THE INDUSTRIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST (TIP)

The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist is published four times yearly (February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1) by the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association. The editorial office is located at the Graduate School, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45431. Published by the Hamilton Printing Co., Hamilton, Ohio. Inquiries regarding advertising should be directed to Major Duncan Dieterly, 435 Fairway Dr., Fairborn, Ohio 45324.

Address changes should be directed to APA Circulation Offices, 1200 Seventeenth St., N. W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Subscriptions are included with membership in the Division. TIP circulation is approximately 2500 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.

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.

Marshall Sashkin was acting editor for this issue.

A. C. MacKinney Editor
M. J. Kavanagh Associate Editor
Marshall Sashkin Assistant Editor
Business Manager
Duncan Dieterly
435 Fairway Drive
Fairborn, Ohio 45324
President
Dr. Lyman W. Porter
Graduate School of Administration
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, California 92664
Secretary-Treasurer
Dr. Mary L. Tenopyr
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
195 Broadway, Room C1620
New York, New York 10007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Division 14's Name? 2
Interview with the Outgoing President 3
Notes and News 6
Umstot Wins Dissertation Award 10
Income of Division 14 Members 10
Washington v. Davis 12
Washington v. Davis Decided by Supreme Court 13
Washington v. Davis: Restrospect and Prospect 15
EEOC Assessed $80,000 in Attorneys' Fees 16
METRO Chooses 1976-77 Officers 16
Convention Program 17
Program-at-a-glance Schedule 24
Small Group Discussion Session Schedule 30
How About Some Public Relations For Your Work? 32
Committee on Scientific Affairs 33
Washington 1976 Program Ready To Go 34
Long-Range Planning Committee 35
Membership Committee 35
Education and Training Committee 36
Professional Affairs Committee 36
Public Policy and Social Issues 37
Committee on Committees 37
Quality of Work Life: Divergent Viewpoints 38
New I/O Psychology Organization in Minnesota 40
Standards for Assessment Center Operations 41
Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector 46
Positions Available 47

DIVISION 14's NAME?

by Duncan Dieterly

In the spring every young man's fancy turns to love — but, it appears that in the spring every Division 14 Member's fancy turns to names. Names for our Division. It would seem we have an identification crisis right in our midst. The previous issues of **TIP** indicated that the Long Range Planning Committee is deeply emeshed into the issue of what would be a more appropriate name for our Division. Unlike new parents who are not plagued by any knowledge of who or what their children might be, we are restricted by history and our current members' experience. The difficulty appears to be what do Division 14 members do? Are they concerned with people in organizations? Industrial organizations? Organizations in general? All of the above!

For every member there exists a different concept of what the division members do. Historically the type of efforts engaged upon were relative to applied problems in personnel and the personnel work in industries. The problems included outcomes of behavior; production, accidents, turnover and absenteeism; inputs of behavior, motivation, human performance and supervision and processes such as hiring, firing, efficiency, and organization as well as situational factors; length of work, wages, facilities and machine complexity. As time passed, the field of professionals expanded, more diverse and complex areas were addressed. Any attempt to identify a general phrase to encompass these areas is doomed to failure since the field is too extensive. As we generalize more, the members' interpretations will also become more general, therefore more open to arguments. The critical issue would appear to be, therefore, not what we name our Division, but what the impact of the name will have. "What's in a name, a rose by any other name will smell just as sweet", is a clever line but incorrect if one is using previous names to identify new things. By selecting from available words we will always offend some people, mislead some people, and please some people. However, if the Division continues to retain its current content then persons of certain interests will be attracted to the Division as previously.

However, to be perfectly clear to everyone we should coin a new word which can then be defined as we see fit. Once the word is selected we can then spend a major portion of our time struggling with a definition. This may be a much more satisfying situation in that at least we know how to label ourselves, then we can worry about what the label means. A new word would only have to be generated every 15 years as the field changes and the problems of concern are modified. Therefore, I suggest that we rename our Division — The BRAMPT Psychology Division — establish a definition Committee and get on with other efforts. The obvious advantages are that everyone will be able to identify us, i.e., "there is a BRAMPT," "look at the BRAMP run" or "he is a dirty BRAMPT." In addition it will create a general stir and interest among our colleagues until they can figure out what BRAMPT is all about.

CONVENTION PROGRAM ISSUE

The centerfold of this issue of **TIP** is designed as a handy tear-out convention program guide. We hope to see you in Washington. Remember to stop by the Division 14 headquarters at the Woodley Room (Sheraton-Park).

INTERVIEW WITH THE OUTGOING PRESIDENT

As in last year's convention issue, **TIP** presents an interview with our outgoing President, **Lyman Porter.**

TIP: Let's start at the general level; what are your overall impressions of your year as President of Division 14?

Porter: It's been a busy year, especially from the perspective of the President, whose role I see as being a "communication facilitator." And, the one year term does pose certain limitations. That is, things started by previous Presidents and Executive Committees are only now bearing fruit, while the results of the things you start may not appear for two or three years. Still, I favor a one-year term of office, because even though the present arrangement creates some problems of continuity, it does increase the number of persons involved. This gain in involvement seems to me to be of real importance. Similarly, the turnover in committee chairs and members creates problems for the operation of the Executive Committee and its various standing committees. New chairpersons must be acquainted with divisional matters, and this takes time and effort. Even so, it's worth it, since the turnover and change allows us to involve a larger proportion of the membership in Division 14 activities and operations. I feel that in a volunteer organization like ours it's crucial that we avoid perpetuation of the same people in top offices.

TIP: You speak of actions and results; what were some of the major accomplishments of Division 14 during the past year?

Porter: Perhaps the primary accomplishment would be our increasingly proactive orientation. The activities of the Public Policy and Social Issues Committee in developing and carrying out a prototype application of the assessment center approach in a non-profit organization — a school district — is a prime achievement for Division 14. [See the PPSI Committee report in this issue for more details; a symposium presentation on this project is on the APA program, Monday, Sept. 6, 4 p.m.] We are developing a model for dissemination and application of new developments in I/O psychology. Of course, we have to face the reality of fixed and limited resources for such projects, and determine how to best select projects for maximum impact. Along similar lines, a major action just taken by the Executive Committee is the recognition of the importance of practice by endorsing in principle the establishment of a "professional practice" award for major innovations in the practice of I/O psychology. A third major achievement is the work of the Education and Training Committee in beginning to cope with questions of continuing education for I/O psychologists.

TIP: On the other side of the coin, what do you see as the major problems or issues confronting Division 14?

Porter: The major issue is that of the impact of events impinging on us from outside the Division and outside APA. For example, certification legislation, legal cases, and the question of continuing education. We can't prevent external events from occuring or from affecting us, but we can have impact on the course of such events. In this way, we serve the public and uphold our own standards. Actually, we are thrust into the midst of significant social issues, and this seems to me to be a major trend over the past fifteen years or so. We have responded to these environment changes, by

taking a more future-oriented tack, instead of dealing only with day-to-day issues. This, too, I see as a trend for Division 14 over the past few years — dealing with policy issues of broad scope, rather than being concerned solely with intra-divisional operations. We have not yet, however, learned to structure ourselves organizationally as effectively as possible, to cope with the demands of a "turbulent field." A primary concern is, as I mentioned earlier, our limited resources. We need to develop a general policy of priorities; we need to set and define the limits of what we can and cannot get involved with. The **Davis v. Washington** amicus brief is a good example: our involvement was much costlier than we'd imagined, and we have been fortunate in breaking even financially. The Long-Range Planning Committee has made real progress with the general issue, but we must still determine what kind of organization Division 14 should be — what **are** the desired parameters? Because of external events that directly affect us, we need to become (and are, in fact, becoming) better at "self-organizing."

TIP: Could you outline specifically a few of the significant issues you're concerned about?

Porter: One need is to better track the composition of the membership of Division 14, especially in terms of educuational background and employment. Division 14 is, basically, healthy, because the field of I/O psychology is healthy. But, the field is also much more diverse than it used to be, and Division 14 reflects this heterogeneity. The Executive Committee tries to be in tune with the needs and interests of the full membership; to do this we must keep aware of the nature of that membership. Another important need is to examine our relationship with APA. I believe that even though our division is attracting a diverse membership — and not all members are psychologists — Division 14 **must** remain embedded in the discipline of psychology. The issue is how to input and impact more effectively on APA — how can we make better use of the resources that APA offers? A third issue concerns our source of funds. I believe it is imperative that Division 14 look to non-dues revenue sources. Even if we approve a small dues increase — the first since 1970 — this would, at best, just keep us even with inflation. In order to deal effectively with the kinds of impact issues we've been discussing, we require funding beyond that which can reasonably be expected from member dues. However, before we can expect outside funding for certain activities we must first define those activities we believe are important and that we want to pursue. Only then can we look for funds, for specific purposes. Finally, we have a problem in taking on any "advocacy" role, due to the heterogeneity of the membership. There is a great liklihood that on any major issue there will be groups of Division 14 members with strongly divergent views. All of these issues are related to the overall question of long range strategy.

TIP: You've raised a number of issues and challenges. How would you sum it all up?

Porter: The biggest challenge is keeping on top of and in touch with multiple concerns. Perhaps the best strategy here is to "scan" the environment and hope we don't miss critical factors — or see them too late. Rather than trying to react to frequent, unexpected needs, we must continue to develop an organization that relies more on a proactive approach.

NOTES AND NEWS

by Art MacKinney

The National Institute of Education (Department of HEW) is advertising two high-level positions, at least one of which might be of interest to Division 14 members. The first is Chief, Measurement and Methodology Division, and the second is Chief, Teaching Division. Both are listed at $26,900 to $37,800. For information, write Dr. **Andrew Porter** or Ms. **Julie Lee,** NIE Personnel Division, Room 642 Brown Building, 1200 19th Street, N.W., Washington, 20208.

Laurie Eyde, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, has been appointed Division 14 Liaison with APA's Committee on Women in Psychology. Laurie would appreciate receiving any suggestions or comments regarding the Committee's work. Write USCSC, Bureau of Policies and Standards, Washington, 20415.

Warren White, doctoral student in Educational Psychology and **Brian Moore,** Department of Management, both of the University of Texas at Austin, have prepared an evaluation of flexitime at the First National Bank of Boston which is to be published by the National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life. A summary of this work is available at no charge from the Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas, Austin, 78712.

Roger Lennon, Chairman of The Psychological Corporation, has announced the publication of **Selected Writings** in memory of **Alexander Wesman.** The volume includes a biographical foreword by **Jerome Doppelt** and **James Ricks.**

TIP has received No. 2 of the Ross Company's "Note to Chief Executive Officers." This issue treats adoption of new practices in an organization. Persons interested in this topic may want to write to **Paul Ross,** The Ross Company, Todd Pond, Lincoln, Massachusetts, 01773.

And **TIP** has also received the first issue of World of Work Report, (March, 1976) which "focuses its coverage on new developments, trends and experiments in the workplace." The Editor and Publisher is **Jerome Rosow** and the U.S. Editor is **Judson Gooding.** Write Work in America Institute, Inc., 700 White Plains Road, Scarsdale, New York, 10583.

Jay Uhlaner, Technical Director of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences and Chief Psychologist of the U.S. Army, has been awarded the first annual Washington Academy of Sciences Award for Achievement in the Behavioral Sciences. He was cited "for outstanding technical direction and leadership in Applied Psychology." Although the Academy has been giving awards in the physical sciences since 1939, this is the first time that an award has been given in behavioral science and the first time that a psychologist has been so honored.

John Proctor of Data Solutions Corporation (6849 Old Dominion Drive, McLean, Virginia, 22101) has provided **TIP** with information on a proposed certification law in Virginia which would certify "any person having at least a master's degree in guidance, counseling, personnel services, or educational counseling or an equivalent degree, and who has at least four years of experience in guidance and personnel counseling as herein defined . . . " Division 14 officers are investigating.

Ken Schenkel, currently President of Divison 31 (State Psychological Association Affairs) co-chaired a workshop at the Southeastern Psych. Association meetings in March. The workshop dealt with professional issues such as liability and health insurance, legislation and lobbying, Health Service Areas, peer review, and the national register. Ken is particularly interested in keeping in touch with other Division 14 members active in their respective state and local associations. Write Ken at 1266 Swims Valley Drive, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30327.

John Hinrichs, Founder and President, Management Decision Systems, Inc., Box 35, Darien, CT, 06820, recently participated in the European Management Forum in Davos, Switzerland. He spoke on "Managing Motivation in the Post-Industrial Society" to about 500 senior executives of European corporations. John reports that he was "impressed with the level of interest" in I-O psychology topics.

Edward Levine, Chief, Selection Resource Center, Arizona Department of Administration Personnel Division, has announced two publications: **The Joy of Interviewing** and **The Training and Experience Evaluation Handbook.** They are being published by Personnel Services Organization, 1414 West Broadway, Tempe, Arizona 85282.

In response to **Gregory Huszczo's** article in the last (May) issue of **TIP, Ross Stagner** has written that "at Wayne State University this has been a recognized area of specialization at least since 1948 when **Arthur Kornhauser** joined the faculty . . . at present **Hjalmar Rosen** and I teach courses in the union area. We have had a number of doctoral dissertations on unions and union-related issues . . . I would agree with Huszczo that we should have more studies of the internal structure and functioning of unions." Write Ross at the Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202.

On June 15, **Robert Morrison,** recently of the University of Toronto, became Director, Management of People and Organizations Program, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California, 92152. Bob is currently serving as Chairman of the division's Scientific Affairs Committee. He is now involved in a longitudinal study of the effects of information input, curriculum, and school size on career role perceptions, commitment, and development decisions of medical students, funded by the Province of Ontario. **P. Niall Byrne** (University of Toronto) is co-principal investigator.

Jim Sharf announced in **TIP** (May) the availability of a bibliography on fair employment. Jim will have an updated version of the bibliography at APA.

Gerald A. Kesselman has been appointed Consulting Psychologist with Felix M. Lopez and Associates, Inc., a human resources consulting firm located in Port Washington, New York. **Felix Lopez** is President; write him at 14 Vanderventer Avenue, Port Washington, 11050.

Peter V. Vygantas has been named Senior Vice-President-Administration for Americana Hotels, a subsidiary of American Airlines. Formerly he has held a number of management positions with American Airlines and its hotel and inflight catering and restaurant subsidiaries. Vygantas will be responsible for a wide range of activities that include legal affairs, personnel, technical services, customer services, and security.

Art MacKinney, until recently Dean of the Graduate School at Wright State University, has been appointed Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Missouri-St. Louis. Write Art at UMSL, 8001 Natural Bridge Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63121. Art is currently completing a term of office as Editor of **TIP.**

Ed Fleishman, who is spending the year as Visiting Professor, University of California, Irvine, has announced the formation of a new organization, Advanced Research Resources Organization (ARRO). Ed is President, and **Al Glickman** is Vice-President. Ed is a past-president of Division 14, and Al is currently serving as Chairman of the Fellowship Committee. Write Ed or Al at 8555 16th Street, Silver Spring, Maryland, 20910, or telephone 301-587-8600. Ed will be traveling to the U.S.S.R. in July, having been invited as part of the delegation of U.S. psychologists, the event being co-sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Psychology of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. This visit represents the first significant action toward a joint U.S.-Soviet program in the behavioral sciences. One objective of the visit is to establish a series of joint seminars to be held in the U.S. and in the U.S.S.R. over the next few years. The U.S. delegation includes, among other prominent psychologists, **Richard Atkinson, Donald Campbell, William Estes, Leon Festinger,** and **Duncan Luce.**

Virginia Schein will be a Visiting Associate Professor at the School of Organization and Management, Yale University, for the 1976-77 academic year. She is currently at Case Western Reserve University.

The Center for Creative Leadership is involved in the development of a survey instrument for examining the nature of "creative organizational environments." Interested parties can receive copies of the current survey form by writing to **David Campbell,** Center for Creative Leadership, 5000 Laurinda Dr., P.O. Box P-1, Greensboro, North Carolina 27402.

Assessment & Development is a newsletter distributed by Development Dimensions Inc., containing much current information on the use of assessment centers. The March issue includes a up-to-date review of research on the reliability of the assessment center method, and a brief report on the use of assessment centers at Johnson Wax Co. Subscriptions are free; write to Editorial Office, Assessment & Development, Development Dimensions, Inc., 250 Mt. Lebanon Blvd., Pittsburgh, PA 15234.

Fred E. Fiedler was an invited speaker at the annual meetings of the Canadian Psychological Association, in June. The title of his presentation was, "Leadership and the Management of Social Power."

Mike Kavanagh, received the Chancellor's Award of the State University of New York at Binghamton, for excellence in teaching.

Several Division 14 members are participating in a large-scale symposium on the subject of "Defining the Fields of Organizational Behavior and Organization Theory" at the national meetings of the Academy of Management in Kansas City on August 12. Position papers are being presented by **Larry Cummings** and **Louis Pondy.** The panel of respondents and discussion leaders includes current Division 14 President **Lyman Porter.** A number of other Division 14 members are on the program, including **Marshall Sashkin** who is co-chairing a symposium on "Data Based Change in Organizations" with former Division 14 President **Stan Seashore** as discussant. **Virginia Schein** chairs a session on the "Quality of Work Life," and **Ed Lawler** is presenting a paper on joint labor-management efforts to redesign work, as well as leading a conversation hour on cognitive vs. behavioral theories of motivation.

Mike Cooper, formerly Assistant Professor of Organizational Behavior in the Graduate School of Business Administration, Suffolk University, has joined Opinion Research Corporation in Princeton, New Jersey, as Director, Employee Relations Programs. Opinion Research Corporation, a subsidiary of Arthur D. Little, Inc., is one of the nation's largest and oldest organizations in the survey research field. Address North Harrison Street, Princeton, New Jersey, 08540, or telephone 609-924-5900.

The City of Minneapolis has asked for and received permission to reprint **Bob Gulon's** article, "Recent EEOC Court Decisions," published originally in the April 1974 **TIP.** The reprint will be part of a training manual written for people in public personnel management. For further information write **Lee Ann Norman,** Civil Service Commission, Personnel Department, 312 Third Avenue South, Minneapolis, 55415.

On October 16 there will be an all day organizing meeting at Harvard for the newly-formed **Evaluation Research Society of America.** The Society will meet annually to discuss and report on advancements in the theory and method of evaluation research. All persons working in any area of evaluation research are invited to join. For more information contact **Marcia Guttentag,** Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

The annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association was held in Toronto, June 9 through 12. Symposia were held on leadership, productivity improvement, quality of work life, human resource accounting, and the integration of women into business. Among the participants from Division 14 were **Martin Evans, S. Saleh, Ron Burke, Corty Commann, Lorne Kendall, Gary Latham, Peter Frost, Jim Goodale, Bob Andrews, Bill Pyle, Pat Rowe, Bob Haccoun,** and **Virginia Schein.** An invited address was made by **Fred Fiedler. Lorne Kendall** was elected chairman of I/O. The past-chairman is Gary Latham.

ATTENTION

All correspondence regarding the next issue of **TIP** (Fall 1976) should be sent to **Mike Kavanagh,** School of Management, SUNY-Binghamton, Binghamton, New York 13901. The deadline for receipt of copy for the Fall issue is

September 15

UMSTOT WINS DISSERTATION AWARD

Denis Umstot, a student of Cecil Bell and Terry Mitchell at the University of Washington, won the 1976 Division 14 S. Rains Wallace Dissertation Award for the best doctoral dissertation submitted in the 1975 competition. The title of his dissertation is, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Job Enrichment and Task Goals on Satisfaction and Productivity." Denis will give an invited address abstracted from his dissertation at the 1976 annual meeting of APA in Washington.

Denis is on the staff of The Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright - Patterson. There he teaches organization behavior and organization development to graduate students in logistics management, part of the School of Systems and Logistics program.

Past recipients of the Wallace Dissertation Award were:

- 1970 Robert Pritchard
- 1971 Michael T. Wood
- 1972 William H. Mobley
- 1973 Phillip W. Yetton
- 1974 Thomas Cochan
- 1975 John Langdale

INCOME OF DIVISION 14 MEMBERS

by Ann Durand and Wayne Sorenson

The biennial survey of the income of Division 14 members, including 1975 income, has been completed and analyzed. The overall response rate was similar to that obtained in previous years, i.e., 53%. Given the relatively rapid growth rate of Division 14 within the last two years, this response was both gratifying and somewhat surprising.

This report summarizes a few of the principal findings which were judged to be of the most general interest. A detailed report summarizing all of the findings from the survey is available upon request from the authors. Such requests should be directed to the authors at the State Farm Insurance Companies, One State Farm Plaza, Bloomington, Illinois 61701.

Principal Findings:

1. Median 1975 income for male Ph.D.'s responding to the survey was $28,032 compared to $26,221 in 1973. Twenty-five percent earned more than $37,517 and 10% earned more than $48,000.
2. Median 1975 income for females (Ph.D.'s and Master's) responding to the survey was $25,000 compared to $22,000 in 1973. It should be noted that females seem to be closing the income gap when compared to males in terms of reported income.
3. Despite increases in median income, all categories analyzed tended to increase their income at a rate slower than the rate of inflation as measured by the Consumer Price Index for the same period of time.
4. Median increase for Ph.D.'s earning $20,000 or less in 1973 was 23%. There was a 19% increase for those who were earning $20,000 to $25,000, and approximately a 12% increase for those who were earning more than $30,000 in 1973.

5. Median starting salary was $20,000 in 1974 compared to $15,000 in 1972. These data are based on very small numbers, but tend to corroborate anecdotal evidence that starting salaries have increased sharply.
6. Incomes of people located in Metro New York continued to be higher overall but increased less than incomes of people not in Metro New York. (Because of sample size restrictions, this is the only geographic comparison available.)

Comparison of 1973 and 1975 Income for Selected Groups of Division 14 Members

Division 14 Categorization	1973 Median Primary Income	1975 Median Primary Income	Percent of Change in Median Primary Income 1973-1975	Adjusted 1975 Median Primary Income [a]	Percent of Change in median Primary Income 1973-1975 with 1975 Income Adjusted
Degree					
Ph.D.	$25,920	$28,031	8.1%	$23,145	—10.7%
Masters	23,200	26,975	16.3	22,273	— 4.0
Age [b]					
29	17,500	18,500	5.7	15,275	—12.7
30-34	20,833	21,500	3.2	17,752	—14.8
35-39	22,233	26,200	17.8	21,633	— 2.7
40-44	27,000	30,600	13.3	25,266	— 6.4
45-49	34,000	35,580	4.6	29,378	—13.6
50-54	30,000	32,175	7.3	26,566	—11.4
Sex					
Male	25,968	28,039	8.0	23,151	—10.8
Female	22,000	25,000	13.6	20,642	— 6.2
Years Since Doctoral Degree					
5- 9	23,500	26,200	11.5	21,633	— 7.9
10-14	27,800	29,500	6.1	24,358	—12.4
15-19	32,034	35,500	10.8	29,312	— 8.5
Primary Professional Employer [b]					
Manufacturing	29,875	34,225	14.6	28,259	— 5.4
Academic (12 mos.)	24,236	29,000	19.7	23,945	— 1.2
Consulting	36,010	36,033	0.1	29,752	—17.4
Major Job Activity [b]					
Mgmt. or Adm. of Research and Development	31,000	33,212	7.1	27,423	—11.5
Teaching	20,964	22,112	5.5	18,257	—12.9
Industrial or Mgmt. Consulting	34,000	35,033	3.0	28,926	—14.9
Location					
Metro New York	32,000	34,000	6.3	28,073	—12.3
Not in Metro New York	24,804	27,962	12.7	23,088	— 6.9

a
1975 median incomes were adjusted to reflect 1973 dollars, based on the Consumer Price Indices for 1973 and 1975 listed in the Monthly Labor Review, March of 1976, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

b
Includes doctorates only.

WASHINGTON V. DAVIS

by Don Grant

As you probably read in your newspaper or have heard, the U.S. Supreme Court rendered a decision on June 7 in the case of **Washington v. Davis.** By a vote of 7 to 2 the Court reversed the decision of the court of appeals and ruled in favor of the police department in the District of Columbia.

The decision, written by Justice White, was based largely on Constitutional grounds, rather than on statutory considerations (i.e., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964). Consequently, its applicability to Title VII cases, which involve most employers, will be ascertained by whether and how it is referenced in future court decisions. The decision is notable, however, because unlike previous cases involving psychological tests which have reached the Supreme Court (**Griggs v. Duke Power** and **Albermarle v. Moody**) it favored the employer.

There are a couple of specific aspects of the decision which are of particular interest to I/O psychologists. For one, the Court noted that, "It appears beyond doubt by now that there is no single method for appropriately validating employment tests for their relationship to job performance." (Footnote 13, p. 16 of the decision) The 1966 APA **Standards** are referenced and the methods elaborated.

The second aspect of interest pertains to the use of training performance as a criterion for validating tests. The Court took a strong position in accepting this criterion as appropriate.

There are, of course, many other facets of the decision which will provide I/O psychologists with much to speculate about and lawyers to ponder. These include a concurring opinion by Justice Stevens and a dissenting opinion by Justice Brennan, joined by Justice Marshall.

The impact of the Division 14 amicus curiae brief is difficult to ascertain. It is not referenced in Justice White's opinion nor in Justice Stevens' concurring opinion. Justice Brennan did cite the brief once in his dissenting opinion. It should be noted, however, that there were several other amicus curiae briefs submitted in this case (e.g., ASPA, ETS) and none were cited in the opinions.

The decision did support a number of views expressed in the Division 14 brief, e.g., the need for flexibility and reasonableness in the application of professional standards developed for I/O psychologists, recognition for multiple approaches to validating tests, and acceptance of training performance as an appropriate criterion. Furthermore, the Court did reverse the decision of the appeals court, as our brief had urged, but decided against remanding the case to the district court for further hearing, as our brief had recommended.

Thanks to generous support from many members of our Division, we have made excellent progress in paying for printing and other costs incurred in preparing the brief. Copies are still available, at $10 each, from Mary Tenopyr (AT&T Co., 195 Broadway, R. C1620, New York, NY 10007).

WASHINGTON V. DAVIS DECIDED BY SUPREME COURT

by James C. Sharf

In June, the Supreme Court in **Washington** v. **Davis** while reaffirming the applicability of the **Griggs** standards for defining discrimination cases brought under Title VII, refused to extend this standard to cases brought under the Constitution. Public sector cases such as **Davis** have two clearly marked avenues by which an aggrieved party can seek redress for discriminatory employment practices. One of the avenues is constitutional under the "equal protection" clauses of the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments while the other is statutory under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Constitutional Argument

The **Davis** case was brought under the Fifth Amendment and not under Title VII for procedural reasons. The Court nevertheless applied the statutory standards of Title VII after they commented on the inapplicability of Title VII's definition of a **prima facie** case to constitutional claims under the "equal protection" doctrine:

> "We have never held that the constitutional standard for adjudicating claims of invidious racial discrimination is identical to the standards applicable under Title VII, and we decline to do so today. (p. 7-8)"

Under a constitutional argument, the charging party has the burden of showing more than adverse impact alone:

> "(O)ur cases have not embraced the proposition that a law or other official act, without regard to whether it reflects a racially discriminatory purpose, is unconstitutional **solely** because it has a racially disproportionate impact. (p. 8)"

> "(W)e have not held that a law, neutral on its face and serving ends otherwise within the power of government to pursue, is invalid under the Equal Protection Clause simply because it may affect a greater proportion of one race than of another. Disproportionate impact is not irrelevant, but it is not the sole touchstone of an invidious racial discrimination forbidden by the Constitution. (p. 11)"

Statutory Argument

The statutory argument under Title VII requires a charging party to establish only that an employment practice adversely affects a class to which that person belongs (a **prima facie** case) at which point the legal burden of proof shifts to the employer to show that the standards used for making the decision are job related. The Court reaffirmed the **Griggs** standard as follows:

> "Under Title VII, Congress provided that when hiring and promotion practices disqualify substantially disproportionate numbers of blacks are challenged, discriminatory purpose need not be proved, and that it is an insufficient response to demonstrate some rational basis for the challenged practice. It is necessary, in addition, that they be 'validated' in terms of job performance in any one of several ways, perhaps by ascertaining the minimum skill, ability or potential necessary for the position at issue and determining whether the qualifying tests are appropriate for the selection of qualified applicants for the job in question. However this process proceeds, it involves a more probing judicial review of, and less

deference to, the seemingly reasonable acts of administrators and executives than is appropriate under the Constitution where special racial impact, without discriminatory purpose, is claimed. We are not disposed to adopt this more rigorous standard for the purpose of applying the Fifth and the Fourteenth Amendments in cases such as this. (p. 16-17)"

"Because the Court of Appeals erroneously applied the legal standards applicable to Title VII cases in resolving the constitutional issue before it, we reverse its judgment in respondents' favor. Although the petition for certiorari did not present this ground for reversal, our Rule . . . provides that we 'may notice a plain error not presented,;and this is an appropriate occasion to invoke the rule. (p. 7)"

The Court went even further taking exception to seven circuit and four district court decisions stretching over the past eight years:

"(V)arious Courts of Appeals have held in several contexts, including public employment, that the substantially disproportionate racial impact of a statute or other official practice standing alone and without regard to discriminatory purpose suffices to prove racial discrimination violating the Equal Protection Clause absent some justification going substantially beyond what would be necessary to validate most other legislative classifications. The cases impressively demonstrate that there is another side to the issue; but, with all due regard, to the extent that those cases rested on or expressed the view that proof of discriminatory racial purpose is unnecessary in making out anequal protection violation, we are in disagreement. (p. 13-14)"

Validation Evidence

Having addressed the constitutional issues improperly decided by the Court of Appeals, the Court then proceded to apply Title VII standards to the question of job relatedness even though the case was not brought under Title VII:

"Test 21, which is administered generally to prospective government employees, concededly seeks to ascertain whether those who take it have acquired a particular level of verbal skill; and it is untenable that the Constitution prevents the government from seeking modestly to upgrade the communicative abilities of its employees rather than to be satisfied with some lower level of competence, particularly where the job requires special ability to communicate orally and in writing. (p. 15)"

"The advisability of the police recruit training course informing the recruit about his upcoming job, acquainting him with its demands and attempting to impart a modicum of required skills seems conceded. It is also apparent to us, as it was to the District Judge, that some minimum verbal and communicative skill would be very useful, if not essential, to satisfactory progress in the training regimen. Based on the evidence before him, the District Judge concluded that Test 21 was directly related to the requirements of the police training program and that a positive relationship between the test and training course performance was sufficient to validate the former, wholly asked from its possible relationship to actual performance as a police officer . . . Nor is the conclusion foreclosed by either **Griggs** or **Albermarle Paper Co. v. Moody;** and it seems to us the much more sensible construction of the job relatedness requirement. (p. 19-20)"

"The District Court's accompanying conclusion that Test 21 was in fact directly related to the requirements of the police training program was supported by a validation study, as well as by other evidence of record; and we are not convinced that this conclusion was erroneous. (p. 20-21)"

In a footnote, the Court made the following statement which likely will have some impact on efforts to revise the 1970 EEOC Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures:

"It appears beyond doubt by now that there is no single method for appropriately validating employment tests for their relationship to job performance. (p. 16)"

The footnote continued listing the APA "Standards" including mention of the three validation strategies and noted the "Standards" " . . . have been judicially noted in cases where validation of employment tests has been in issue. (p. 16)"

WASHINGTON V. DAVIS: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

by Marshall Sashkin

Two reports on the recent Supreme Court decision appear in this issue of **TIP;** thus, further detail as to the decision seems unnecessary. Yet the decision has many implications and leaves open several questions, in terms of employment selection testing in general (which is the focus of **Jim Sharf's** article), in terms of future EEOC actions, and in terms of the role Division 14 has taken and should take in any future cases (to which question **Don Grant's** comments are relevant). In a lucid editorial of June 15, the **Washington Post** noted that the decision hits two major points: (1) **impact** is not the sole criterion for determining legality of selection tests — purpose or **intent** must also be examined; (2) there is no single acceptable method for validating employment selection tests — training program performance can be an acceptable validation criterion. The **Post** goes on to note that this second point leaves open the possibility of discrimination via design of training programs in which success is keyed to non-job related factors. Of course, this makes the first point all the most important: such an attempt would hopefully be found illegal on grounds of intent.

A second area of interest will be the reaction of the EEOC. The "May 10 Draft" of the revised EEOC Guidelines has not been approved, and it is questionable as to whether it will receive final approval without further revision. Clearly, there should now be pressure EEOC to change its stand on not revising the Guidelines with respect to job performance as **the** acceptable validation criterion.

Finally, we should consider the role of Division 14 in all this. As **Don Grant** notes, our amicus brief, prepared at considerable effort and expense, was cited only once, in a dissenting opinion, although the views expressed in the brief were in part upheld in the majority ruling. Thus, it is difficult to assess what impact, if any, our brief actually had on the final decision. This would suggest extremely careful consideration by Division 14 about taking similar actions in the future.

These and other issues will doubtless be discussed at the APA symposium on "Implications of Fair Employment Litigation for the Practicing I/O Psychologist" (Monday, Sept. 6, 12 to 2 pm, Cotillion North Room, Sheraton Park).

EEOC ASSESSED $80,000 IN ATTORNEYS' FEES

by Tom Ramsay

Division 14 members **Roger Clark, Steve Bemis** and **Tom Ramsay** provided consultation to Datapoint Corporation in EEOC and Helen Sierra vs. Datapoint Corporation (April 1976), a Title VII action. U.S. District Court Judge John H. Wood, Jr., in San Antonio, Texas reviewed all of Datapoint's employment practices, including but not limited to, its practices concerning recruiting, hiring, job assignments, promotions, transfers, treatment of disabled employees, wages, fringe benefits, reprimands, discharges, tests (as far as this term is defined by EEOC regulation), and all other terms and conditions of employment. He found Datapoint Corporation had engaged in no unfair employment practices against Helen Sierra, or against any other employee, former employee or applicant in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, or the Civil Rights Act of 1866 from November 1, 1969, until March 16, 1976. In connection with the Datapoint tests Messrs. Ramsay and Clark revised a previously conducted criterion related validation study, conducted a content validation study, and initiated a new criterion related validation study.

The Court found that no employment tests utilized by Datapoint, including but not limited to the test technician test, the typing test and the Purdue Pegboard test were designed, intended or used to discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex or national origin. Also each of Datapoint's tests were ruled "professionally developed" ability tests within the meaning of Section 703(h) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Further, all tests utilized by Datapoint from November 1, 1969, to March 16, 1976, were found "valid" as that term is defined in applicable EEOC regulations.

Accompanying the ruling was the requirement that Datapoint Corporation was to be awarded approximately $80,000 in attorneys' and experts' fees taxed as costs against the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

This is one of the few instances of a defendant receiving an award of attorneys' fees and may result in greater willingness to conciliate by EEOC in future cases. The case may of course be appealed by EEOC to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

METRO CHOOSES 1976-77 OFFICERS

by Gini Boehm

The Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology, more commonly known as METRO, has chosen officers for 1976-1977:

President: **Dr. Virginia R. Boehm,** AT&T; Vice President: **Dr. George W. Henderson,** ITT; Treasurer: **Dr. Gerald Olivero, Merrill Lynch;** Secretary: **Dr. Constant C. Queller,** Metropolitan Life.

METRO holds monthly meetings from September to May to hear guest speakers, hold discussions, and socialize. We've got over 250 members, (mostly from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut) and all Division 14 members are invited to join, or simply attend our meetings if you happen to be in town.

In addition to our monthly meetings, we publish a professional employment newsletter that is sent free to our members. Anyone interested in learning more about METRO should call or write **Dr. Constant C. Queller,** Personnel Research (7-Y), Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, One Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10010 (212) 578-6346.

CONVENTION PROGRAM

DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

John H. Wakeley, Chairperson
Stanley Acker
Virginia Boehm
Lorraine Eyde
J. Richard Hackman
Milton Hakel
John Hinrichs

Sheraton Park Hotel
Washington, D.C.

Friday, September 3 — Tuesday, September 7, 1976

Note: All rooms are in the Sheraton Park unless otherwise indicated. This is not an official program; only the APA-published program is "official."

FRIDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 3

9:00 - 9:50 PAPER SESSION: COMPENSATION; RECRUITING; ATTENDANCE (Senate). **Ed Cornelius,** Ohio State University, Chairperson.

- Effects of Worker Sex Upon Perceived Commitment and Merited Salary. **Naomi G. Rotter,** Montclair College.
- Reactions of College Recruiters to Interviewee Sex and Self-Presentation Style. **Robert L. Dipboye** and **Jack Wiley,** University of Tennessee.
- Employee Attendance: An Operant Conditioning Intervention in a Field Setting. **Ronald D. Johnson,** Northeast Louisiana University, and **Jerry A. Wallin,** Louisiana State University.

10:00 - 10:50 INVITED ADDRESS (Cotillion North). **Lorraine D. Eyde,** U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., Chairperson.

- **Carl F. Goodman,** U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. Tensions Between Privacy and Freedom of Information.

11:00 - 12:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 8): THE STRUCTURE AND DYNAMICS OF ORGANIZATION BOUNDARY ROLES (Cotillion South). **Robert H. Miles,** Yale University, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **J. Stacy Adams,** University of North Carolina. Organization Boundary Roles: Toward a General Model.
- **James A. Wall, Jr.,** University of Indiana. Organization Boundary Roles: The Core Experiments.
- **Richard Klimoski,** Ohio State University. Organization Boundary Roles: Bargaining and Negotiation.
- **Benson Rosen,** University of North Carolina. Organization Boundary Roles: Information Gatekeeping and Transmission.
- **Dennis W. Organ,** Indiana University. Organization Boundary Roles: Implication for the Real World.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 3

1:00 - 2:50 SYMPOSIUM: CURRENT ISSUES IN ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH (Cotillion North). **Paul S. Goodman,** Carnegie-Mellon University, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **John P. Campbell,** University of Minnesota. Structures for Organizational Effectiveness Criteria and Their Implication.
- **Johannes M. Pennings,** Cargegie-Mellon University. A Framework of Organizational Effectiveness.
- **Richard M. Steers,** University of Oregon. Methodological Issues in Evaluating Organizational Effectiveness.

1:00 - 2:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 21): EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF WORK AND ORGANIZATION REDESIGN (Blue Room, Shoreham Americana). **Richard O. Peterson,** American Telephone and Telegraph, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **Mary Jo Kulp,** American Telephone and Telegraph. Diagnosis and Evaluation in Applications of Work Redesign.
- **John D. Folley Jr.,** Applied Science Associates, Inc. Measuring the Dimensions of Work Design.
- **Neal Litinger,** Stevens Institute of Technology. Measuring the Effectiveness of Company Reorganization.

Discussant:

- **J. Richard Hackman,** Yale University.

3:00 - 4:50 SYMPOSIUM: CONTINGENCIES IN WORK-RELATED GOAL-SETTING PROGRAMS (Continental). **Richard M. Steers,** University of Oregon, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **Edwin A. Locke,** University of Maryland. Ubiquity of Goal-Setting in Philosophies of Employee Motivation.
- **Gary P. Latham,** Weyerhaueser Company, Tacoma, Washington. The Application of Goal-Setting Techniques to Organizations.
- **Denis D. Umstot,** Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, and **Terence R. Mitchell,** University of Washington. Goal-Setting, Job Enrichment, and Expectancy Theory: Implications for Employee Motivation.

Discussants:

- **W. Clay Hamner,** Northwestern University.
- **Lyman W. Porter,** University of California, Irvine.

3:00 - 5:00 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION: Future Directions for Organization Development (Woodley). **James Thurber,** Discussion Leader.

5:00 - 10:50 OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (Vinson). **Lyman W. Porter,** University of California, Irvine, Chairperson.

SATURDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 4

9:00 - 9:50 INVITED ADDRESS BY THE 1976 S. RAINS WALLACE DISSERTATION AWARD WINNER (Alexandria). **Robert F. Morrison,** University of Toronto, Chairperson.

- **Major Denis Umstot,** Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Job Enrichment and Task Goals: Effects on Satisfaction and Productivity.

10:00 - 10:50 OPEN FORUM (Continental). **Paul W. Thayer,** Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association, Hartford, Connecticut, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **John P. Campbell,** University of Minnesota.
- **Virginia E. Schein,** Case Western Reserve University.
- **Richard J. Campbell,** American Telephone and Telegraph Company, New York.

11:00 - 11:50 CONVERSATION WITH THE ANNUAL REVIEW AUTHOR (Marshall). **Lyman W. Porter,** University of California, Irvine, Chairperson.

- **Clayton P. Alderfer,** Yale University.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 4

12:00 - 1:50 SYMPOSIUM: THE BEHAVIORAL ECOLOGY OF ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: HEALTH CARE DELIVERY (Continental). **John F. MacNaughton,** University of Houston, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **Gary Scott Danford,** State University of New York at Buffalo. Behavioral Ecology: Toward a Technology of Performance and Effectiveness.
- **Edwin P. Willems,** University of Houston. Patient Performance as a Criterion of Change in Hospital Programs.
- **Lauro S. Halstead,** Baylor College of Medicine. Longitudinal Assessment of Patient Performance as a Clinical Tool in Rehabilitation.

1:00 - 2:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 13): HUMANIZATION OF LEADERSHIP AND POWER IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR (Lincoln West Room, Washington Hilton Hotel). **Hyman Meltzer,** Washington University, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **Harry Levinson,** Levinson Institute. The Resurgence of Power in Psychology.
- **Robert J. House,** University of Toronto. Toward an Understanding of Charismatic Leadership.
- **Samuel A. Culbert,** University of California, Los Angeles. Ego Patrol: Problems in Organization Effectiveness.
- **Walter R. Nord,** Washington University. Dreams of Humanization and the Realities of Power.

Discussant:

- **Warren Bennis,** University of Cincinnati.

1:00 - 3:00 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION: Pre-Retirement Planning (Woodley). **Michael Perlson** and **Samuel Levinson,** Discussion Leaders.

3:00 - 3:50 BUSINESS MEETING (Cotillion North). **Lyman W. Porter,** University of California, Irvine, Chairperson.

4:00 - 4:50 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS (Cotillion North). **Paul W. Thayer,** Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association, Hartford, Connecticut, Chairperson.

- **Lyman W. Porter,** University of California, Irvine. Organizations as Political Animals.

5:00 SOCIAL HOUR (Cotillion South).

SUNDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 5

9:00 - 10:50 SYMPOSIUM: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND FEEDBACK: FLIES IN THE OINTMENT (Cotillion North). **David L. DeVries,** Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **Herbert H. Meyer,** University of South Florida. The Performance Review Discussion: Making it Constructive.
- **Larry L. Cummings,** University of Wisconsin-Madison. Appraisal Purpose and the Nature, Amount, and Frequency of Feedback.
- **Keith Edwards,** Rosemead Graduate School of Psychology. Fair Employment and Performance Appraisal: Legal Issues and Practical Guidelines.
- **Morgan W. McCall, Jr.** and **David L. DeVries,** Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina. Appraisal in Context: Clashing with Organizational Realities.

Discussants:

- **Michael J. Kavanagh,** State University of New York - Binghamton.
- **David P. Campbell,** Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina.

10:00 - 12:00 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION: Issues in Professional Training (Woodley). **Douglas Bray,** Discussion Leader.

11:00 - 12:50 SYMPOSIUM: PHYSICAL ABILITY TESTS: DEVELOPMENT, VALIDITY, AND EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (Cotillion North). **Mary Tenopyr,** American Telephone and Telegraph Company, New York, Chairperson.

Participants:

- **R.A.H. Goodfellow,** Selection Consulting Center, Sacramento, California. Development and Use of a "Task Simulation" Physical Ability Examination.

• **William W. Ruch,** Psychological Services, Inc., Los Angeles, California. Differential Validation of Physical Tests for Male and Female Patrol Officers.

• **Sheldon Zedeck,** University of California. Validation of Physical Ability Tests for Prediction of Training Criteria.

Discussants:

• **Edwin Fleishman,** University of California, Irvine.

• **Milton R. Blood,** Georgia Institute of Technology.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 5

1:00 - 2:50 SYMPOSIUM: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WORK IN EUROPE: REVIEW OF A PROFESSION (Continental). **Milton D. Hakel,** Ohio State University, Chairperson.

• **Charles J. de Wolff,** Netherlands, and **Sylvia Shimmin,** Great Britain. Developments in Industrial Psychology in Europe — Emergence of a Profession?

• **Maurice de Montmollin,** France (University of Paris). Negative and Positive Aspects of French Industrial Psychology.

• **Goral Ekvall,** Sweden. The Political Situation, Labor Laws, and Industrial Psychology in Sweden.

• **Heinz-Ludwig Horney,** West German Mining Institute. Job Design in the Federal Republic of Germany.

• **Enzo Spaltro,** Institute for Psychosociological Research and Intervention, Italy. Industrial Psychology in a Conflicting Society.

Discussant:

• **Jay E. Uhlaner,** Army Research Institute, Arlington, Virginia.

1:00 - 3:00 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION: New Ways of Utilizing Biographical Data (Woodley). **William Owens,** Discussion Leader.

3:00 - 3:50 CONVERSATION WITH THE EDITOR: THE INDUSTRIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST (Madison). **A.C. MacKinney,** Wright State University, Ohio, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **M.J. Kavanagh,** State University of New York, Binghamton, New York.

• **Marshall Sashkin,** Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

4:00 - 4:50 PAPER SESSION: ATTITUDE; EXPECTANCY; JOB ANALYSIS (Dover). **Neal Schmitt,** Michigan State University, Chairperson.

• Validation of a Set of Attitude Scales. **Randall B. Dunham,** University of Wisconsin-Madison, and **Frank J. Smith,** Sears Roebuck & Company, Chicago, Illinois.

• Two Analyses in Search of a Job. **George P. Hollenbeck,** Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., New York, New York, and **Walter C. Borman,** Personnel Decisions Research Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

• Normative, Ipsative and Return of Effort Versions of Expectancy Theory. **Richard E. Kopelman,** Baruch College, City University of New York.

MONDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 6

8:00 - 11:50 INCOMING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (Vinson). **Paul W. Thayer,** Life Insurance Marketing and Insurance Association, Hartford, Connecticut, Chairperson.

9:00 - 9:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 25): APPLICATIONS OF IMPLIED BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS TO INDUSTRY (Palladian Room, Shoreham Hotel). **R. Vance Hall,** University of Kansas, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **Robert W. Kempen** and **R. Vance Hall,** University of Kansas. Reduction of Industrial Absenteeism: Results of a Behavioral Approach.

• **Robert Mirman, Ermanno R. Ritschl, R. Vance Hall,** University of Kansas, and **John Sigler,** Thompson-Hayward Chemical Company. Protective Poker: A Behavioral Approach to Industrial Safety.

9:00 - 10:50 SYMPOSIUM: BEYOND EEO — APPROACHES FOR REDUCING RACISM AND SEXISM IN ORGANIZATIONS (Continental). **Hal W. Hendrick,** Defense Race Relations Institute, Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **David Payne,** USAF Social Actions School, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Description and Evaluation of a Large Scale Education Intervention Program.

• **LCDR Kevin Healy,** Defense Race Relations Institute, Patrick Air Force Base, Florida. The U.S. Navy Human Resource Management Support System.

• **Carl R. Martray,** Western Kentucky University. Interpersonal Relationship Training and Implementation in a Desegregated School System.

• **Bernard Bass,** University of Rochester, **Wayne F. Cascio,** Florida International University, and **J. Westbrook McPherson** and **Harold Tragash,** Xerox Corporation. Prosper—Increasing Management Awareness in Race Relations.

• **Peter Nordlie,** Westgate Research Park, McLean, Virginia. Use of Quantitative Measures to Evaluate Institutional Discrimination.

Convention Program Schedule

	FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 3	SATURDAY SEPTEMBER 4	SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 5	MONDAY SEPTEMBER 6	TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 7
9:00 to 9:50	Paper Session: Compensation; Recruiting; Attendance. Cornelius; Rotter, Dipboye, Wiley, Johnson, Wallin. Senate Room	Invited Address: 1976 S. Rains Wallace Dissertation Award Winner. Job Enrichment and Task Goals. Morrison; Umstot. Alexandria Room	Symposium: Performance Appraisal and Feedback. DeVries; Meyer, Cummings, Edwards, McCall, DeVries, Kavanagh, Campbell. Cotillion North Room	Incoming Executive Committee Meeting. Thayer. Vinson Room NOTE: Meeting Begins at 8:00 a.m.	Symposium (w/div. 20): Work as an Aspect of Human Development in Mid-Life Years. Wittels; Boyarsky, Lowenthal, Chiriboga, Pierce, Ryterband, Slonaker, Levinson. Continental Room.
10:00 to 10:50	Invited Address: Tensions Between Privacy and Freedom of Information. Edye; Goodman Cotillion North Room	Open Forum Thayer; J. Campbell, Schein, R. Campbell. Continental Room	Small Group Discussion; Issues in Professional Training. Bray. Woodley Room	Symposium: (w/div. 25) Applications of Implied Behavioral Analysis to Industry. Hall; Kempen, Hall, Mirman, Ritschl, Hall, Sigler. Shoreham—Palladian Room Small Group Discussion: The I/O Psychologist and Organized Labor. Purcell. Woodley Room	Symposium Beyond EEO—Approaches for Reducing Racism & Sexism in Organizations. Hendrick; Payne, Healy, Martray, Bass, Cascio, McPherson, Tragash, Terry, Shamblee. Continental Room
11:00 to 11:50	Symposium (w/div. 8): Structure and Dynamics of Organization Boundary Roles. Miles; Adams, Wall, Klimoski, Rosen, Organ. Cotillion South Room	Conversation with the Annual Review Author. Porter; Alderfer. Marshall Room	Symposium: Physical Ability Tests: Development, Validity, and EEO. Tenopyr; Goodfellow, Ruch, Zedeck, Fleishman, Blood. Cotillion North Rm.		Invited Address: Modern Woman in the Modern Union. Wakeley; Johnson. Continental Room
12:00 to 12:50		Symposium: Behavioral Ecology of Organizational Performance: Health Care Delivery. MacNaughton; Danford, Willems, Halstead. Continental Rm.		Symposium: Implications of Fair Employment Litigation for the Practicing I/O Psychologist. Sharf; Taylor, Letwin, Barrett, Ashe, Baehr, Rose. Cotillion North Room	Paper Session: Locus of Control; Leadership. Ronen; Baird, Bigoness, Cosentino, Miller, Andrisani, Abeles. Senate Rm.
1:00 to 1:50	Symposium: Current Issues in Organizational Effectiveness Research. Goodman; J. Campbell, Pennings, Steers. Cotillion North Rm. Symposium (w/div. 21): Evaluating the Impact of Work and Organization Redesign. Peterson; Kulp, Folley, Litinger, Hackman. Shoreham—Blue Room	Symposium (w/div. 13): Humanization of Leadership and Power in Organizational Behavior. Meltzer; Levinson, House, Culbert, Nord, Bennis. Hilton—Lincoln West Room Small Group Discussion: Pre-Retirement Planning. Perlson; Levinson. Woodley Room	Symposium: The Psychology of Work in Europe: Review of a Profession. Hakel; de Wolff, de Montmollin; Ekvall, Horney, Spaltro, Uhlaner. Continental Room	Small Group Discussion: New Ways of Utilizing Biographical Data. Owens. Woodley Rm.	Symposium (w/div. 27): Organizational Development and Change in Mental Hospitals: A Community Experiment. Lounsbury; David, Salasin, Fairweather, Tornatzky, Fergus, Avellar. Alexandria Rm.
2:00 to 2:50				Symposium (w/div. 35): Women Managers: How Different Are They? O'Leary; Ullrich, Holden, Terborg, Goetz, Herman, Jerdee, Rosen, Braunstein, Schein. Cotillion South Room Symposium (w/div. 8): Job Demands and Worker Health. French; Caplan, Harrison, Pinneau. Hilton - Georgetown East Rm.	
3:00 to 3:50	Symposium: Contingencies in Work-Related Goal Setting Programs. Steers; Locke, Latham, Umstot, Mitchell, Hamner, Porter. Continental Rm. Small Group Discussion: Future Directions for Organization Development. Thurber. Woodley Room	Business Meeting. Porter. Cotillion North Room	Conversation with the Editor: The Industrial - Organizational Psychologist **(TIP).** MacKinney, Kavanagh, Sashkin, Dieterly. Madison Rm.		Symposium: An Appraisal of Current Continuing Professional Education. Dubin; Hussein, Goldstein, Fischer, Levey, Lindsay, Dubin, Morris. Franklin Rm.
4:00 to 4:50		Presidential Address: Organizations As Political Animals. Thayer; Porter. Cotillion North Room	Paper Session: Attitude; Expectancy; Job Analysis. Schmitt; Dunham, Smith, Hollenbeck, Borman, Kopelman. Dover Rm.	Symposium: Public Policy and Social Action in Action. Grant; Moses, Jeswald, Hersey. Wilmington Room	
5:00 and later	Outgoing Executive Committee Meeting. Porter. Vinson Room (to 10:50 p.m.)	Social Hour Cotillion South Room			

• **Robert W. Terry,** Neely, Campbell, Terry and Associates, Ann Arbor, Michigan. The White Male Club.

• **Major Yeston Shamblee,** Defense Race Relations Institute, Patrick Air Force Base, Florida. Implications of Cultural Differences for Professional Training and Updating.

10:00 - 12:00 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION: The I-O Psychologist and Organized Labor (Woodley). **Theodore V. Purcell,** Discussion Leader.

MONDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 6

12:00 - 1:50 SYMPOSIUM: IMPLICATIONS OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT LITIGATION FOR THE PRACTICING I/O Psychologist (Cotillion North). **James C. Sharf,** Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington, D.C., Chairperson.

Participants:

• **James O. Taylor Jr.,** Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington, D.C. A Review of Courts' Definitions of Adverse Impact.

• **Jerry Letwin,** Attorney in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington, D.C. Selection Procedures Addressed by the Courts Under Title VII.

• **Richard S. Barrett,** Stevens Institute of Technology. How to Improve Selection While Hiring Minorities and Women.

• **R. Lawrence Ashe,** Attorney with Kilpatrick, Cody, Rogers, McClatchey et al. A View From the (Despondent) Respondent.

• **Melany E. Baehr,** University of Chicago. The Practitioner's View of Revised and Improved EEOC Requirements.

• **David Rose,** Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The Government's View on Qualifications and Affirmative Action.

2:00 - 3:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 35): WOMEN MANAGERS: HOW DIFFERENT ARE THEY? (Cotillion South). **Virginia E. O'Leary,** Oakland University, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **Maureen F. Ullrich,** University of Montana, and **John D. Holden,** U.S. Forest Service. Attitudes Toward Equal Employment.

• **James R. Terborg,** University of Illinois. Integration of Women into Management Positions: A Research Review.

• **Therese E. Goetz,** University of Illinois, and **Jeanne B. Herman,** University of Michigan. Effects of Supervisor's and Subordinates' Sex on Satisfaction and Productivity.

• **Thomas H. Jerdee** and **Benson Rosen,** University of North Carolina. Factors Influencing the Career Commitment of Women.

Discussants:

• **Daniel Braunstein,** Oakland University.

• **Virginia Schein,** Case Western Reserve University.

2:00 - 3:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 8): JOB DEMANDS AND WORKER HEALTH (Georgetown East, Washington Hilton Hotel). **John R.P. French Jr.,** University of Michigan, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **Robert D. Caplan,** University of Michigan. Occupational Differences in Job Demands and Strain.

• **R. Van Harrison,** University of Michigan. Job Stress as Person-Environment Misfit.

• **S.P. Pinneau Jr.,** University of Michigan. Effects of Social Support on Occupational Stresses and Strains.

4:00 - 4:50 SYMPOSIUM: PUBLIC POLICY AND SOCIAL ACTION IN ACTION (Wilmington). **Donald L. Grant,** American Telephone and Telegraph Company, New York, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **Joseph L. Moses,** American Telephone and Telegraph, New York. The Technical Assistance Program.

• **Thomas A. Jeswald,** R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company, Chicago, Illinois. Designing an Assessment Center for School Administrators.

• **Paul W. Hersey,** National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Virginia. A User's Perspective.

TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 7

9:00 - 10:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 20): WORK AS AN ASPECT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN MID-LIFE YEARS (Continental). **Ilene Wittels,** Psychological Associates, St. Louis, Missouri, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **Rose Boyarsky,** Boyhill Center, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri. Male Sexuality and Work: Ages 35-50.

• **Marjorie F. Lowenthal, David Chiriboga,** and **Robert Pierce,** University of California-San Francisco. Work in Midlife: Resource or Stress?

• **Edward Ryterband,** Hay Associates, New York. A model for Managing Work-Related Midlife Crises.

• **David F. Slonaker,** Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina. Rejuvenation at Mid-Career Via the Sabbatical Experience.

Discussant:

• **Daniel J. Levinson,** Yale University.

11:00 - 11:50 INVITED ADDRESS: MODERN WOMAN IN THE MODERN UNION (Continental). **John H. Wakeley,** Michigan State University, Chairperson.

• **Gloria Johnson,** International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL/CIO, Washington, D.C. Modern Woman in the Modern Union.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 7

12:00 - 12:50 PAPER SESSION: LOCUS OF CONTROL; LEADERSHIP (Senate). **Simcha Ronen,** Tel Aviv University, Chairperson.

• Response of Internal and External Employees to Tasks and Roles. **Lloyd S. Baird** and **William J. Bigoness,** University of North Carolina.

• The Overlap of Task and Affective Leader Referents and Performance. **Charles J. Cosentino,** U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, and **Richard L. Miller,** Georgetown University.

• Locus of Control, Its Dimensions, and Work Experience: Longitudinal Analysis. **Paul J. Andrisani,** Temple University, and **Ronald P. Abeles,** Social Science Research Council, Wilmington, Delaware.

1:00 - 2:50 SYMPOSIUM (with Division 27): ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE IN MENTAL HOSPITALS: A COMMUNITY EXPERIMENT (Alexandria). **John Lounsbury,** University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **Howard R. David** and **Susan Salasin,** National Institute of Mental Health, Rockville, Maryland. Government's Role in Fostering Dissemination and Utilization of Scientific Knowledge.

• **George W. Fairweather,** Michigan State University. The Role of Experimental Research in the Social Change Process.

• **Louis G. Tornatzky,** Michigan State University. Experimental Social Change: Implications of the MSU-NIMH Innovation Diffusion Project.

• **Esther O. Fergus,** Michigan State University. The Role of Participative Decision Making in Organizational Change.

• **Joseph W. Avellar,** Michigan State University. Enhancement of Innovation Adoption Through Organizational Development.

3:00 - 4:50 SYMPOSIUM: AN APPRAISAL OF CURRENT CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (Franklin). **Samuel S. Dubin,** Pennsylvania State University, Chairperson.

Participants:

• **Ann L. Hussein,** Drexel University, and **Irwin I. Goldstein,** University of Maryland. Assessment of Continuing Education in Psychology: Emphasis on Division 14.

• **Floyd Fischer,** Pennsylvania State University. Continuing Education in the Professions — State of the Art Review.

• **Gerald Levey,** Battelle Columbus Laboratory, Columbus, Ohio. Continuing Education for Non-Academic Scientists and Engineers.

• **Carl A. Lindsay** and **Samuel S. Dubin,** Pennsylvania State University. Continuing Education Needs Assessment and Program Develoment: Some Conceptual and Empirical Models.

• **Albert J. Morris,** Genesys Systems, Inc., Palo Alto, California. The Return on Investment of Continuing Education of Engineers.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM EVENTS OF INTEREST

As usual, there are a number of APA program events which are not sponsored or co-sponsored by Division 14. Unfortunately, it is impossible to learn of such papers, symposia, etc., through APA — until the official program is published and mailed, which is too late for inclusion in **TIP.** For next year, **TIP** will be making a concerted effort to learn of and include such program items in the August (convention) issue. For this year, we are aware of two items of interest.

On Tuesday, September 7, 9:00-10:50 a.m., Division 9 (SPSSI) is sponsoring s symposium titled "Privacy, the Law, and the Practice of Psychology." **Virginia Schein** will be presenting a paper on "Industrial-Organizational Psychology and the Law." (Hilton, Rm. 225)

Another Division 9 symposium on Tuesday from 11:00 to 1:50 is titled "Ameliorating the Impact of Unemployment: Established Programs vs. Individual Needs." **Oliver Moles,** National Institute of Education, is chairperson and discussant. Papers to be presented are:

The Government's Role in Amelioration of the Impact of Unemployment. **Barbara Gutek,** Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Individual Needs and Programmitic Responses. **Michael Moch,** SRC, ISR, UM.

Assessing the Effectiveness of Non-Professional Counseling During a Plant Closing. **Jeffrey Walsh** and **Thomas Taber,** SRC, ISR, UM.

Reducing the Impact of A Plant Closing: An Inter-Organizational Approach. **Thomas Taber, Jeffrey Walsh,** and **Robert Cooke,** SRC, ISR, UM.

Facilitating the Job-Seeking Process. **Robert Cooke** and **Michael Moch,** SRC, ISR, UM.

This symposium is being held at the Hilton Hotel, Conservatory Room.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS ARE PLANNED FOR CONVENTION

by Gini Boehm

It worked well last year so the Program Committee is doing it again — running a series of small group discussions at APA.

The format will remain the same. The discussion leader's role is to define the discussion area, get it going and people participating, keep the discussion more or less on track, and serve as a resource person. The leaders have not been asked to prepare formal presentations. These will be discussion sessions (not reading or presentation sessions) intended to let practitioners share ideas and maybe even generate new ones.

To keep these discussions manageable in size and provide opportunity for everyone to actively participate, admission to the group will be on a first come, first served basis. A circle of chairs will be provided. **When the chairs are filled, the session is closed** — as a lot of last year's late arrivals learned!

All discussions will be held in the Woodley Room at the Sheraton Park Hotel. The schedule is as follows:

Session Schedule

Friday, September 3, 3-5 PM

Future Directions for O.D. — What's new and innovative in the application of organizational development principles? Where are we now, and where do we go from here? Discussion Leader — Jim Thurber.

Saturday, September 4, 1-3 PM

Pre-Retirement Planning — What can a psychologist do, working with an organization, to develop pre-retirement programs that go beyond financial planning to include personal goals and continued growth? Discussion Leaders — Mike Perlson and Sam Levinson.

Sunday, September 5, 10-12 AM

Issues in Professional Training — What kinds of training do we need to prepare I/O psychologists (or whatever we're calling ourselves these days) to do whatever it is we're trying to do? Discussion Leader — Doug Bray.

Sunday, September 5, 1-3 PM

New Ways of Utilizing Bio Data — What are some new ways that biographical data can be used in the employment process? What does its use mean in terms of validity? EEO? Discussion Leader — Bill Owens.

Monday, September 6, 10-12 AM

The I/O Psychologist and Organized Labor — How can the I/O psychologist develop closer working relationships with the labor movement? Should we do so? Why? Why not? Discussion Leader — Ted Purcell.

HOW ABOUT SOME PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR YOUR WORK?

By Dick Peterson

A major goal of our Public Relations efforts continues to be. To let people outside I/O psychology know what it is we do. This audience should include other psychologists and professionals, potential users of our knowledge and services, and ultimately the general public. We're finding that it doesn't take as much effort as you might imagine to reach some of those audiences. Those whose business is news, "human interest," science or business reporting, and other specialized content are continually on the search for information, ideas, and fresh subjects for their writing. We in Public Relations have been working along several lines this year to make it easier to get information on the activities and accomplishments of I/O psychologists into the hands of media representatives. You can make use of two of these services now.

News Release Guide

Herb Kamin has developed a set of concise guidelines on how to prepare material in appropriate journalistic style and format to inform local editors and writers about some specific accomplishment or activity. You can get a free copy of this "news release guide" by writing to **Dick Peterson** at the address below.

Citations, Abstracts, and Articles

In response to our request in the February **TIP**, several members of the Division sent us articles, research reports, and other materials which they thought might be of interest to audiences outside the usual psychological journals. For most of what was sent us, we queried editors and writers concerning their interest, sending them copies of the material. Their response has been very gratifying. Several of the items will be cited in outside publications with references to where they can get more information. A couple of the studies will be abstracted, and at least one publication is considering a longer article developed from the material. For Public Relations purposes, we are asking that they acknowledge the author as an industrial or organizational psychologist and a member of the American Psychological Association. Some of the responses indicated interest in receiving additional material for noting or abstracting, and some would welcome articles written for their publications. We again invite members to send to us research reports, recent articles which have appeared in professional journals and might be of interest to wider audiences, and descriptions of other newsworthy activities or accomplishments. We will try to find at least one publication or writer interested in referring to your work or perhaps preparing an article about it. We will keep you informed of our progress and will ultimately put the publication directly in touch with you, especially if something more is to be written or if there are questions about the content. Send such material to Dick Peterson, current Chairperson, and he will see that it gets reviewed.

By the way, there are still copies available of the Writer's Kit developed last year by the Committee to help members find markets and outlets for their writing outside the usual journals. There is a charge of $1 for this kit to cover the fees the Division paid to use some of the copyrighted material in the kit. Send your request with $1 to Paul Thayer, at the address below.

Paul W. Thayer
LIMRA
170 Sigourney Street
Hartford, Conn. 06105

R.O. Peterson
AT&T
195 Broadway Room 30-2274
New York, New York 10007

COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

by Bob Morrison

A major activity involving all committee members is the administration of two contests involving research excellence. **Tom Bouchard** aided with the administration of a blind review of ten 1975 dissertations submitted in the S. Rains Wallace Dissertation Award competition.

The James McKeen Cattell Award for Research Design also had ten submisions. The proposals were considered to be strong enough for multiple awards to be given this year. The principal author of each research proposal is receiving feedback from the committee this year.

Jeanne Herman and **Dan Ilgen** have completed a special study to develop criteria to be used in the Wallace and Cattell competitions. The first draft of this work was used by the judges this year.

The committee also developed documentation supporting the nominations of Division members for the APA Distinguished Scientific Contribution and the APF Gold Medal Awards. **Jan Wijting** and **Larry Cummings** represented the committee in this activity.

Terry Mitchell masterminded the long range planning efforts of the committee. **Hilda Wing** developed major report identifying means for Division members to met their needs for continuous up-dating in new methods and results of scientific investigation. **George Graen** is developing guidelines to improve the administration of the Cattell Award and provide guidelines for potential submitters.

A special project was initiated to develop means to implement Cattell Award proposals. **Larry Cummings** initiated dialogue with the American Society of Personnel Administrators as a potential supporter. **Ben Schneider** developed contacts within six organizations.

In addition to the official committee members identified above seven others have been involved heavily in committee activities. **Karlene Roberts** worked on the criterion study. **Dick Hoffman, Chuck Hulin, Wayne Kirchner, Jack Larsen,** and **Stan Seashore** aided with the preparation of documents to support Division 14 and APA acknowledgement of scientific excellence. **Frank Smith** is involved with a special task to develop guidelines for auditing attitude survey proposals.

WASHINGTON 1976 PROGRAM READY TO GO

by John H. Wakeley

The Division 14 Convention Program is approved by APA and ready to go on September 3. The APA constraints on the Division 14 Program Committee this year were similar to those in years past. We were allotted 34 hours, up two from last year, and required to fill a maximum of 7 and a minimum of 6 hours each day with substantive programming. In addition to substantive programming (paper sessions, symposia, and formal discussions) we have programmed additional activities, such as the business meeting, invited addresses, and the social hour. Again this year, we will have informal group discussions in the Division 14 Headquarters Room — Woodley Room, Sheraton Park. Adding all the parts together, the Program Committee has provided more than 50 hours of activities over the five days of the convention.

We have tried to schedule the Division 14 sessions so that conflicts are as few as possible within our own division. APA takes responsibility for coordinating the various divisions and attempts to keep programs of broad interest across divisions from conflicting with each other. APA's task is probably impossible, but the effort is heroic.

The program is a full one, and will, we hope, be an exciting and interesting experience for each member. Along with filling up time, the Program Committee has made a serious effort to provide a program that is intellectually and professionally stimulating, a program that appeals to the breadth of interest within our division, and one you will attend from the first to the last session. Of 50 papers submitted, 9 were approved by the committee (18%), while 13 of the 36 symposia proposed were accepted (36%).

In this issue of **TIP** is the complete Division 14 convention program for Washington. We are required to inform you that the **APA Convention Program** is **the only official** and final schedule; however, this one is as good as an unofficial program can be.

Activities in the Woodley Room, Division 14 Headquarters, cannot be listed in the official **APA Convention Program,** so they too are unofficially listed here.

We will have a schedule of activities for the Headquarters Room posted by the room during the convention. Our general plan is to schedule an informal, small group discussion once or twice each day. When these activities are not in session, there will be a host/hostess from the Executive Committee on hand. We encourage you to use the Headquarters Room as an informal gathering place, and are especially eager to have graduate students come by to meet and talk with the host/hostess.

If you have suggestions for next year's program, or comments about the 1976 program, write to me and I will see that the information goes to next year's chairperson.

WHAT HAVE YOU BEEN UP TO?

New Job? **Interesting Activity?** **New Publication?**

Let us know, for inclusion in Notes and News. Send items of interest to **Mike Kavanagh,** School of Management, State University of New York, Binghamton, New York 13901. The Fall issue deadline is September 15.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The LRP Committee (**Paul Thayer,** chairperson; **John Campbell; Richard Campbell; Virginia Schein**) submitted an extensive and detailed report to the Executive Committee in June. Copies of this report will be available at the Division 14 headquarters room (Woodley Room — Sheraton Park). The committee suggests that Division 14 members obtain and review the report prior to the Open Forum (Saturday, 10 AM, Continental Room, Sheraton Park). Despite the charge to consider the name change issue, the LRP Committee did not take up the issue; ten minutes at the end of the Open Forum will be reserved for more input from Division 14 members, which the committee feels is prerequisite to further deliberation.

The report is succinct and highly readable. The committee first examined present and future needs, societal, educational, organizational, and professional, as they impact on Division 14. They then defined a set of issues and developed brief, clear position statements. Finally, a set of specific recommendations was developed. Most significant are: (a) that Division 14 develop, publish, and advocate a model plan for the continuing education of I/O psychologists by 1977; (b) that the Continuing Education Subcommittee of the E & T Committee be expanded; (c) that Division 14 make specific efforts to attain greater visibility for I/O psychology, especially with regard to organizations which have not traditionally used the services of I/O psychologists; (d) that Division 14 actively support work on the development, dissemination, and utilization of new or nontraditional research methods; (e) that an ad hoc fund raising committee be immediately appointed, charged with studying ways to support the above-listed and other new activities.

The LRP report goes far beyond the issue of a name change, toward concerns of substance that all Division 14 members should be aware of and give thought to. These issues will be the focus of the 1976 Open Forum session.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

At the June Executive Committee meeting, **Ken Wexley** (chairperson) reported that this year the committee has mailed about 2000 letters to members of APA Divisions 5 (Evaluation and Measurement), 13 (Consulting), and 23 (Consumer). About 900 letters went to members of the Organizational Behavior division of the Academy of Management, and the response here was quite favorable. As of June 4 the Membership Committee had accepted 137 applications for membership in Division 14 (107 Members; 30 Associates). Ten applications were denied. The committee expects to have still more applications processed prior to the 1976 convention, and is continuing work on the goals developed at its meeting last September (see **TIP,** November 1975).

EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMITTEE

The E & T Committee continues work on several on-going projects. **George Thornton** is wrapping up work on the survey of graduate programs in I/O psychology; a final report will appear in **TIP** (see the last issue of **TIP** for a report on data obtained through August 1975). The questionnaire may be revised and sent to organizational behavior/management departments. **Gene Mayfield** will soon have a final report on this year's survey of employers of recent graduates. Further I/O Workshop programs at regional psychology association meetings are being planned. **Paul Muchinsky** reports that the I/O workshops have been well received at the Southern meetings and will be continued. **Bill Graham** is working on a similar program for the Western meetings, while **Bob Pritchard** and **Dan Ilgen** will set up programs at the Midwest meetings. An article presenting the guidelines for graduate training in psychology was submitted to the **American Psychologist,** and is currently being revised. **Mary Tenopyr** is working on a paper for laymen regarding the hiring of I/O psychologists. **Steven Cohen** at the University of South Florida has taken responsibility for the project on developing a clearinghouse of information on the teaching social issues. (See **TIP,** August 1975). He would like other Division 14 members to get involved in this effort. **Irv Goldstein** chaired a subcommittee on continuing education, which has been looking at issues around the development of continuing education requirements for certification and licensing of psychologists. Several states are now in the process of developing such legislation, and it seems important that Division 14 take an active role in influencing the design of mandated continuing education programs. A report will appear in **TIP** soon, regarding Division 14 efforts toward the design of a "model" program.

PROFESSIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

At the June Executive Committee meeting, the Professional Affairs Committee (**Bob Heckman,** chairperson) recommended that Division 14 institute a professional practice award, proposed in detail by **Fred Fiedler** and **John Rasmussen,** for development and implementation of a practice, procedure or method which has had a major beneficial and substantiated impact on the profession of I/O psychology within the ten years preceding the award. The Executive Committee approved such a plan, in principle, with action details to be developed for consideration.

Ed Levine surveyed all states west of the Mississippi as to licensure/certification of psychologists. All but Nevada responded (24 of 25 states surveyed), and the general conclusion was that I/O psychologists are not having problems obtaining licenses/certificates. Ed asks that any I/O psychologists who know about or have experienced such problems contact the Professional Affairs Committee. **Rick Avery** is now compiling the results of a similar survey of eastern states. A list of liason I/O psychologists for states where large members of Division 14 members reside will be available at the APA meeting in September.

Frank Smith and **Nancy Mansfield** have prepared a draft of a questionnair to assess the practice of I/O psychology; the questionnaire may be pretested on I/O psychologists in Illinois.

PUBLIC POLICY AND SOCIAL ISSUES

The major activity and accomplishment of the committee this year has been the successful implementation of a demonstration project under the Technical Assistance Program (see **TIP,** August, 1975). Working with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), a pilot assessment center program for secondary school administrators was developed and installed. Two Virginia school districts were involved. A two-day assessment center program was developed under the direction of **Tom Jeswald,** and experienced school administrators were selected and trained as assessors by Tom, **Joel Moses,** and **George Henderson.** Twelve assessors used were made and can be used in later training. These tapes will be available for viewing at the convention, in the Division 14 headquarters room (Woodley Room, Sheraton Park). Assessment centers will have been initiated in both districts by the time this report appears; members of the PPSI Committee are to be present at these first assessment centers (which will be conducted by the trained assessors) to facilitate transfer of training. NASSP plans to publicize their capacity to conduct assessment centers, and should be self-sufficient in providing this service to school administrators by the end of 1977. During that year, the PPSI Committee will follow up on and evaluate the program in each of the initial two districts. All-in-all, this effort has so far proven quite successful. We need to consider other TAP projects in other non-profit organizations, examine the possibility of government funding, and look at the long-range effectiveness of this type of diffusion/dissemination approach.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

During the past year, the committee (**Lew Albright,** chairperson; **Bill Buel; Ken Clark; Pat Dyer;** and **Frank Schmidt)** engaged in three major activities. First, there was the difficult problem of selecting nominees for consideration by President-Elect **Paul Thayer,** who will make appointments to the 1976-1977 committees after he takes office in September. To facilitate this committee's work, chairpersons of all Division 14 committees were formally surveyed and asked to provide statements as to the purpose of their committee and committee member "job descriptions." The third activity was to recommend Division 14 members for appointment for APA boards and committees.

There were 163 candidates for the standing committees, with about 30 slots to fill. So, while this indicates a high level of interest and willingness to serve among our membership (over 10% of the membership desiring active involvement), the committee's task was not easy. A list of 43 nominees was finally presented to the President-Elect. The committee also developed a list of 31 Division 14 members as candidates for 14 APA boards and committees. This list has been given to President **Lyman Porter,** who will recommend the final list of nominees to APA.

The committee appreciates the willingness to serve of all candidates. Those not selected for appointment this year will be reconsidered by next year's committee.

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE: DIVERGENT VIEWPOINTS

As outgoing President **Lyman Porter** notes in this issue's interview, Division 14 members form a heterogenous group and are likely to have diverse views on almost any advocacy issue. One current example is an exchange recently published in **Personnel Administration** (January 1976; May 1976) between **Ed Lawler** and **Ed Locke. TIP** asked them to summarize and briefly react to one another's position for this issue. The comments received are printed below in the form of an interchange.

Lawler:

In my article I discussed a number of legislative approaches that might be taken by government to improve the quality of work life of individuals. These included fining a company for having working conditions that are undesirable (e.g., repetitive jobs), requiring a company to have certain practices and administrative processes (e.g., Workers Councils, worker membership on boards of directors) and fining or otherwise penalizing organizations for having high rates of such undesirable worker behavior as alcoholism, drug abuse, and mental illness. I concluded, however, that such actions are not now appropriate, for a number of reasons. It was then suggested that the government could play a constructive role by requiring organizations to issue regular public quantitative reports on the quality of work life that they provide for their employees. It was recognized that there are a number of measurement difficulties inherent in doing this, but I also pointed out that unless such efforts are initiated these problems will never be solved. The presumed advantages of public quantitative quality of work life reports include allowing potential employees to make more intelligent job choice decisions, allowing stock holders to gain better investment information, making it possible for stockholders to influence the behavior of their organizations, and allowing the government to better monitor what goes on in organizations.

(Locke, in his published rejoinder, took issue with all elements of Lawler's argument which, Locke feels, is based on incorrect premises and faulty logic. With respect to turnover, absenteeism, alcoholism, and drug abuse, for example — four specific measures of quality of work life suggested by Lawler — Locke

commented that using these criteria " . . . the slave labor camps of Soviet Russia . . . should be taken as the epitome of a good environment." Locke summarizes his comments, below.)

Locke:

I presented four objections to Lawler's proposals. I argued, first, that there can be no "right" to a satisfying job, since this would violate the rights of those who must provide such jobs. Second, I asserted that companies are not the sole cause (if a cause at all) of the "behavioral outcomes" which Lawler proposes to eliminate (e.g., alcoholism, mental illness), and I added that some of these outcomes are not necessarily unhealthy (e.g., turnover). My third argument disputed the parallel Lawler drew between anti-pollution laws and Lawler's own proposed legislation. Pollution laws are (or should be) objective and are designed to prevent the initiation of force, while Lawler's proposals are non-objective and would involve the initiation of force against companies by the government. Finally, I concluded by noting that I view Lawler's proposals as involving an attempt to enhance the status of social scientists by force (e.g., by legally requiring companies to conduct "human" audits in addition to financial audits) and thus to bypass the need to persuade company managers of their worth.

Lawler:

My first tendency in responding to Locke's comments is to say that I, too, am in favor of freedom, democracy, motherhood, fatherhood, and all other good things; and, that I am against prison camps, coercion, force, and all other bad things. In fact, I view my approach as much more likely to produce freedom for individuals than is Locke's social Darwinism approach, which seems to draw upon the best thoughts of Ayn Rand. Indeed, if we were to take Locke's approach, we would have no legislation in the areas of discrimination, physical safety, minimum wages, child labor, and so on. The fallacy as I see it in a pure social Darwinism approach is that individual freedom requires two things: valid data and meaningful choices. If we had a free, well functioning market in terms of jobs and opportunities for individuals, there would never be a problem with respect to individual autonomy and rights. Unfortunately, because of things like discrimination, the tendency of organizations to be managed in the same manner and to design their jobs in the same manner, individuals often don't have real choices about the kind of situation in which they will work. Further, there often aren't data available to them about the nature of the choices that they can make. Thus, individuals sometimes make bad decisions even though real choices are available to them. My idea is that by providing quality of work life information to the public, two things could happen: first, individuals would have the data that they need to make valid decisions, and, second, pressure would be generated on organizations to produce the kind of working conditions that fit the preferences of individuals.

In his reply to my article, Locke states that organizations do not owe individuals satisfying jobs; the other side of the coin is that individuals do not owe organizations their allegiance, commitment, presence, and performance. A contract needs to be reached between the individual and the organization. Unfortunately, at the present time the contracts which are reached are based on poor data, misunderstanding, and lack of meaningful choices. The result is low satisfaction for the individual and poor performance for the organization. I think there is a role for the government in facilitating the reaching of a meaningful and mutually rewarding contract. To this end, I think valid data can be helpful.

NEW I/O PSYCHOLOGY ORGANIZATION IN MINNESOTA

Last Spring, the Minnesota Pro-Seminar Group was formed by **Marv Dunnette** and three graduate students at the University of Minnesota, **Rob Silzer, Jim Rush,** and **Tim Gartland.** The organization was formed to facilitate communication among I/O psychologists and graduate students in the twin cities area. Response to the initial meetings was very good and the group now has about 60 members.

Monthly meetings are held in Minneapolis to exchange ideas and research findings and to hear speakers on issues related to I/O psychology. Some of the speakers on this year's program are: **Tim Hall** (on career development), **Dick Campbell** (on EEO), **Wesley Harry** (on EEO), **Greg Peters** (on human factors research), **Allan Penman** (on management consulting), **Ed Lawler** (on compensation), and **John Campbell** (on progress in I/O psychology).

The group is now planning next year's program. Anyone who would like to receive notices of meetings or who is interested in becoming a member should contact Rob Silzer, Personnel Decisions Inc., 821 Marquette Ave., Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 (phone 612-339-0927).

STANDARDS AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER OPERATIONS

Task Force on Development of Assessment Center Standards

Joseph L. Moses, Ph.D., Chairman

Albert Alon
Douglas W. Bray, Ph.D.
William C. Byham, Ph.D.
Donald L. Grant, Ph.D.
Lowell W. Hellervik, Ph.D.
James R. Huck, Ph.D.
Cabot L. Jaffee, Ph.D.
Alan I. Kraut, Ph.D.
John H. McConnell
Leonard W. Slivinski, Ph.D.
Thomas E. Standing, Ph.D.
Edwin Yager

Endorsed by Third International Congress on the Assessment Center Method
Quebec, Canada
May, 1975

1. Rationale for Assessment Center Standards

The rapid growth in the use of the Assessment Center Method in recent years has resulted in a proliferation of applications in a variety of organizational, educational and governmental settings. Serious concerns have been raised by many interested parties which reflect a need for a set of minimal professional standards for users of this technique. These standards should:

- define what is meant by an assessment center
- describe minimal acceptable practices concerning:
  - —organizational support for assessment operations
  - —assessor training
  - —informed consent on the part of participants
  - —use of assessment center data
  - —validation issues

These standards are not designed to prescribe specific practices. Neither do these standards in any way endorse a specific assessment center format or specific assessment techniques. Rather, we have attempted to provide general principles which can be adapted to meet existing and future applications. The reader should keep in mind the spirit by which these standards were written: as an aid to the assessment center user, rather than as a set of restrictive prohibitions.

2. Assessment Center Defined

To be considered as an assessment center, the following minimal requirements must be met:

1. Multiple assessment techniques must be used. At least one of these techniques must be a simulation.

   A simulation is an exercise or technique designed to elicit behaviors related to dimensions of performance on the job by requiring the participant to respond behaviorally to situational stimuli. The stimuli present in a simulation parallel or resemble stimuli in the work situation. Examples of simulations include group exercises, in-basket exercises and fact finding exercises.
2. Multiple assessors must be used. These assessors must receive training prior to participating in a center.
3. Judgments resulting in an outcome (i.e., recommendation for promotion, specific training or development) must be based on pooling information from assessors and techniques.
4. An overall evaluation of behavior must be made by the assessors at a separate time from observation of behavior.

5. Simulation exercises are used. These exercises are developed to tap a variety of predetermined behaviors and have been pretested prior to use to insure that the techniques provide reliable, objective and relevant behavioral information for the organization in question.
6. The dimensions, attributes, characteristics or qualities evaulated by the assessment center are determined by an analysis of relevant job behaviors.
7. The techniques used in the assessment center are designedto provide information which is used in evaluating the dimensions, attributes or qualities previously determined.

In summary, an assessment center consists of a standardized evaluation of behavior based on multiple inputs. Multiple trained observers and techniques are used. Judgments about behavior are made, in part, from specially developed assessment simulations.

These judgments are pooled by the assessors at an evaluation meeting during which all relevant assessment data are reported and discussed, and the assessors agree on the evaluation of the dimensions and any overall evaluation that is made.

The following kinds of activities **do not** constitute an assessment center:

1. Panel interviews or a series of sequential interviews as the sole technique.
2. Reliance on a specific technique (regardless of whether a simulation or not) as the sole basis for evaluation.
3. Using only a test battery composed of a number of pencil and paper measures, regardless of whether the judgments are made by a statistical or judgmental pooling of scores.
4. Single assessor assessment (often referred to as individual assessment) — measurement by one individual using a variety of techniques such as pencil and paper tests, interviews, personality measures or simulations.
5. The use of several simulations with more than one assessor where there is no pooling of data, i.e., each assessor prepares a report on performance in an exercise, and the individual reports (unintegrated) are used as the final product of the center.
6. A physical location labeled as an "assessment center" which does not conform to the requirements noted above.

3. Organizational Support for Assessment Center Operations

The assessment center should be administered in a professional manner with concern for the treatment of individuals, accuracy of results and overall quality of the operation. Assessment centers should be incorporated as part of a total system rather than as a process that operates in a vacuum. Considerable care and planning should precede the introduction of an assessment center. Policy statements concerning assessment operations should be formally developed and agreed upon by the organization. Minimal considerations in developing this policy should include:

1. The population to be assessed.
2. The purpose of assessment.
3. The kinds of people who will serve as assessors.
4. The type of training they receive and who is to provide it.
5. The responsibility for administration of the center.
6. Specific restrictions concerning who is to see the assessment data, and how they are to be used.

7. Procedures for collection of data for research and program evaluation.
8. Feedback procedure to participants and management.
9. Expected "life" of assessment center data — i.e., the length of time assessment center data will be kept in the files and used for decision making purposes.
10. The professional qualifications (including relevant training) of the individual or individuals initially responsible for developing the center.

4. Assessor Training

Assessors should receive sufficient training to enable them to evaluate intelligently the behaviors measured in the center. "Sufficient training" will vary from organization to organization and is a function of many factors including:

- — The length of time an individual serves as an assessor.
- — The frequency of individual participation as an assessor.
- — The amount of time devoted to assessor training.
- — The qualification and expertise of the assessment center trainer.
- — The assessment experience of other members of the assessment staff.
- — The use of professionals (i.e., licensed or certified psychologists) as assessors.

The above list is illustrative of the many issues related to assessor training. There is more variability in this area than in any other section of the standards.

While we do not wish to establish minimal standards concerning the number of hours of assessor training needed, it is difficult to imagine assessors functioning effectively with only a one or two hour orientation prior to serving as an assessor. However, whatever the approach to assessor training, the essential goal is attaining accurate assessor judgments. A variety of training approaches can be used, as long as it can be demonstrated that accurate assessor judgments are obtained. The following minimum training is required:

1. Knowledge of the assessment techniques used. This could include, for example, the kinds of behaviors elicited by each technique, relevant dimensions to be observed, expected or typical behaviors, examples or samples of actual behaviors, etc.
2. Knowledge of the assessment dimensions. This could include, for example, definitions of dimensions, relationship to other dimensions, relationship to job performance, examples of effective and ineffective performance, etc.
3. Knowledge of behavior observation and recording including the forms used by the center.
4. Knowledge of evaluation and rating procedures including how data are integrated by the assessment center staff.
5. Knowledge of assessment policies and practices of the organization, including restrictions on how assessment data are to be used.
6. Knowledge of feedback procedures where appropriate.

In addition, some measurement is needed indicating that the individual being trained has the capability of functioning as an assessor. The actual measurement of assessor performance may vary and could, for example, include data in terms of rating performance, critiques of assessor reports, observation as an evaluator, etc. What is important is that assessor performance is evaluated to insure that individuals are sufficiently trained to

function as assessors, prior to their actual duties, and that such performance is periodically monitored to insure that skills learned in training are applied.

5. Informed Consent on the Part of Participants

Informed consent is a fundamental concern in conducting an assessment center program. This means that the participant is given sufficient information **prior** to assessment to evaluate intelligently the nature of the program and the consequences of attending or not attending a center. While organizations have the right to require participation in an assessment program as a condition of employment or advancement, individuals should not simply be "sent" to a center with little awareness of why they are going. Rather, they should be provided with sufficient information to decide whether or not they should attend.

While the actual information provided will vary from organization to organization, the following basic information should be given to all prospective participants:

1. The purpose of the center and the objectives of the program.
2. How individuals are selected to participate in the center.
3. General information about the assessors — the composition of the staff and their training.
4. General information concerning the assessment process itself. This should include a description of the techniques and how the results will be used, the kind of feedback given.
5. Reassessment policy.

It is recognized that many assessment center programs have descriptive names or titles which are often neutral or purposefully general. This is an acceptable practice. However, it would be inappropriate to suggest to participants that the assessment center is for personal development or training when the clear intent is for selection or management staffing.

6. Use of Assessment Center Data

One characteristic of an assessment center is the volume of data produced. There are many different forms of assessment data, ranging for example, from observer notes, to reports on performance in the assessment techniques, to assessor ratings and reports prepared for management. The preceding is not exhaustive and could also include participant and peer reports and observations, biographical and test data, etc.

The specific purpose of the reports and data obtained by the assessment center should be clearly established. This will include a statement concerning individuals who will have access to assessment data, the kind of information they will receive and the format that will be provided.

The recipient of assessment data will be given sufficient information or training so that the data provided can be clearly interpreted. This will include an estimate of the relevance of current assessment data for the use in the future.

The individual assessed should be informed of how the assessment data are to be used. This will include:

1. Who has access to assessment reports.
2. Whether participants will normally receive feedback concerning assessment performance. If not, provisions must be made to provide such information upon specific request.
3. How long assessment information will be retained for operational use (as opposed to research use).

7. Validation Issues

A major factor in the widespread acceptance and use of assessment centers is directly related to an emphasis on sound validation research. Numerous studies have been conducted and reported in the professional literature demonstrating the validity of the assessment center process in a variety of organizational settings.

The historical record of the validity of this process, however, cannot be taken as a guarantee that a given assessment program will or will not be valid in a given setting. Because of this, each user must ascertain the validity of the program as applied in one's organization. The technical standards and principles for validation are well documented and appear in "Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures" prepared by the Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association, 1975 and "Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Manuals" prepared by the American Psychological Association, 1974.

In addition to the above standards, which include provisions related to demonstrating fairness and validity; some specific guidelines are provided for assessment center programs. These include:

1. The ability to document the selection of dimensions, attributes or qualities evaluated in the center.
2. The ability to document the relationship of assessment center techniques to specific dimensions, attributes or qualities evaluated.
3. The ability to document the demographic composition of the assessment staff as representative of the group of individuals assessed.

8. Concluding Statement

It became obvious in developing these standards that the standards should serve as guidelines rather than doctrine. Rather than create a set of standards that become ends in themselves, the authors attempted to provide a series of general principles which can apply to both managers and professionals using this technique. These standards should enable the assessment center professional to create, implement and maintain assessment center programs that protect the rights of individuals while meeting organizational needs at the same time.

Assessment Center Standards Published

Above, **TIP** reprints in full the "Standards" document developed by the task force members listed at the head. This is in order to achieve maximum dissemination of the Standards, which we believe will be of interest to many Division 14 members. **TIP** currently reaches about 2500 people, including all Division 14 members (approx. 1400), graduate students, APA officers, and interested persons in organizations.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

by Tove Helland Hammer

The most significant development in industrial relations during the past decade has probably been the rapid growth of unionism and collective bargaining in the American public service. The main difference between private and public sector bargaining centers around the prohibition of public servants to strike in most states when the bargaining process comes to an impasse and no agreement is reached on a new contract. Even in those seven states where some of the public employees are free to strike (Vermont, Montana, Hawaii, Pennsylvania, Alaska, Oregon and Minnesota), collective bargaining laws require labor and managment to exhaust a series of impasse procedures, such as mediation or fact-finding in an effort to avoid a strike whenever possible.

In the departments of Collective Bargaining and Organizational Behavior at the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University, several research projects are underway to examine the process and effects of the special forms of collective bargaining in public sector employment.

Tom Kochan, Byron Yaffe and **Ron Ehrenberg** are engaged in a two year evaluation study of the 1974 New York State law establishing compulsory interest arbitration for disputes in labor agreements between city governments and police and firefighters. Before the law came into effect, helped in large part by intense lobbying from labor, an impasse in negotiations was handled first through the intervention of a neutral mediator. If the dispute could not be solved through mediation, it would go to fact-finding. As there were no provisions in the existing laws to accept the recommendation of the publicly appointed fact-finder, however, municipal governments would solve the disputes themselves if the recommendations were not to their liking, for example, by a city board decision. This was clearly an inequitable labor-management relationship, and the new law sets as the final step at an impasse, compulsory arbitration by a tripartite panel. Since the arbitration decision is binding and may go against the employer there should be more of an incentive for the city governments to reach a settlement in negotiations, and one should consequently expect fewer instances of an impasse. Data after one year of study indicates no more willingness to reach a settlement after the enactment of the law than before. Any positive effect of the law is overshaddowed by the somber economic conditions in New York State which has led employers to leave the final stage of the bargaining process to the arbitration panel as a way to escape mounting public criticism of costly labor contracts. When the panel makes the award, the responsibility for the final outcome lies with the arbitrators, not with the municipalities.

With the uncertain outcomes of the compulsory arbitration law and increased demands by public sector employees for the right to strike one may want to examine the Canadian experience in public sector bargaining. The Federal Public Service of Canada allows its unions to choose before the start of the bargaining process, whether compulsory arbitration or mediation and a strike option will be used if a settlement cannot be negotiated between the employer and the unions. **John Anderson** just completed a study on the effects of this dual impasse procedure over four sets of contract negotiations. He found that unions with most bargaining power strength chose the mediation-strike option while the weaker and less militant unions preferred to go to arbitration. The threat of a strike also provided a stronger incentive to the government to settle the contract in the mediation stage than did the threat of arbitration. Over time, however, unions which opted for arbitration went away from that choice in the next rounds of bargaining and accepted the strike option largely as a result of not being able to avoid an impasse with the arbitration option, and arbitration awards going against them.

If a union goes to strike over a contract, however, there is no guarantee that a settlement will be reached to the members' benefit. John Anderson together with **Robert Stern** are now in the process of studying the Canadian Postal Workers' Strike which lasted from October to December 1975. The postal workers essentially lost the strike on the issue of wages, and the strike was broken largely as a result of community pressures on local unions in the western provinces and the boarder towns. The Anderson-Stern project involves an examination of those factors in the local environments which contributed to the breaking of the strike in some areas of Canada but not in others.

Finally, a note on private sector union research. **Ned Rosen** has just completed a feasibility study on the establishment of a panel of local labor leaders and work shop foremen to regularly assess the labor relations climate throughout New York State's industrial sector. His initial findings show that foremen report "sunnier" labor-management relations than do union stewards, with higher levels of worker satisfaction with jobs, pay, management fairness and contract provisions, but that the labor-relations climate is **in general** not likely to boil over. If funds can be obtained the ILR School hopes to continue regular measurement of labor relations issues of interest to public policy makers, employers and union officials.

POSITIONS AVAILABLE

Industrial-Organizational Psychologist: One-year lectureship available for 1976-1977 academic year. Teach one or two graduate (M.A.) courses in the area of I/O and also undergraduate experimental or statistics courses. Assist in supervision of M.A. candidates. Ph.D. required. Salary approx. $14,000. Send resume to: Recruitment Committee, Department of Psychology, California State University, Northridge, California 91324. (Equal Opportunity Employer/Affirmative Action)

Industrial-Organizational Psychologist: Asst. Prof., teach graduate and undergraduate courses in area of specialization as well as experimental psychology labs and some general psychology. Skills and interest in electronics and instrumentation are desirable. Would be expected to supervise graduate research in a growing Master's degree program. Possibilities for consulting exist. Starting Sept. 7, 1976. Salary depends on degree and experience. Refer to Position No. 82a in contacting Dr. Wilber E. Scoville, Chairman, Psychology Dept. Recruiting Committee, University of Wisconsin — Oshkosh, Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901.

Development Dimensions, Inc., announces two position openings — one in its Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, office and one in its Washington, D.C., office. Applicants should be I/O Psychologists with industrial or governmental experience. They will develop, implement and apply innovative training, assessment and selection concepts for both first-line supervisors and government organizations, implement programs, train trainers and assessment center administrators, and conduct research in the effectiveness of programs. Fifty per cent travel. Write Development Dimensions, Inc., 250 Mt. Lebanon Blvd., Suite 303, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15234. Development Dimensions is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

ADVERTISE IN TIP

The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist is the official newsletter of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association. As such, it is distributed four times a year to the entire membership, now numbering in excess of 1400. This group includes both academics and professional-practitioners in the field. In addition, **TIP** is distributed to many foreign affiliates, many graduate students in the field, and to the leaders of the American Psychological Association generally. Present distribution is approximately 2500 copies per issue.

Advertising may be purchased in **TIP** in units as small as the half-page and up to double-page spreads. In addition, classified ads are available — presently at no charge to members for certain limited space ads (e.g. positions available). For information, or for placement of ads, Write to **Mike Kavanagh,** School of Management, State University of New York, Binghamton, N.Y. 13901.

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	March 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15.		