossible if the experimenter is not going to be around that long. Of course, not only the psychologist but the company situation may change and in changing destroy longitudinal studies otherwise possible. Longitudinal studies require some tenure for both researcher and object situation. One wonders how a man whose tenure on job after job is two or three years ever carries any project of consequence through to much fruition. The answer may be that he doesn't; perhaps he lives a life of starting bigger and better projects. Until we have more situations where a psychologist will design a long range prediction problem and then stay long enough to see it through, the disappointingly concurrent nature of the validities we live by will be with us. Whenever a study becomes possible which tests prediction by waiting for actual outcome, it should be highly prized.

Editor's Note

ABEPP A.B.D.

In the Official Divisional Business section of this issue of TIP reference is made to the fact that few members of Division 14 have applied to take the examination for the ABEPP Diplomat and the suggestion has been made to open up the "Grandfather's Clause" and that, perhaps, the Division should have "Honorary Diplomates."

It may be that I am only a wee small voice crying in the wilderness, but I am opposed to both of these suggestions and feel that neither should be given further consideration until other measures are considered if, in fact, the small number of Diplomates is a problem. It is interesting to me that, on the one hand, we are considering watering down one distinction available to Division members, the Diplomat, while on the other, we are making it more difficult to obtain another distinction, that of Fellowship. From a biased point of view, it appears that at one time, to become a Fellow, one needed only to be a member of the association for a certain number of years and have a few friends. Reading Ed Rundquist's report and material from the APA, you will see that this is no longer true.

I believe that many members of the Division could pass the ABEPP examination without much difficulty, and I believe that more should be encouraged to take the examination. If necessary, perhaps the Fellows and/or the Diplomates could be asked to prepare a booklet similar to the one I saw advertised, "How to Pass the Miller Analogies Test", although even this is, I believe, unnecessary since ABEPP does issue a very helpful booklet to those taking the examination.

John R. Boulger

p.s. If it is not obvious from the above, I am a Diplomat, but not a Fellow.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

Officers and Committees, Division of Industrial Psychology, 1967-68

President	Philip Ash	Representatives to	Bernard Bass (1965-68)
President-Elect	Stanley E. Seashore	APA Council	Herbert H. Meyer (1966-69)
Past President	Marvin D. Dunnette		Douglas Bray (1967-70)
Secretary-Treasurer	Herbert H. Meyer		Patricia C. Smith (1967-70)

Member at Large of Executive Committee	Robert Perloff (1965-68)
	Clifford Jurgensen (1966-69)
	Lyman W. Porter (1967-70)

<u>Education and Training</u>	<u>Fellowship</u>	<u>Membership</u>
A. C. MacKinney, Chairman	Edward A. Rundquist, Chairman	Albert S. Thompson, Chairman
C. J. Bartlett	Douglas Bray	John S. Gorsuch
George W. England	Charles S. Dewey	Seymour Levy
Edward E. Lawler	B. von Haller Gilmer	
Don Livingston		<u>Public Relations</u>
Howard Maher		J. E. Uhlman, Chairman
Ernest J. McCormick	<u>Program</u>	Douglas W. Bray
Treadway C. Parker	Lyman Porter, Chairman	John Butler
	Felix Lopez, Chairman-Elect	Arthur J. Drucker
<u>Professional Affairs</u>	Lewis Albright	Frank W. Uhlmann
Joseph H. McPherson,	Frank Friedlander	
Chairman	Robert M. Guion	<u>Scientific Affairs</u>
Seymour Levy	Melvin R. Marks	Harry C. Triandis, Chairman
Theodore R. Lindbom	John B. Miner	Fred L. Herzberg
Jarold S. Niven		Wayne K. Kirchner
Leroy A. Vernon	<u>Workshop</u>	Floyd Mann
	Jack Parrish, Chairman	James C. Naylor
<u>Special Interest Activities</u>	Paul A. Banas	Patricia C. Smith
James J. Keenan, Chairman	Ralph R. Canter	Paul Thayer
William C. Buel	Raymond D. Hedberg	Karl E. Weick
Jack C. Denton	Erich P. Prien	
Eugene Jacobson	Jay T. Rusmore	<u>Newsletter Editor:</u>
James Vaughan	C. Michael York	John R. Boulger
	John V. Zuckerman	

Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Student Fellowships

Henry R. Brenner, Co-Chairman	Edwin R. Henry, Co-Chairman
Ralph R. Canter	William McGehee
James R. Glennon	Herbert H. Meyer
L. Richard Hoffman	William A. Owens, Jr.
Raymond A. Katzell	Jack A. Parrish
A. C. MacKinney	Ross Stagner
P. W. Maloney	Joseph Weitz