

The *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist* is published three times yearly (April 1, August 1, and December 1) by the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association. The editorial office is located at the Graduate Division, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45431. Published by the Hamilton Printing Co., Hamilton, Ohio. Inquiries regarding advertising should be directed to Dr. Saul Scherzer, General Electric, Bldg. 27EE, Boston Ave., Bridgeport, Connecticut 06602.

Opinions expressed are those of the writers and do not necessarily reflect the official positions of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology unless so stated.

Address changes should be directed to APA, 1200 Seventeenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Subscriptions are included with membership in the Division. TIP circulation is approximately 2,000 which includes the membership of the Division, leaders in the industrial and academic communities, APA officers and board members, presidents of APA divisions, Editors of APA newsletters, graduate students in industrial-organizational psychology, and to libraries and graduate schools.

A.C. MacKinneyEditor

Associate Editors

Michael J. Kavanagh

J.P. Siegel

Mark Van Slyke

Advertising Manager

Saul Scherzer

Secretary-Treasurer, Div. 14

Dr. Paul Thayer

LIAMA

170 Sigourney St.

Hartford, Conn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

President's Column	1
Notes and News	2
Do EEOC and OFCC Guidelines Discriminate Against Blacks?	4
Membership Drive Announced	5
Ghiselli Wins APA Award	6
PR Committee Announces Liaison with ASPA	7
News from the North	8
Are EEOC Guidelines Applicable in the Public Sector?	10
Report from the Council of Representatives	11
Handbook of Industrial-Organizational Psychology	12
Proposed Bylaws Change	14
New Journal Article Awards	15
Cattell Awards for '73	15
1973 Workshops Announced	16
Workshops Registration Form	18
Hussein Resolution Under Study	19
Guidelines for Doctoral Education	20
Selection Testing and the Law	24

If a 500-word limit is room enough for something to be called a potpourri, this is it. It includes three unrelated areas of comment.

First. For several years, members of Division 14 have been concerned, almost preoccupied, with the actions of the Courts in cases involving fair employment practices; at least, some members (those whose professional activity involves employee selection) have been intensely aware of the impact of judicial decision on employment testing programs. Others who work in "less traditional" specialties may think of this as not of concern to them. If so, they should consider the case of **Long v. Ford Motor Company**. In a District Court decision, the Court considered and evaluated methods of performance appraisal, training, and job assignment and transfer. It does not appear that the decision was based on evaluation of any research data presented on these matters — but, then, neither was the **Griggs** decision. This decision has in it many statements worth pondering. "What must be understood . . . is that a black man should not be hired just because he is black. A black person who is hired solely for appearance sake and is inexperienced and not given thorough job training is likely to fail. If that occurs and he is then fired, one may conclude that just as he was hired because he was black, so he was fired because he was black." And, later: "To put a black person in a position for which he has been inadequately trained is not a way to eliminate racial discrimination, but rather an unthinking way to perpetuate it."

Can it be that preoccupation with the testing issues inherent in the fair employment problem has inhibited a fuller exploration of the implications of Title VII?

Second. A recent letter gently chides the field of industrial - organizational psychology for its apparent lack of concern in the nation's problems of health care delivery. It points out that "health care is the second largest industry in the country today and is predicted to become the largest by 1980." It seems unlikely that the writer wanted to point out an untapped source of fees, research ideas, or jobs for I-O psychologists; what he seeks is information about "the kinds of contributions that psychologists, other than clinical, might make to the health industry." The fact is often in the news that millions of Americans do not have reasonably close access to competent health care. There are probably many reasons, including poverty, the shortage of physicians in nonmetropolitan areas, or the overcrowding of hospitals by those who may not genuinely need to be in them. Whatever the reasons, it is likely that the concept of organization can apply to the health care system beyond hospital walls and that some of us can make real contributions to the effectiveness of such systems.

I should like to hear from members who are doing or have done work relevant to hospital and health care delivery problems.

Third. Not long after this issue is mailed, the President-elect will begin to name the Division 14 committee members for 1973-74. If you wish to volunteer or to nominate someone else, write to the chairman of the Committee on Committees: **Dr. Milton Hakel**, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 43210.

NOTES AND NEWS

Bob Perloff of the University of Pittsburgh has been appointed to the new APA Task Force for the Development of Criteria for Evaluating Graduate Training Programs. This new task force is being chaired by **Alexander Astin** of the American Council on Education. (Division 14-ers who have things to say about the evaluation/accreditation of doctoral programs by APA should make their ideas known to Bob.)

The **Professional Affairs Committee** seeks to obtain "cases" of experiences of industrial and organizational psychologists who have had a role in testing and discrimination issues that have gone to court. As a preliminary step in preparing a published case book (to aid future psychologists who may find themselves in similar situations) it is desired to collect narrative accounts (cases) of experiences from anyone who may have testified in court on this issue. If you are willing to share your experiences, please send your name, a brief description of the event, and your role in it to **Wayne Sorenson**, Chairman. Wayne's address is State Farm Insurance Companies, One State Farm Plaza, Bloomington, IL 61701.

The **Committee on Committees** seeks nominations of Division 14 members who would be interested in actively participating in the affairs of the division through service on one of the standing committees. Nominating letters should include the nominee's current address and phone number(s), pertinent background information, and committee assignment preferences. The committee is charged to "recommend appointments to all other standing committees to the incoming President" and the committee "shall make a special effort to see that each year some members of the Division who have not served frequently in the past are appointed to standing committees". Nominations should be sent by May 15 to **Milt Hakel**, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210.

TIP has been informed that **John B. Miner** will join Georgia State University's Department of Management, School of Business Administration, in the fall, 1973. Jack will be the school's first research professor, in addition to his duties as editor of the **Journal of the Academy of Management**.

TIP is delighted to announce the appointment of **Saul Scherzer** as Advertising and Business Manager. Saul is with General Electric in Bridgeport, Connecticut. Inquiries about advertising should be addressed to him.

Mildred Katzell has been appointed Vice-President of the Professional Examination Service, New York City. PES develops written examinations and other evaluation procedures in health and health-related fields for use in personnel selection, promotion, and licensure. Previously, Dr. Katzell has been associated with the division of measurement of the National League for Nursing, most recently as director of that division. In 1972, Dr. Katzell edited "Women in the Work Force", published by Behavioral Publications.

Paul Thayer, Secretary-Treasurer, announces the establishment of the **Division 14 archives** at the Department of Industrial Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio. Dr. Thayer reports that voluminous records which have accrued since the division was established, have been purged of duplicate and trivial information and the remainder deposited at the University of Akron. This action not only removes the necessity of transporting old records each time the Secretary-Treasurer changes, but it establishes in a single secure location a valuable source for information of potential use by later researchers.

It was announced in the last issue of TIP, that the division's **Georgia Power Amicus Briefs** are being sold as a part of the total effort to raise funds to pay for the legal costs. This is a reminder that copies are available from President **Bob Guion**, Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403. The price to members is \$10.00 and to nonmembers is \$25.00. Your support is needed!

Paul Sparks announces that as of January 1, Humble Oil and Refining, was merged into Exxon Corp. (formerly Standard Oil Company of New Jersey). Humble becomes Exxon Company, USA, a division of Exxon Corporation. Paul's activities and responsibilities remain the same as previously.

CAPPS, the Council for the Advancement of Psychological Professions and Sciences, has named **Joseph L. Nellis**, a Washington attorney, as general counsel and legislative representative. Mr. Nellis has extensive experience in many kinds of litigation as well as in congressional legislative work. He has acted as counsel for both the House Committee on Select Crime and for the Senate Crime Investigating Committee.

Bob Perloff of the University of Pittsburgh has accepted a position as member of the editorial board of the new journal, **American Journal of Community Psychology**.

A major **New York City bank** is seeking **two** industrial-organizational psychologists, one to manage its personnel research function and one to work in the personnel research department. The former requires the doctorate plus experience and the latter the Master's plus experience or a new doctorate. Write TIP and we will put you in touch with the right person.

Dr. Doug Bray of AT & T is serving as the division's representative on the steering committee which is planning a **national conference on training in professional psychology** to be held in Vail, Colorado on July 26-30, 1973. Dr. Bray's long-term interest in education for professional psychologists is well known, and it is assumed that he will attend the conference. A subcommittee of the E & T Committee, **Bob Pritchard**, Chairman, is considering how the division can best contribute to the national conference.

Results of the **1971 Salary Survey** of Division 14 members are available from **Wayne Sorenson**, State Farm Insurance, One State Farm Plaza, Bloomington, IL 61701. Space limitations in TIP have prevented publication thus far, but readers who need these data may obtain them by writing Dr. Sorenson. Only limited numbers are available.

DO THE EEOC AND OFCC GUIDELINES DISCRIMINATE AGAINST BLACKS?

An Interview Regarding Recent Research
With William W. Ruch, Vice-President, Psychological Services, Inc.

by Michael J. Kavanagh

During a Division 14 seminar at the 1972 APA Convention (Differential Validation Under EEOC and OFCC Testing and Selection Regulations), William W. Ruch, responded positively to the above question. In his paper, "A reanalysis of published differential validity studies," Mr. Ruch reviewed twenty studies in the recent literature which addressed the empirical issue of differential validity; and he concluded that "following the OFCC and EEOC Guidelines will **reduce**, not increase, the employment opportunities of blacks." Let's see how he arrived at this conclusion.

In choosing the studies to be re-analysed, Mr. Ruch used the following four criteria: (1) studies were conducted in a business or industrial setting; (2) separate statistics were available for blacks and whites; (3) race was not confounded with some outside variable; and (4) necessary data were reported to enable a test of homogeneity of regression between racial groups. Although this selection limited the generality of his interpretation, Mr. Ruch noted that his conclusion agreed with that of another review of 10 military studies.

Differential validity for a test would occur when a given test has different criterion-related (predictive) validity for two groups differing on some characteristic, most obviously, race. The Guidelines state that, "Data must be generated and results separately reported for minority and non-minority groups whenever technically feasible . . . A test which is differentially valid may be used in groups for which it is valid but not for those in which it is not valid . . . where a test is valid for two groups (differentially) . . . cutoff scores must be set so as to predict the same probability of job success in both groups." It was this requirement of the Guidelines that prompted Mr. Ruch to conduct his research. The important question was: If these differential validity studies have been done, what can we learn from the results?

In order to examine the results of the 20 studies, Mr. Ruch computed three significance tests for homogeneity of regression between whites and blacks within each study. After approximately 1600 tests had been run (due to multiple predictors and criteria within studies), he reported that "there was no evidence of differential validity" for these studies. This conclusion was based on the fact that neither the standard errors nor the slopes resulted in a significantly different pattern of results. (As a sidelight, Mr. Ruch, in a recent phone conversation, noted that the statistical procedure he used in re-analysing these studies has been recommended for establishing differential validity in the recent draft of **Standards for Development and Use of Educational and Psychological Tests** (APA Monitor, February, 1973).)

However, Mr. Ruch did report that the intercepts between whites and blacks did show a significant pattern. In non-technical terms, this means that the criterion scores of one group were being significantly overestimated. "If the tests were interpreted the same for both blacks and whites," according to Mr. Ruch, "they would systematically overestimate the criterion scores for blacks. That is, where a bias in the studies was found, it was in favor of blacks."

How then, does this fact lead to discrimination against blacks if one follows the guidelines? Mr. Ruch's final paragraph of his APA paper describes the situation as follows:

"If we follow the OFCC and EEOC Guidelines, and conduct validation studies separately for blacks, we are likely to find that between-group differences in test scores do not correspond to between-group differences in job performance (the intercept differences). If we then **follow** the Guidelines and **adjust cutoff scores** 'so as to predict the same probability of job success in both groups,' we will have to **raise**, not lower, the passing scores for blacks. Thus, following the OFCC and EEOC Guidelines will **reduce**, not increase, the employment opportunities of blacks."

Where does this now leave the practitioner? If the industrial psychologist follows the Guidelines and conducts differential validity studies, the evidence may indicate a personnel action that will bring less blacks into the organization (by raising passing scores for blacks). Considered in light of the pressure to increase the percentage of minority members, the practitioner might be in somewhat of a dilemma. Mr. Ruch, in addressing this problem, stated that it "looks like **right now** that practitioners **should follow the Guidelines** to protect their clients and/or organizations." However, Mr. Ruch ventured the opinion that it may be appropriate in the future for Industrial Psychologists to exert pressure to modify the Guidelines in light of emerging evidence.

Membership Drive Announced by Jack Larsen

The Membership Committee of Division 14 urges all Division members to work to increase membership in the Division by APA member psychologists who operate in the areas of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. The By-laws of the Division define Industrial-Organizational areas as those promoting human welfare through the utilization of psychology for aid in organizations whether business or public agency in nature.

The representation base of the Division depends upon those who are members of the Division allocating a part or all of their total votes to be represented by Division 14. Obviously, the greater the number of total base the more probable it is that the Division power base will be augmented.

If you will ask possible members if they are interested and send the name and address of the prospective member (or associate) to me, I shall immediately forward full application materials to that person. It would help, too, if members were to follow up a bit — the forms are rather long and the applicant does have to write two or three letters.

Sample three colleagues this week — old APA members "moved" into Industrial-Organizational areas, new graduates entering APA, "old" Industrial-Organizational types who just never bothered, and so on.

On a Management by Objective basis, our quota is 100 new members this year. We need your help.

GHISELLI WINS APA AWARD

In the last issue, TIP reported that **Edwin E. Ghiselli**, University of California, had been awarded the APA Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award, the first Division 14 member to be so honored. On behalf of the Division, President Guion wrote to Dr. Ghiselli. His letter and Dr. Ghiselli's reply are reprinted below.

January 30, 1973

Dr. Edwin E. Ghiselli
Department of Psychology
University of California - Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Ed:

I have at hand one of the nicest assignments I've ever been given: to write to you, on behalf of the Executive Committee of Division 14, to extend our collective congratulations to you for receiving the APA Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award. You have honored us as well as yourself, and we want to say thank you.

Tolman **would** have been proud, and not merely for your associations that day. The astonishing thing is that everything said in that glowing citation was actually true — and even an understatement of the contribution that you have made. You have set a standard that I hope many in our division will follow.

Besides, I'm mighty pleased to call you friend. I hope to get to the Berkeley area one of these days and I hope that I will see you when I do.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Guion
President

February 13, 1973

Dr. Robert M. Guion
Psychology Department
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Dear Bob,

Thank you for your warm and kind letter about my Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award. It came to me as a surprise, but a most gratifying one. I have interpreted the award as largely a recognition in the APA of the fact that we industrial psychologists do fundamental research into the nature of the mind of man, and that we do a great deal of it. Indeed, it seems to me that we are the only psychologists who devote their ef-

forts to the study of the ordinary man. We do not concern ourselves entirely with certain processes, as learning or perception, nor with particular individuals, as children or disturbed people. Rather our concern is with the broad spectrum of individuals who people the earth and who work to support their families and themselves, and who contribute to the general welfare of man. We are the psychologists of the ordinary man, and this is what my recognition was about. I am proud to have been an industrial psychologist.

I hope all goes well with you and your family. Perhaps I shall see you at the Montreal meetings. These meetings, I think, will be my last. As you may know I have retired from the University, in part because of health, and I am going to do as Harvey Carr said he was doing in retirement, review my life's work with pride and with shame.

Best regards,

Edwin E. Ghiselli
Professor Emeritus

P.R. COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES LIAISON WITH A.S.P.A. — RESEARCH GRANTS AVAILABLE by Jack Butler

The Public Relations Committee has established an ongoing relationship with the American Society for Personnel Administration (ASPA) which should bear considerable fruits over the years to come. Specifically, we have been given approval to publish items relative to activities in areas of mutual interest between ASPA and Division 14 members in the ASPA Newsletter, **Action**. Further, ASPA has indicated that they will be pleased to entertain research proposals from Division 14 members in areas that would contribute towards the betterment of Personnel-Industrial Relations functions. Proposals submitted this year should generally be in the range of \$2,000 to \$3,000. Any Division 14 member interested in submitting such proposals should do so to J. William Urschel, Chairman - Research Projects Sub-Committee, ASPA, P. O. Box 1986, Chicago, Illinois 60690.

The Public Relations Committee is also in the process of establishing a Speakers' Bureau made up of Division 14 members. This Speakers' Bureau list will be published with the individual's name and subjects on which he can speak. The publication will then be forwarded to various associations throughout the United States for their use. The questionnaire will be sent to all Division 14 members within the next month inquiring as to member's interest in making speaking engagements, fees, charge, subjects on which they would like to speak, etc. The information so collected will be compiled into a public speakers' list and distributed to a wide spectrum of organizations throughout the United States.

The Public Relations Committee is currently negotiating with six other organizations who are interested in establishing relationships with Division 14 similar to those that are currently enjoyed with ASPA. As soon as we have been able to perfect the model of Division 14 relationships with other organizations, through the experiences we are currently having with ASPA, we will actively pursue developing these relationships and announce the names of the other organizations to Division 14 membership.

News From The North

by J. P. Siegel

The 1973 meetings of APA will be held in Montreal and I could think of nothing more fitting than a sequence of articles describing recent activities by Industrial - Organizational psychologists in Canada. Canadian members of division 14 are playing active teaching, research as well as applied consulting roles.

Canada's First Chair In Organization Behavior

Division 14 member, **Robert J. House**, has accepted Canada's first university chair in Organizational Behaviour. The chair was established at the Faculty of Management Studies at the University of Toronto by a generous donation by Shell Canada Ltd.

John F. Bookout, president of Shell Canada, in announcing the chair said "Up until now, most of the work in behavioral science — that is, the reasons why people behave or perform in certain ways in the environment we call work — came from other countries. Since little work was done in this field in Canada, results of work done in other countries have been used here on the assumption that they were valid in the Canadian Milieu".

Bob House in accepting the chair noted "What goes on in the work environment for the worker not only has an effect on his physical and mental health, but also has spillover effects. Housewives and children, for example, have to live with people who — because of their work — are bringing problems home. I think Canada is in a position to avoid mistakes that have been made by other industrial societies, because it is still maturing."

Bob's research horizon contains a national sample survey of work determinants of mental health.

Perspectives on Industrial and Organizational Psychology In Canada

An interview with Dr. **Dan Ondrack**, chairman of the Organization Behavior division of the Canadian Association of Administrative Sciences.

The Organization Behavior division is one of five in the newly formed Canadian Association of Administrative Sciences. Dan feels that it has a potential membership of two hundred including many industrial and organizational psychologists who are also members of APA, CPA, and the Academy of Management. According to Dan this will serve as a forum for Canadians to get together with other Canadians to examine each others research and the unique problems of Organizational Psychology. Dan illustrated the need for such a forum by noting that there is no industrial division of CPA, there is no Canadian division of the Academy of Management, and APA division 14 offers no forum for Canadians.

In response to the question "Just what are the unique problems of Industrial and Organizational Psychology in Canada," Dan stated the historical absence of this field in Canada as forcing a legitimacy problem in Canada's organizations. Also, business organizations in general were seen as less advanced than United States firms in sophistication and practices.

Dr. Ondrack outlines several impediments to translating American Research to the Canadian setting: Canadian managers historically have had less university education and consequently a lower level of sophistication. Canadian firms are generally of smaller scale, thereby not formalizing personnel functions or organization departments. There appear to be life style differences in Canada with respect to use of leisure time and "getting ahead". Canada has a situation of dual cultures with separate histories, language, and values. In addition the branch plant nature of Canadian industry (i.e. heavy foreign ownership) has inhibited the development of personnel-industrial research in Canadian operations.

Fair employment practices have been occupying the attention of American industrial psychologists but this has not yet "spilled over" to Canada. The situation here is similar to the U.S. ten years ago in that there is very little federal legislation affecting the conduct of firms, and most provincial legislation has little in the way of an enforcement mechanism. Fair employment practices in Canada will probably refer more to discrimination of women than race discrimination.

The odds are long against the development of an Industrial-Organizational psychology program in Canadian universities. No such program exists now, and Dan described Canadian Psychology departments as very "experimental" in orientation, having a negative bias against applied psychology. The main hope for such a program, although remote, is in Faculties of Business where clusters of American trained Industrial-Organizational psychologists have been recruited.

Career Crossroads

An interview with Dr. **Robert F. Morrison**, Research director of Forty-plus of Canada.

Bob described Forty-plus as a non-profit organization established in Toronto in 1971 to provide counseling, guidance and job information to executives over 40 who are at career crossroads.

According to Bob there is virtually no comprehensive body of knowledge on the mid-life adult. Developmental and educational psychologists have studied children and young adults, while gerontology emphasized the aged; but the mid-life adult has been overlooked.

Bob noted that today's rate of change is making the middle-aged, mid-career executive more vulnerable to job obsolescence, a situation which affects the executive, his family and his employer.

Asked to describe the Research Program, Bob outlined a five year, three phase program involving such division fourteeners as Dr. **Peter Moon** of Saunders-Moon consultants and Dr. **D. T. Hall** of York University. The First Phase will study the effect of personal characteristics which may enhance, inhibit, or constrain the executives ability to learn and change. Bob hopes to be able to identify early the executive most likely to face problems of obsolescence by contrasting those individuals who appear to cope well with change and those who don't.

Bob described the other phases of the program as helping to identify the influence of the work setting, community, and family on the opportunity and tendency for mid-career changes and developing techniques of forecasting future management knowledge and skill requirements.

Three major Canadian companies contributed "seed" money to launch the first phase of the program to deal with a problem which appears to be increasing in magnitude.

ARE THE EEOC GUIDELINES APPLICABLE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR?

by Michael J. Kavanagh

Most of the publicity in recent years concerning possible violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has centered around cases in the private sector of our society. Should the results of these cases, to include the relevant evidence on discrimination (or the lack of it), be generalized to organizations in the public sector such as state, federal, and local agencies? Or, are there special circumstances that exist in the public sector that do not exist in the private sector?

Dr. Lorraine Eyde,¹ Senior Research Psychologist, United States Civil Service Commission, will be providing some insights on these and other questions in a forthcoming (probably the next) issue of TIP. Dr. Eyde has been compiling and reviewing various cases in the public sector involving alleged violations of Title VII. As many agencies are presently developing and implementing "affirmative action plans", this review should have direct pragmatic value for them. In addition, Dr. Eyde's work should provide another important piece of information for all readers regarding compliance with EEOC Guidelines, and hopefully, aid in proper interpretation.

The whole issue of compliance with Title VII has thrust industrial psychologists into the political and social arena, a position previously held, for the most part, by our colleagues in other specializations within psychology. This growing visibility in public affairs is reflected by the Committee on Public Policy and Social Issues (PPSI), of which Dr. Eyde is a member. The general purpose of this committee (see another article in this issue of TIP) appears to be to promote active involvement of Division 14 members in public policy and social issues by means of a matching process of talent and need. From this perspective, the relevance of Dr. Eyde's work becomes obvious.

Compliance with Title VII, through the EEOC and OFCC Guidelines, has shaken some of the fundamental roots of Industrial Psychology. One of the most important contributions of psychologists to industry has been in the development of testing and selection programs, both for initial hire and later promotion. Now, many of these efforts have been crumbling in specific situations due to either inattention to or inappropriate use of well-developed instruments, e. g., Duke Power Versus Griggs. This fact has certainly made many industrial psychologists stop and think.

A positive result of this increased awareness has been that industrial psychologists are more carefully monitoring selection programs and turning their attention and energies to exploring this problem area. The positive advice by Howard C. Lockwood (TIP, Winter 1972 issue) to reorient our efforts rather than abandoning testing, and the research by William Ruch reported in this issue, are examples of these efforts. Dr. Eyde's work is in this same category and we eagerly await its arrival.

Report on the December, 1972, Meeting of Council of Representatives by Lyman W. Porter

The Council of Representatives of APA currently meets twice each year, once at the time of APA's Annual Meeting and again in December. Major business ordinarily is transacted only at the December meeting. The following is a summary report of the most recent December meeting, which was attended by Division 14's three Representatives: Donald Grant (outgoing Representative), Robert Perloff, and Lyman Porter.

For those who have been reading recent issues of the **APA Monitor**, it will be apparent that the two most important issues dealt with at the last Council meeting were the following:

(1) **APA Membership for holders of the MA degree:** This is an issue that has been debated in Council for a number of years — with no clear resolution. At the December, 1971, meeting of Council it was voted (by about a 2-1 margin) that the Membership Committee of APA should draw up a formal ballot proposition — in favor of admitting those with MA degrees — to be approved at the 1972 Council meeting and subsequently submitted for ultimate approval by the membership (since this involves a change in APA By-laws). However, by the time of the December, 1972, meeting of Council, sentiment had shifted from 2-1 in favor of admitting MAs to about 2-1 **against** admitting them. After considerable debate, Council decided to submit a straw ballot (that would not be binding, of course) to the membership asking for an expression of opinion with respect to three options: (1) full membership for MAs; (2) giving present Associates full rights and privileges (including voting) but not the title "member"; and (3) no change in present membership requirements. The issue could be one of rather great importance to Division 14, since if MAs are admitted it will add a significant number of voting members to APA. Therefore, Division 14 members should carefully consider the various alternatives before casting their straw ballot.

(2) **Reorganization of APA:** In 1971 the then Policy and Planning Board had submitted proposals to Council concerning possible reorganization of APA into a federation of societies (e.g., three-five) rather than having a single, unified association. At the 1971 Council meeting the P and P report was referred to a special ad hoc committee of Council for further study and recommendations to Council in 1972. During the interim period the ad hoc committee surveyed divisions and state associations and found that sentiment seemed to be overwhelmingly **against** reorganization into a federation. Most respondents indicated they wanted APA to speak as a "single voice" for psychology, and they also thought the advantages of a single association (e.g., economies in journal publication, annual meeting format that permitted members from different sections of psychology to get together, etc.) outweighed those of a federation. At the December, 1972, meeting of Council, this report was discussed in the "committee of the whole" for one hour. At the end of this discussion it was clear that Council's view was also decisively against any major reorganization at this time. Therefore, the federation idea is dead for the moment. However, Council did specify that a new ad hoc committee be formed to consider less major modifications of APA structure that might be undertaken to improve its effectiveness. This committee (George Albee, James Deese, Edwin Newman, Marcia Guttentag, John Stern, and **Lyman Porter**) will report back to Council in December, 1973.

(continued on page 17)

Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Marvin D. Dunnette, Editor

At TIP's suggestion, Marv Dunnette, general editor of the **Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology**, has agreed to give readers an advance look at the content of the volume. Sections and chapters are listed below.

Chapter Number and Title	Author
Introduction	
Section I: Conceptual Foundations of Industrial and Organizational Psychology; Section editor: George W. England	
1. Theory Building in Applied Areas	Robert Dubin
2. Human Motivation	John P. Campbell & Robert D. Chard
3. Human Learning	Russell W. Burris
4. Systems Theory	F. Kenneth Berrien
Section II: Methodological Foundations of Industrial and Organizational Psychology; Section editor: John P. Campbell	
5. Psychometric Theory	John P. Campbell
6. Experimental Design	Thomas D. Cook & Donald T. Campbell
7. Multivariate Procedures	David J. Weiss
8. Field Research Methods: Interviewing, Questionnaires, Participant Observation, Systematic Observation, Unobtrusive Measures	Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr.
9. Problems and New Directions for Industrial Psychology	Chris Argyris
10. Laboratory Experimentation	H. L. Fromkin & S. Streufert
Section III: Basic Attributes of Individuals in Relation to Behavior in Organizations; Section editor: Marvin D. Dunnette	
11. Aptitudes and Abilities	Marvin D. Dunnette
12. Vocational Preferences	John L. Holland
13. Personality and Personality Assessment	Harrison Gough
14. Motor Skills	Paul W. Fox
15. Background Data	William A. Owens
Section IV: Attributes of Organizations and Their Effects on Behavior in Organizations; Section editor: J. Richard Hackman	
16. Organizations and Their Environments	William H. Starbuck
17. Organizational Structure and Climate	Roy Payne & Derek S. Pugh
18. The Structure and Dynamics of Behavior in Organization Boundary Roles	J. Stacy Adams
19. Role-Making Processes within Complex Organizations	George Graen
20. Control Systems in Organizations	Edward E. Lawler III

Section V: Behavioral Processes in Organizations; Section editor: J. Richard Hackman

21. The Nature and Consequences of Job Satisfaction	Edwin A. Locke
22. Stress and Behavior in Organizations	Joseph E. McGrath
23. Decision Making and Problem Solving Processes	Kenneth R. MacCrimmon & Ronald N. Taylor
24. Group Influences on Individuals	J. Richard Hackman
25. Leadership	Victor H. Vroom
26. Communication in Organizations	L. W. Porter & K. H. Roberts
27. Change Processes in Organizations	Clayton P. Alderfer

Section VI: The Practice of Industrial and Organizational Psychology; Section editor: Robert M. Guion

28. Job and Task Analysis	Ernest J. McCormick
29. Behaviors, Results, and Organizational Effectiveness: The Problem of Criteria	Patricia Cain Smith
30. Engineering Psychology	Alphonse Chapanis
31. Recruiting, Selection, and Job Placement	Robert M. Guion
32. Managerial Assessment Centers	Robert B. Finkle
33. Personnel Training	John R. Hinrichs
34. The Technology of Organization Development	Michael Beer
35. Conflict and Conflict Management	Kenneth Thomas
36. Management of Ineffective Performance	John B. Miner & J. Frank Brewer

Section VII: Professional and Scientific Frontiers in Industrial and Organizational Psychology; Section editor: Robert D. Pritchard

37. Cross-Cultural Issues in Industrial and Organizational Psychology	Gerald V. Barrett & Bernard M. Bass
38. Consumer and Industrial Psychology: Prospects for Construct Validation and Mutual Contribution	Jacob Jacoby
39. Ecology in Tomorrow's World of Work	Bernard M. Bass & Ruth Bass
40. Ethical Issues in Industrial and Organizational Psychology	Kenneth E. Clark

Section VIII: Appendix

Section editor: Robert D. Pritchard	
A. Tables, monographs, etc.	Robert D. Pritchard
B. Training Guidelines for Industrial and Organizational Psychology	Division 14, American Psychological Association

OFFICIAL NOTICE OF PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGE

Bylaws Amendment Necessary Under New Council Structure by Paul Thayer

The APA Bylaws were amended last year to reduce the size of the Council of Representatives. Under the new Article IV of APA Bylaws, voting members choose annually how they want to have their interests represented on council by allocating 10 votes to various Divisions and/or State Associations. One council seat is awarded for each one percent of the allocated votes.

Last year, Division 14 earned one more seat through this procedure, bringing our representation up to four. Our Division Bylaws, however, must provide for the possibility of a loss of one or more seats, according to the aforementioned APA Bylaw: "... if during that three year period (term of office) the Division or State Association is allocated fewer seats, the Division or State Association shall recall the appropriate number of Representatives. The term of office of the recalled member is thereby terminated."

After considerable discussion at the January 1973 meeting of the Executive Committee, the following amendment was approved unanimously for submission to Division 14 membership at its Business Meeting during the APA Convention: (This would be an addition to Article V of the Division Bylaws.)

9. In the event that the number of Division Representatives is reduced in accordance with APA Bylaws, the recall of Division Representatives will be accomplished by employing the following rules in sequence:
 - a. Failure to nominate to fill expiring term(s).
 - b. Equalization of representation by length of term remaining; i.e., if two or more Representatives have the same terms remaining, the appropriate number of Representatives would be recalled by lot conducted by the Election Committee Chairman.
 - c. By lot conducted by the Election Committee Chairman.

Other procedures were considered at length, including rules which would recall the most junior or most senior Representative. The rules finally adopted give high priority to continuing and balanced representation by length of experience.

Here is an illustration of how this would work. Presently, our representation is:

Porter	term expires 1973
Perloff	term expires 1974
Lawler	term expires 1975
Vroom	term expires 1975

If we lost a seat for 1974, rule (a) states that no nomination would be made to replace Porter. If we kept that seat, but lost one for the 1975, rule (a) would again apply in not replacing Perloff. If we kept those seats, but lost one for 1976, rule (a) still applies, but only one person would be

nominated to replace Lawler and Vroom. Thus, with the loss of only one seat, all representatives would serve full terms as long as we have a representative in each "graduating class."

If we lost two seats for 1974, rules (a) and (b) would apply. A replacement for Porter would not be nominated under (a), and the Chairman of the Election Committee would determine by lot whether Lawler or Vroom would be recalled.

Rule (c) would have special impact only if we don't have representatives in each "graduating class" and we have an equal number in those "classes" represented.

The proposed addition to our Bylaws seems to be an equitable solution. Please think about it and be prepared to vote at the Business Meeting of APA in Montreal.

DIVISION ESTABLISHES JOURNAL ARTICLE AWARDS

At the meeting on January 26 and on recommendation of the Scientific Affairs Committee (John Campbell, Chairman), the Executive Committee elected to establish a yearly award for the best journal article in each of two categories:

1. Reports of empirical research,
2. Theoretical, conceptual, methodological, or integrative statements.

Candidates for the awards will be nominated by the division's membership and the call for such nominations will be made at the same time as the call for Cattell proposals — i.e., in January. Articles will be judged in terms of their overall contribution to the understanding of individual behavior in organizations. The program will be initiated in 1974.

In other business, the Scientific Affairs Committee announced that invitations for the Cattell Awards for 1973 were mailed in January and with a deadline of April 15. Criteria for the 1973 award remain much the same as previously, except for somewhat more specificity about format and with the imposition of a 20 page length limit.

Division 14 is Pleased to Announce The 1973 James McKeen Cattell Award for Research Design

The award (\$500 to the winner) is designed to stimulate new and innovative approaches to problems of individual behavior in organizations. It is for a proposal, not a completed project. All entries must be either written or sponsored by an APA member and the deadline is April 15, 1973. Informational brochures have been sent to all Division 14 members. Additional copies may be obtained from John P. Campbell, Dept. of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455. All entries should be sent to:

Dr. Paul W. Thayer
Life Insurance Agency Management Association
170 Sigourney Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06105

Division 14 Workshop Announced

The 21st Annual Division 14 Workshops will be held in Montreal, Canada on Sunday, August 26, 1973. The sessions and leaders will be as follows:

Programmatic Organization Development

Jay Hall, Dick Olson, Geary Rummler - Section 1

This workshop will be concerned with instrumented approaches being used in O. D. activities. Topics will include confrontation and interpersonal skills training, analysis of human performance problems, and organization analysis.

Dr. Hall is President, Teleometrics, Inc., Dr. Olson is Vice President, XICOM, Inc., and Dr. Rummler is Vice President, Praxis Inc.

Leadership Style

Victor Vroom - Section 2

Virtually all leadership theories stress that leadership styles must be adapted to fit the situation, but there is far from agreement concerning the specific ways in which leadership style should be adapted to fit situational demands. Professor Vroom will describe in detail his work on the development of normative models which specify the extent to which a manager should share his power with his subordinates in different situations. Participants will have an opportunity to examine their own leadership style as it is reflected in standardized situations, to compare it with others and with normative models of the leadership process.

Dr. Vroom is Professor and Chairman of the Department of Administrative Sciences at Yale University.

Individual Executive Assessment

Robert Dugan - Section 3

Dr. Dugan will briefly describe the applications of individual executive assessment at I. T. T. and compare his approach with the assessment center techniques. He will discuss current trends in individual assessment, as well as its implications for equal employment opportunity.

Dr. Dugan is currently Director of Management Evaluation and Planning at I. T. T.

Transactional Analysis in Management

George and Ruth McClendon - Section 4

The process, technique and possible applications of Transactional Analysis will be discussed. It will include an experiential presentation of T. A. with special emphasis on managerial decision making and communication in the industrial setting.

Mr. McClendon is presently on the staff of the Western Institute for Group and Family Therapy, Watsonville, California. Mr. and Mrs. McClendon are active members of the International Transactional Analysis Association.

Governmental Regulations - Validation Research Steve Bemis - Section 5

The workshop will be concerned with the standards of validation research as they relate to governmental regulations. Clarification of requirements for acceptable validation research will be an objective.

Mr. Bemis is Staff Psychologist, OFCC. He is responsible for assuring that Federal Contractors use tests and selection devices in a professional and non-discriminatory way.

Job Design

Eric Trist - Section 6

The concepts developed by Dr. Trist and his colleagues will be reviewed and discussed as they relate to the Job Enrichment movement.

Dr. Trist is best known for his work at the Tavistock Institute. He is presently at the University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School of Management.

Workshops will be limited. Registration fee will be \$40 for APA members and \$50 for non APA members. If you need further information please contact:

Paul A. Banas
(313) 322-6490
Room 431, World Headquarters
Ford Motor Company
The American Road
Dearborn, MI 48121

Participants will be assigned to workshops of their choice on the following basis:

Registration before May 30

1st priority - APA members
2nd priority - non APA members

(Reservation Form Page 18)

(Council - continued from page 11)

Several other less major decisions of Council were the following:

(1) The Convention Proceedings will no longer be issued after 1973.
(2) The "journal credit" on dues statements will be eliminated, thereby reducing dues by \$15. However, Council also voted to increase dues by \$5. Therefore, the net effect of these actions is that dues technically will be lower next year by \$10, but there will be no journal credit.

(3) A new award (similar to the Distinguished Scientific Achievement award) is to be established by APA. The new award will be for "Distinguished Professional Contributions."

(4) Council voted to make a contribution of \$20,000 to the Council for the Advancement of the Psychological Professions and Sciences (CAPPS). (Parenthetically, it should be noted that this action received rather widespread support — it passed by about 2-1 — including support from, for example, some of the representatives from Division 3 (Experimental).)

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Registration
9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Workshop Sessions
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.	Conversation and Social Hour

EARLY REGISTRATION

21st Annual Workshop

in

Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Montreal, Canada August 26, 1973

Please Print

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Rank order below the workshops you would be interested in attending:

- () Programmatic Organization Development - Section 1
- () Leadership Style - Section 2
- () Individual Executive Assessment - Section 3
- () Transactional Analysis in Management - Section 4
- () Governmental Regulations-Validation Research - Section 5
- () Job Design - Section 6

REGISTER EARLY!!!

\$40 APA Members \$50 Non APA Members
\$5 Guest-Social Hour

Make check or money order payable to:

APA DIVISION 14 WORKSHOP

Mail this form with your fee to:

Dr. Mary L. Tenopyr
American Telephone & Telegraph
195 Broadway
Room C - 1620
New York, New York 10007

HUSSEIN RESOLUTION UNDER COMMITTEE STUDY

The much-discussed Hussein Resolution, first introduced at the 1971 annual business meeting, is under active study by the division's Public Policy and Social Issues Committee, of which **Frank Landy** is Chairman. The E & T Committee, of which **Ann Hussein** is a member, in response to the resolution, has taken up the matter and has decided to leave the initiative to the PPSI Committee. To refresh readers' memories, relevant segments of the minutes of the annual business meetings of 1971 and 1972 are reproduced below:

From the Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting, 1971

- A. Be it resolved that Division 14 appoint or elect a task force to gather information, evaluate it, and make recommendations on the following issues, with particulars appropriate to our spheres of activity:
1. What are the typical sources of funds shaping research and other activity?
 2. Does the nature of public or private research and/or services by Division 14 members fulfill the APA's Constitutional objective of "Promoting Human Welfare?"
 3. Do academic curricula and training materials for Industrial Psychologists promote racism, sexism, or militarism?
 4. Does training in Industrial Psychology encourage openness toward challenges to basic assumptions and attention to social values, particularly in respect to sex, age, and ethnicity?
 5. Does the Division protect the jobs of those members who dissent from prevailing practices that they question?
- B. Be it resolved that Division 14 members join together with other appropriate divisions and groups to establish social standards for institutions within which they are employed.

Following discussion, a motion was made and passed referring the resolutions to the newly established Committee on Public Policy and Social Issues for its consideration.

From the Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting, 1972

Further to points 2, 3, and 4 from the resolution sent to Public Policy and Social Issues Committee, be it resolved that Division 14 in continuing to examine its role within APA and its guidelines for graduate education in Industrial Psychology, urges the Committee on Education and Training and the Committee on Public Policy and Social Issues to examine together the principles being developed to guide PhD. education in Industrial Psychology.

The motion was seconded and passed.

The PPSI is preparing a questionnaire which will be designed to elicit information of the kind needed to respond to these resolutions. The E & T Committee will offer possible modifications in the questionnaire. Suggestions from the membership are, as always, needed and welcome. Write Dr. Landy or **Sheldon Zedek**, Chairman of the subcommittee of E & T considering these matters.

**A Summary of the
Guidelines For Education And Training
In Industrial-Organizational Psychology
by Sheldon Zedeck***

** This is intended to be a descriptive summary of the Education and Training Guidelines accepted by the 1970-71 Executive Committee. The Guidelines were originally prepared by Benjamin Schneider, Robert E. Carlson, and Edward E. Lawler.*

A subcommittee of the 1970-71 Education and Training Committee undertook the task of revising the 1965 Guidelines for Doctoral Education in Industrial Psychology. There were five major reasons for updating the 1965 Guidelines:

First, there is an increasing demand for professionals qualified in the application and interpretation of psychology to organizations. Second, there has been a growth of facilities (and faculty) outside of psychology departments for the education and training of scientists and professionals who are specialists in the study of organizations as well as the study of behavior in organizations. The directions such programs are taking are unclear and guidance in providing quality education in new areas is needed. Third, the quantity and quality of knowledge which is now available for understanding behavior in organizations and for modifying organizational functioning and individual performance, satisfaction, and development is much greater than before and growth thereof is accelerating. There are many more areas in which the psychologist can practice or do research. Fourth, paralleling the growth of knowledge has been the belated recognition that many of the nation's most pressing social problems have to do with organizational and employment behavior and thus fall within the purview of industrial-organizational psychology. Fifth, in addition to those problems designated as "socially relevant," many basic research areas and theoretical issues have emerged as the field has broadened. The education of industrial-organizational psychologists must equip members of the discipline to deal with these basic issues in an innovative and productive way. In the best of all possible worlds, these educational experiences should facilitate the definition of research problems, the construction of theoretical models, and the development of methodologies that will cut through irrelevant or inefficient activities to those that will maximally advance our understanding of human behavior in organizations. Given these reasons, the 1970-71 committee assumed the responsibility of developing guidelines for education and training.

The development of industrial-organizational psychology has created a need for several different paths or models of graduate education. As a result, several models are suggested for educating the industrial-organizational research scientist as a specialist and for the training of professionals in the application of skills and knowledge (the Professional Model).

One set of issues with which the subcommittee concerned itself was the increasing demand for professional practitioners educated in industrial-

organizational psychology and the growth in the number of students undergoing education in organizational-behavioral science or similar programs outside of psychology departments. These two conditions strongly suggested consideration of the training of professional practitioners as distinguished from the education of research scientists. Such consideration in no way suggested the demise of the generalist, the professional-scientist, and so forth. It did, however, support a concept of education and training which has at its foundation clarification of the levels and nature of education required for performing the chosen role. Thus, distinctions were made between the professional (practitioner) and the (research) scientist for purposes of exposition and are a reaffirmation of the necessity for quality education.

The industrial-organizational psychologist scientist is one who uses and/or develops theory and has proven his research and empirical skills to test deductively and/or generate hypotheses inductively. The professional, on the other hand, is a consumer of research and theory who has skills in conducting immediately relevant developmental or applied research. The scientist typically will conduct research that has a longer time perspective, which is concerned with understanding behavior at a general level rather than at the specific organizational level. The professional is equipped to apply psychological principles and behavioral science research techniques which have been refined through experience and successive application.

A second major issue was the scope and nature of what constitutes the education of the research scientist. It was the opinion of the 1970-71 subcommittee that it is not necessary for all students to have knowledge in depth of all aspects of behavior, from the subhuman physiological to the societal sociological. As our knowledge, understanding, and theories about individual, group, and organizational behavior expands, the demand for specialists, rather than generalists, will increase.

The current guidelines have been drafted with the recognition that education in industrial-organizational psychology has undergone change since 1965 when the last guidelines statement was prepared. The committee presented four models of education and training: three with particular relevance to the PhD. scientist and one to the professional. These programs are referred to as (1) Model I — the model described by the 1965 Guidelines; (2) Model II — the industrial-organizational psychologist with broad in-depth knowledge of a particular part of the industrial-organizational theory and literature; (3) Model III — the organizational specialist concentrating his research efforts on organizations with in-depth knowledge of specific basic and industrial-organizational theory and literature as well as appropriate education in allied disciplines such as economics, sociology, anthropology, etc. (4) The Professional — the practitioner model defined briefly above. The three models with the scientist label may also be practitioners; this is an individual choice but should be based on specific education over and above those to be expected of the scientist as scientist.

The kinds of, and extent of, subject matter were presented for each model. Specifically considered were: (1) advanced general psychology and psychological theory, (2) foundation areas of basic psychology, (3) professional affairs, (4) quantitative methodology, (5) behavioral measurement, (6) concentration areas within Industrial-Organizational Psychology, (7) research, and (8) additional areas of knowledge.

1. **Advanced General Psychology and Psychological Theory.** This area concerns the knowledge in the subject matter of psychology-at-large, including, for example, sensation, perception, motivation, learning,

thinking, attitudes, social factors, personality, etc. Since Model I could be considered a generalist's approach, it was recommended that students in this Model study all of the areas mentioned in depth. This depth was defined as at least 6-quarter or 4-semester credits in each of five distinctive areas. Since Model II is a specialist with the individual as a focus, it was recommended that the student be a specialist in the knowledge in the foundation area of psychology most related to his speciality. Since Model III is a specialist in the study of organizations, this student requires less depth in general psychology and psychological theory than students in Models I or II. Model IV is a professional practitioner and, therefore, the emphasis should be on those theories and principles which have the most research support. This should facilitate his application of the information necessary in his work.

2. **Foundation Areas of Basic Psychology.** It was generally agreed that three aspects of basic behavioral science are fundamental to industrial - organizational psychology: Differential Psychology, Experimental Psychology, and Personality-Social Psychology. The student in the generalist model (I) should have the equivalent of 9-quarter or 6-semester credits in the foundation area elected. The Models II and III student should specialize in one of these areas, whereas the practitioner of Model IV should emphasize the use and potential application of the material contained in these courses.

3. **Professional Affairs.** This training includes a working knowledge of national, regional, and local scientific and professional societies in psychology and other relevant disciplines. It also includes the nature and purpose of certification and licensing, ethical problems in psychological practice, and relations with other professions. It was agreed that two classroom hours be devoted to professional affairs for Models I, II, and III. Model IV would involve, in addition, special seminars pertaining to professional affairs and ethics, as well as supervised field work. The purpose of the latter is to establish professional identity, insure ethical practice, develop awareness of the professional's role and capabilities relative to those of the more basic research scientist, and to develop abilities which will enable the professional to evaluate both literature and methodology.

4. **Quantitative Methodology in Psychology.** The generalist model (I) requires that the student acquire general familiarity with fundamental mathematics and statistics, including sampling and probability theory and the mathematical models underlying such procedures as descriptive statistics, inferential statistics, factor analysis, survey methodology and the design of psychological experiments. Basically, this means at least one year of study in experimental design and the statistics of inference. The Model II specialist would require that the student be a specialist in selective quantitative approaches relative to his speciality. Model III is similar to Model II, whereas the emphasis in the practitioner model (IV) is on the use and interpretation of the quantitative methodology.

5. **Behavioral Measurement.** This involves all topics bearing upon behavioral measurement; e.g., the basic theory of measurement, such as validity and reliability concepts, test development, evaluation of criterion measures, and the use and evaluation of various test information sources, etc. As a minimum, the Model I program should include one course in measurement theory beyond the undergraduate course in addition to the more operational aspects of test construction, questionnaire development, attitude scaling, and criterion development. The Model II program

requires that students have general familiarity with all topics bearing upon behavioral measurement, with special expertise required in techniques related to the area of specialization. The same is true for Models III and IV.

6. **Concentration Areas Within Industrial-Organizational Psychology.** It was agreed that there are five concentrations within industrial-organizational psychology: personnel psychology, human factors psychology, organizational-social psychology (for example, work motivation, environmental perception, job satisfaction, communication, leadership, organization theory, etc.), industrial-clinical psychology (assessment interviews and programs of testing for individuals, career planning, individual development, occupational mental health diagnosis, etc.), and marketing and consumer psychology. The Model I student would be required to have knowledge in depth of the personnel - industrial concentration and general familiarity with the remaining four areas. Model II would require that the student be familiar with at least four of the five concentration areas as well as specializing in one of these areas. Model III is similar to Model II. The Model IV professional should have general familiarity with all areas of the field and knowledge in depth of one or more. He should be familiar, as well, with a considerable portion of research from other disciplines, especially as regards his area of current greatest interest.

7. **Research.** The student under Model I should receive extensive and intensive research experience during his graduate training, and this training should include the practicum for those planning a role as both professional and scientist. This research experience should start as early as possible. The Model II specialist should produce at least one written research report in addition to his dissertation. This initial research need not be original, but the emphasis should be placed on people in organizational settings. In addition, the research experience should be of both the laboratory and field type. The Model III student is guided by the same principles for Model I and Model II; however, he must also become accomplished in the appropriate research of related disciplines.

8. **Additional Areas of Knowledge.** The Model I student should have more than a nodding acquaintance with areas to which his own work may be related. Several appropriate areas for supplementary study include mathematical statistics, sociology, economics, industrial engineering, industrial relations, business administration, systems engineering, mathematics, political science, computer techniques, etc. The student should have at least 12-quarter credits or their equivalent in these areas. The same is true for Models II, III, and IV.

In summary, the subcommittee presented guidelines for educating and training four different doctoral level students in industrial - organizational psychology. Clearly, the three science-oriented models have a different focus than the professional practitioner. Model I differs from the more specialized Models II and III because of the breadth vs depth option. Models I and II concentrate on individual behavior in the organization, employing measures at the individual level to predict and assess individual behavior within the organization under specified conditions. Model III is concerned with conducting research on organizations and employing organizational / environmental characteristics as independent variables and primary group performance differences as dependent variables. The Model I psychologist should be capable of conducting research in a number of areas of specialization. It should be emphasized at this point that the models were merely suggestive of the kinds of programs that departments may design.

Given that multiple programs will develop as a result of the variety of training models specified in these guidelines, it became obvious that a need existed for some common content which would be an integral part of all programs. Thus, the committee urged that the common content or common language in all models be training in research methodology (measurement, statistics, design, and models). This fundamental methodology should include sources and methods of data collection, issues and methods of measurement, statistical analysis and experimental design materials, the use of computers, and principles of mathematical modeling of behavior. In addition, for the professional model, training must include guided experience in constructing and maintaining programs to implement research findings.

(The full — and official — guidelines statements will be published in the **Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology**, to be published in 1974. A limited number of copies are available immediately from Secretary Thayer.)

SELECTION, TESTING, AND THE LAW: WHAT PSYCHOLOGISTS CAN DO¹ by Mary L. Tenopir

American Telephone & Telegraph Company

The time has come to propose a new job knowledge test for selecting personnel psychologists. The first question would be, "Define *amicus curiae*." It would be well if there was a parallel test for attorneys and judges. Here, the test would start with "Compare and contrast mean, median, and mode."

Such is the world in which the personnel psychologist finds himself today. The now-famous Griggs decision has left a legacy of EEOC cases, court cases, and OFCC compliance reviews for him or her to contend with. No longer is there just the requirement that the personnel psychologist do his work competently; he or she must also be prepared to defend it, at times, against competent psychologists acting as adversaries. In addition, the psychologist must be prepared to take a position in areas in which there are no clear cut professional precedents.

There is much industrial psychologists collectively can and should do so that psychologists working on either side in a legal proceeding involving employee selection can speak from fact and not opinion.

As a result of Griggs, the typical employee selection case or compliance review has two stages: First, the plaintiff must prove that the use of the employment practice has an adverse impact upon a protected class. Second, if and only if adverse impact is shown, the defendant must show that his employment practice is job related.

At this point, the legal process may seem simple, but one need only read a few legal briefs in employee selection cases to find out quickly that it is not.

ADVERSE IMPACT

The first showing — that of adverse impact — has become quite complicated. A first natural thought might be that showing of a different rejection rate for each of two ethnic or sex groups might be all that is needed. However, employers with vigorous affirmative action programs are quick to point out that they do differential recruiting. Under such circumstances, different rejection rates become more probable. Assume, for example, that an employer has 20 job openings. He may not make any special recruiting efforts for whites and hire 10 of 30 whites who apply. He may make special efforts to recruit severely disadvantaged blacks and hire 10 of 100 who have applied. The rejection rate for whites is 67%, and that for blacks is 90%; yet the employer has put 10 whites and 10 blacks on the job and his employment rate is 50% black and 50% white.

On the other hand, the ethnic and sex composition of the group of incumbents on a job is not necessarily an appropriate indicator of adverse impact. One always has the problem of choosing a base population with which to compare the sample group on the job. Does one choose the population in the community without regard to education and skill levels? Does one use state-wide or national figures? Does one consider only persons actually interested in working for the employer?

Another pervasive problem in the proving of adverse impact is that of determining "practical impact." Should, for example, the courts require only that differences in rejection rate be statistically significant before ruling that there is adverse impact? When *N*'s are large, statistically significant differences of little practical consequence may be obtained. Conversely, it may be argued that when large numbers of applicants are involved, even small percentage differences can affect a large number of lives.

It is easy to see that there are many problems with regard to determining the degree of adverse impact. Possibly there is little industrial psychologists can do in this area except delineate the problems and offer general guidance on matters such as assessing practical significance. Another service which psychologists could perform is to alert employers to the fact that they do not always have to have validity evidence for tests and other employment practices.

Despite the fact that valid employment procedures are to an employer's advantage, there are no legal requirements that he have such procedures unless he does not employ sufficient minorities and women. As Guion¹ has put it, "An employer may be fairly stupid, as long as he is stupid fairly."

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

We now come to the point at which an employer has to furnish proof of the job relatedness of his employment practices. Here, a number of questions arise. First, what is an employment practice? It has become clear through various legal decisions that an employment practice may be defined very broadly in many cases. Various courts have held that the following are all subject to proof of job relatedness: paper-pencil tests, interviews, arrest records, training, undocumented supervisory judgments, garnishments, and biographical data, such as number of minor children. It is clear that the paper-pencil test, although receiving the greatest criticism as a possible deterrent to fair employment, is not the only employment practice which may be vulnerable.

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology in January, 1973.

1. Robert M. Guion, personal communication.

The personnel psychologist today must be looking at whole employment and promotion systems. Although he or she must continue to devote effort to psychological tests, he or she must not overlook recruiting, interviewing, reference checking, and medical examinations and how these things interact to produce personnel actions.

TYPE OF VALIDITY

The question of what constitutes satisfactory evidence of job relatedness of employment practices has been treated in various ways by the courts and other legal bodies. It should be noted that in the Griggs decision, the Supreme Court did not specify the form which evidence of job relatedness should take. The court did not mention the word "validity" or even specify that evidence of job relatedness should be empirical. Thus, we have a situation in which different lower courts have accepted different forms of evidence. Some courts have accepted rational evidence of job relatedness of tests; others have required statistical validation; some have even gone so far as to specify the nature of acceptable criteria.

One hears many arguments about the merits of criterion-related, content, and construct validity as evidence. In reading the EEOC Guidelines and the OFCC Order, it becomes clear that, although criterion-related validity is preferred, all three forms of validity are acceptable to these organizations.

Perhaps some of the controversy could be eliminated if there were uniform, professionally-accepted methods of demonstrating content and construct validity. As I have argued previously (Tenopyr, 1972), there are no conceptual differences among criterion-related, content, and construct validity. All involve the same rationale. Possibly one of the reasons for the tendency for plaintiffs to prefer criterion-related validity is that only for the criterion-related aspect of validity are there professionally accepted rules of evidence. However, the application of rules in the legal process has often been superficial. There has been too much reliance upon the size of the coefficient of correlation and its probability of occurrence under the hypothesis of a zero correlation. The rules of evidence should not be reduced to the mechanics level, where all one does is enter a coefficient of correlation in a table. The **alpha** level of .05 has been treated with unprecedented reverence. In fact, it has almost become a magic number.

Where content and construct validity are concerned, there, of course, are no magic numbers. There is little doubt that a case becomes seemingly more complicated when content or construct validity is offered as a defense. However, employers will have to rely more upon these two methods, as criterion-related validation is often not feasible, particularly for the small employer.

Industrial psychologists can do much to contribute to solutions of many of the problems involved in determining content and construct validity. First, we need better methods of linking test tasks to job tasks and job behaviors. Such methodology, when developed, needs to be translated into terms which those personnel specialists with minimal psychological training can understand. Second, we should attempt to agree upon some minimal standards for content and construct validation. Surely, we all decry purely speculative "armchair" methods, but there appears to be little agreement about the quality and quantity of empiricism which must be placed in the armchair.

THE CRITERION

Another major problem associated with showing job relatedness is that of the criterion. Even the most competently done criterion-related studies have been criticized on the grounds of criterion inadequacy or inap-

propriateness. There is a tendency now for plaintiffs to demand criteria which are "actual measures of job performance." But carefully developed work samples and job knowledge tests used as criteria should not be criticized. The only alternative in most cases is supervisors' ratings. These, according to their advocates, represent actual day-to-day job performance in its totality, whereas work samples only measure one component of performance and ignore factors like motivation. Obviously, the long documented history of problems with supervisors' ratings need not be repeated here.

Another tendency is the attempt of plaintiffs to have legal bodies disallow measures of training success as criteria. (Such measures are clearly acceptable, according to the EEOC Guidelines and the OFCC Order.) However, according to critics of training criteria, only measures of actual job performance are suitable criteria. Again, we have the option of ratings. Should present trends continue, it is clear that any criterion an investigator chooses to use will be suspect.

One wonders what industrial psychologists can do about the criterion problem. Possibly, everything which can be said about this problem has long since been said. However, perhaps, we should reiterate for the benefit of judges and attorneys that the ultimate criterion is only an ideal and that all practical criteria, especially ratings, fall far short of this ideal. Also some courts appear to need better understanding of business goals in hiring. Employee costs, which affect the quality and costs of services a company can offer and alter its competitive position, can take many forms such as training costs and costs of absenteeism. They are not limited to cost of poor job performance alone.

DIFFERENTIAL VALIDITY

The requirement, where technically feasible for determining validity separately for each ethnic and sex group is clear in both the EEOC Guidelines and the OFCC Order. The meaning of the term "differential validity" has unfortunately been obscured through the years. The term has been used to refer to validity coefficients, slopes, and intercepts. Fortunately, research findings which indicate that ability tests should be used differently for different groups are uncommon, and the subtler aspects of "differential validity" seldom have arisen in legal proceedings. Despite the fact that the complexities of differential validation are seldom an issue, much needs to be done in the way of clarifying the logic and the mathematics involved in the so-called "differential validity" issue. Various approaches to the questions of group differences and test fairness have been offered, e.g., Cleary (1968), Thorndike (1971), Darlington (1971), Cole (1972). These approaches have resulted in different and sometimes contradictory definitions of test fairness. The characteristics of the various definitions of test fairness need to be brought into clear perspective. The statistical problems involving some of the definitions need closer attention.

VALIDITY GENERALIZATION

The final issue with regard to selection and the law is that of validity generalization. Here there is almost a dearth of professional guidance. The many questions about whether validity can be generalized from job to job, location to location, and the like, receive few definitive answers. When one considers the scope of the problems involved and the lack of concrete evidence, it is little wonder that psychologists are unwilling to commit themselves in this area. Possibly the only hope for a basis for guidance in this area lies in well funded cooperative laboratory research. Unless we do some work involving systematic variation of numerous conditions, we have little support for any except the vaguest rules of thumb.

SUMMARY

In summary, it may be said that there are many gray areas relative to the application of industrial psychology in legal proceedings. In addition, there are many areas where research is needed to ensure fair employment and adherence to the law.

One thing psychologists should do is to pay more attention to assuring the job relatedness of employment practices other than paper-pencil tests. To do so, we need to devote more effort to basic research on methods of establishing job relatedness in areas in which criterion related validation is not feasible.

The whole area of relating employment practices to job behavior in a systematic way without endless criterion related studies needs considerable further development.

We also need to develop a consensus about the procedures which should be used in establishing content validity.

Better criterion development should be encouraged, especially in the area of non-rating criteria. More companies should be encouraged to attempt performance measurement programs, despite the serious problems which are almost always encountered in such programs.

The problems of validity generalization, as difficult as they are, need attention.

Finally, we need clarification of the various definitions of test fairness and the methodology for determining unfairness.

Throughout this discussion, there has been emphasis on technical demands arising through the legal processes. The basic problems in the development and practice of industrial psychology were already in attendance. The legal process has done nothing but accentuate these problems. These problems cannot be ignored by the profession. If psychologists do not take the lead in providing sound psychological doctrine as a basis for legal decisions, the courts may take that option out of their hands.

REFERENCES

- Cleary, T.A. Test bias: Prediction of grades of Negro and White students in integrated colleges. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1968, 5, 114 - 124.
- Cole, N. Bias in selection. American College Testing Program, Report 51, May 1972.
- Darlington, R.B. Another look at culture fairness: *Journal of Educational Measurement*. 1971, 3, 71 - 72
- Tenopir, M.L. Nature of the basic measurement system. Presentation at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, 1972.
- Thorndike, R.L. Concepts of cultural fairness: *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1971, 8, 63 - 70

ADVERTISING INFORMATION

GENERAL INFORMATION **The Industrial - Organizational Psychologist**, a publication devoted to professional developments in the field of industrial and organizational psychology. Serves as Newsletter of Division 14 of APA and is a forum for the discussion of issues and challenges facing the profession. Published three times per year — Fall, Spring, and Summer.

Guaranteed circulation of 1,800. **TIP** is sent to leaders of the field in the industrial and academic communities, and to the most influential members of the American Psychological Association — APA Officers, The Board of Directors, Presidents of all Divisions of APA and Editors of all psychological Newsletters. **TIP** is also distributed to advanced graduate students of industrial psychology and to libraries and graduate schools training industrial psychologists.

RATES PER INSERTION	Size of Ad	Number of Insertions	
		One Time	Three Times
	Two-page spread	\$200	\$180
	Cover	150	135
	One Page	125	110
	Half Page	75	70

AGENCY DISCOUNT 15%

PLATE SIZES	Size of Ad	Vertical	Horizontal
	One Page	7-1/2"	4-1/2"
	Half Page	3-1/2"	4-1/2"

OTHER INFORMATION Printed by offset on offset stock, saddle stitch binding.

CLOSING DATES February 15, June 15, and October 15.