

## THE INDUSTRIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST (TIP)

The *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist* is published four times yearly (February, May, August, and November) by the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association. The editorial board is located at the Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720. Printed by the University of California Printing Department, Berkeley. Inquiries regarding advertising and listing of positions available should be directed to **Larry Fogli** at the Institute.

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 3000 which includes the membership of the Division, all APA officers and board members, presidents of other APA Divisions, graduate students in industrial-organizational psychology and organizational behavior programs, Editors of APA newsletters, and to subscribers. Opinions expressed are those of the writers and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology unless so stated.

**Sheldon Zedeck** Editor  
**Larry Fogli** Business Manager

### Editorial Board

**Bob Boldt**  
**Irv Goldstein**  
**Tove Hammer**  
**Judi Komaki**  
**Joel Moses**  
**Laurel Oliver**  
**Neal Schmitt**  
**Jim Sharf**  
**Jim Thurber**

### President

**Mary L. Tenopir**  
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.  
295 North Maple Ave.  
Room 6126G2  
Basking Ridge, N.J. 07920

### Secretary-Treasurer

**Lewis E. Albright**  
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation  
300 Lakeside Drive  
Room KB 2140  
Oakland, CA 94643

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Message From Your President	1
Report from the APA Council	2
Profile: Wayne Sorenson	4
14 TIPBITS	6
Content Validity: Whither Thou Goest?	8
OD	18
Division 14 Members on APA Boards and Council	21
I/O Students	28
Division 14 Workshop Program and Registration Form	29
Events in the Training World	39
Government Research Activities	41
Report from the Commission on Organization of APA	44
On Revising the Principles	46
Applied Behavior Analysis	54
Report from the Program Committee	55
Journal Review Service	57
Division 14 Committee Members	62
Positions Available	64

## THE WILSON BATTERY OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION SURVEYS

MLMS — The Multi-Level Management Surveys } These available in a format  
PEER — The Survey of Peer Relations } for on-the-spot or self-scoring  
GROUP — The Survey of the Work Group } if desirable.  
S.O.S. — The Survey of Satisfaction

The most comprehensive, coordinated, operationally-oriented, psychometrically sound measuring instruments available for management and organization development. They help identify needs; assist in planning and implementing programs and policies; help assess effectiveness. May be used singly or jointly.

**MLMS:** These matching surveys measure 15 factors of a manager's operational and interpersonal relations with his/her subordinates. Assessments are from perspectives of self, subordinates, superiors, peers. Factored scales include: **Clarification of goals and objectives, Encouragement of participation in decisions, Orderly work planning, Goal pressure, Approachability, Interest in subordinate growth, etc.**

**PEER:** Focuses on operational and interpersonal relations with one's peers and superiors. For use with those who manage people as well as professionals, specialists, staff, etc. who do not. Of 13 PEER factors, 11 are translations of MLMS scales: e.g. **Clarity of one's own goals, Encouragement of peer participation in decisions, Orderly work planning, Pressure on peers, Approachability, etc.** Added dimensions are **Clarity of Communications and Dependability.**

**GROUP:** This eight-factor survey deals with the attitudes of group members toward their work, their co-workers, and the organization. Factors include **Work involvement, Co-worker competence, Team atmosphere, Commitment, Tension level, Opportunity for growth, Company policies, etc.**

**S.O.S.** An advanced, more information-laden, shorter form of traditional attitude survey. Flexible in that it enables you to assess such specifics as pay, training programs, company practices, commuting requirements — any topic of interest. The added feature is that S.O.S. is administered with MLMS, PEER, or GROUP. Correlation with these factored scales permits analysis of the specifics in the context of the larger framework of organization, management, or group factors. In turn this leads to more co-ordinated overall planning. Also, because the factored scales are more reliable than the responses to single questions, this co-ordinated analysis enables better assessment of changes to evaluate programs.

**SEND FOR:** Specimen kit: Copies of all instruments and profile charts; **Manual; Guide to Good Management Practices** (For participants and counselors use with MLMS); **Guide to Effective Peer Relations** (Use with PEER); **Teambuilding with MLMS, PEER, or GROUP** (For facilitators); **Coaching Manual** (For counselors and superiors to follow through after MLMS and PEER); References to published technical evaluations; Mimeo reports on validity of MLMS or PEER dimensions for: administrative MBO's (collections, budget variances, order entry errors, etc.), sales quotas, production floor performance, general management performance (sales, employee turnover, performance reviews). Charge for kit: \$50. Add \$25 and receive any 10 MLMS, PEER, or GROUP surveys for trial.

*Author and Publisher*

Clark L. Wilson  
Fellow, Division 14 APA

Box 471  
New Canaan, CT 06840

# THE GOODYEAR SERIES IN MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONS

LYMAN W. PORTER

## INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION IN ORGANIZATIONS

Otis W. Baskin, University of Houston,  
Clear Lake City  
Craig E. Aronoff, Georgia State University

## STAFFING ORGANIZATIONS

Benjamin Schneider, Michigan State University

## INFORMATION AND CONTROL IN ORGANIZATIONS

Edward E. Lawler, III, University of Michigan and  
Battelle Memorial Institute  
John Grant Rhode, University of Washington

## ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: A BEHAVIORAL VIEW

Richard M. Steers, University of Oregon

## CAREERS IN ORGANIZATIONS

Douglas T. Hall, Northwestern University

## RESEARCH METHODS IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Eugene F. Stone, Purdue University



## A Message From Your President

MARY L. TENOPYR

The year's activities have been going along well. A dedicated executive committee and a hardworking group of committee chairs have done a great deal to make the president's job easier. The major problem we face appears to be funding in this era of runaway inflation. We are instituting a policy that any committee chair who can effectively conduct his or her business with the executive committee with a written report be instructed not to attend the executive committee meetings. We have done this with considerable misgivings as we feel that much of the strength of Division 14 lies in the involvement of its members. We are also reviewing the committee structure. **Milton R. Blood** has written a proposal for sunseting committees. This will be reviewed by the executive committee at its May meeting. We have also instructed executive committee members to buy excursion tickets, where possible, for trips on Division 14 business.

Another financial development of far more impact is the withdrawal of the James McKeen Cattell Fund support of our research design award. We have received from the fund a \$2,000 donation to cover a transition period while we seek alternate funding. At the May meeting of the executive committee we will make a decision about the future of the award. Finally, the Division has donated \$200 to the Graduate Student Conference in I/O Psychology.

The efforts of the Public Relations Committee to promote Division 14 speakers have been successful. We have had over fifty requests from Psi Chi chapters. We are communicating with ASPA about providing speakers for that organization's convention.

We are still maintaining close liaison with other segments of APA. **Mike Pallak**, Executive Officer, attended our February executive committee meeting, and we had constructive interchanges with him. **C. J. Bartlett** (see his report, p. 15) represented the division at a BPA-sponsored invitational conference on competency testing in psychology. We have responded against a proposal to allow self nomination of prospective Fellows. Also, your president has written to the head of BSA stressing the importance of competence in members of the proposed committee to revise the APA test standards.

In the area of test disclosure legislation, it appears as if there is no new or renewed activity on the Federal front. We are watching developments in the states closely. Your president met with the state oversight committee of the Equal Employment Advisory Council to inform them about the implications of pending test disclosure legislation in the states. She and **C. J. Bartlett** also met with **Clarence Martin** of AAP to help coordinate the efforts of our two organizations. It appears that with all of the testing legislation activity now in the states, the issue of a national commission on opportunity is moot. We will continue to monitor developments in this area and keep the membership informed.

I am particularly appreciative of the efforts of the many members of Division 14 who work many long unpaid volunteer hours for the division. I am concerned about the large number of unsung heroes we have in the division. Somehow, there appears to be little reward for persons like the

To order examination copies of these books, write to:  
Chris Weyn, Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., P.O. Box 2113, Dept. L,  
Santa Monica, CA 90401

program committee members who spend long hours reading and evaluating papers or the secretary-treasurer who works at night trying to find APA's inevitable bookkeeping errors, or the professional and scientific affairs committee members who laboriously prepare thorough dossiers on our distinguished members.

In order to honor persons who have given a number of years of service to the division and have not received a great degree of visibility, I have asked the editor of *TIP*, **Sheldon Zedeck** to prepare articles on several of these persons. These articles will appear regularly in *TIP*.

I thank all of you for your continued support. I especially appreciate the votes that Division 14 received in the APA apportionment elections. We now have the third largest delegation in the APA Council of Representatives. Again I thank all of you.

## REPORT FROM THE APA COUNCIL

MILTON HAKEL

Unprecedented growth of APA during the 70's has fostered the growth of several problems which were discussed at the winter meetings of the Council of Representatives. The relative decline in influence of research/academic interests and the absolute decline in membership of several long established divisions have led to several proposals for reorganization. The Council of Representatives has become fully "politicized," with several coalitions serving the functions of political parties. Division 14 participates in the Scientist Practitioner (January 27th) coalition, the Public Interest Coalition and the Research Academic Coalition. We have the third largest council delegation in APA, behind California (7 representatives) and Division 12—Clinical (6 representatives). Thanks to your support we retain five seats on Council for 1980. In contrast, Division 8—Social—now has only two representatives (down from five in 1977) and Division 13—Consulting—loses its Council representation entirely. Keep those ten-point votes coming.

Council received a draft report on reorganization from the Commission on Organization. Comment is invited. Division 14 members can send their comments to **Kenneth Clark**, chairman of the Commission, or to **Richard Campbell**, both of whom are Division 14 members. The draft report is described elsewhere in this issue of *TIP* (p. 44).

Specialty Guidelines for the Delivery of Psychological Services by Industrial and Organizational Psychologists were approved after some last minute editing along with similar guidelines for counseling, clinical, and school psychologists.

**Milton Blood** initiated Council action to limit the duration of continuing committees to renewable terms of five years. This "sunset legislation" was introduced as an amendment to a motion creating a Continuing Committee on Gay Concerns. After 30 minutes of deliberation, the sunset amendment carried on a standing vote of 55 to 51. The main motion to create the committee was then overwhelmingly approved. Then, in what proved to be the first outbreak of much parliamentary agony to come, Council handled an item of new business out of order. This item was **Blood's** motion to create

sunset legislation for all standing boards and committees not authorized in the APA by-laws. The motion was referred to the Committee on Structure and Function of Council, and will be handled at the next Council meeting in Montreal. Having established the sunset principle, the Council then went back and undid its earlier action by removing the sunset provision from the Committee on Gay Concerns. That committee along with all others will come under a general sunset provision after the August meeting.

Council was informed of the establishment of a Research Network in the Office of Scientific Affairs of the APA central office. The Network will function as a mechanism to link researchers, federal agencies, congressional committees, the APA central office, and APA members employed in federal agencies. The Network begins operation on July 1st, and will cover six different topic areas initially. These areas are currently being selected, and both testing issues and quality of working life are topics under consideration. Write to **Robert Lowman**, APA Central Office, to indicate your interest in the Network's topics.

A \$12,600,000 budget for 1980 was approved and it will be implemented without a dues increase. However, a hefty (\$15) dues increase is projected for 1981 or 1982.

The Psychology Defense Fund authorized at the August meeting of Council has already collected over \$60,000. Procedures for evaluating case merits and distribution of the funds were approved.

Two items relating to elections were considered. Division 12 proposed to change the method by which ballots are counted for the Board of Directors elections. The proposal would have enabled a slim majority to dominate the election via block voting for a fixed slate. This was one of the most mischievous and cynical proposals to appear before Council in many years, and it was defeated resoundingly. On a second election issue, APA will take over elections in state associations for Council representatives by 1982. This action is needed because states currently allow all state association members, not just APA members, to vote for Council representatives.

In other actions, the Council voted to confirm "Education and Credentialing Task Force" as the name of the group which will look into criteria for designation of graduate programs as psychological programs. This issue concerns licensing and should be of particular interest to Division 14 members who teach in programs located in business schools.

Council voted to defer action on the creation of a National Institute of Psychological Policy Studies until the Montreal meeting. This proposal would create a semi-autonomous agency, and action was deferred because details on the degree of autonomy were not sufficiently clear.

Council heard a report on convention locations. The sites recommended: Montreal, 1980; Los Angeles, 1981; Washington, 1982; Anaheim, 1983; Toronto, 1984; Los Angeles, 1985; Washington, 1986; Dallas, 1987. Honolulu is tentatively scheduled for 1988. The recent convention in New York posted the all time high in attendance and also in revenue. Division 14 members who would like to return to New York for the APA convention sometime before 1989 may write to the Board of Convention Affairs at APA central office, conveying their views on any of the site recommendations.

On the lighter side, concerning more parliamentary agony, the high point (actually, it was the low point) of the Council meeting came on a tied standing

vote (50 to 50 with 13 abstentions) which was a recount of a vote on an amended motion to set the Council's adjournment time at 1:00 p.m. Sunday, January 20th. The half-hour debate on this question resulted in a 45-minute delay in serving a hot (cold?) catered lunch. President **Cummings's** tie-breaking vote affirmed the principle of giving full and complete consideration to all agenda items (during the afternoon we deliberated fully and completely and adjourned by 6:00 p.m., eliminating the need for the Sunday session).

A final note from Council: **Milton Blood** was elected coordinator of the Scientist/Practitioner (January 27th) coalition. **Lenore Harmon**, a counseling psychologist from the University of Illinois representing Division 17, will serve as secretary-treasurer.

(This summary was prepared by **Milt Hakel** for **Kitty Katzell**, **Virginia Schein**, **Milton Blood**, **Richard Campbell**, and **Paul Thayer**.)

## Profile: Wayne Sorenson

(EDITOR'S NOTE: About 10 years ago, **Wayne Sorenson** began the first of his biennial surveys of Division 14 members and their salaries. The following is *TIP's* first "survey" of members who have made special contribution to Division 14, a **Wayne Sorenson** survey.)

**Wayne Sorenson** was born in Twin Falls, Idaho about 45 years ago (*TIP's* survey will not be precise). After receiving his BA from the University of Minnesota he stayed on to take his MA and Ph.D. in Industrial Psychology (when I/O psychology had no O) in 1964 under the direction of **Marvin Dunnette**. In addition, Wayne minored in measurement. On graduating, he went to Eastman Kodak where he "developed" validation and other personnel psychology strategies. The exposure at Kodak wasn't negative, but Wayne thought the picture could be brighter and thus sought an opportunity to be involved with policies—so he moved to an insurance company in 1967, to State Farm Insurance Companies. At State Farm, Wayne wrote some renewable policies (those dealing with human resources) such that today he is Vice President of Research. Wayne supervises a department of 45, two-thirds of whom are professionals, including two Ph.D.s in I/O Psychology (State Farm is currently looking for another I/O psychologist who has a particular interest in consumer research). Wayne's department performs a variety of insurance business research, part of which run the gamut of I/O Psychology. Psychologists in his department have been involved with validation, attitudes, remuneration, market research and consumer surveys, accident research, and even some human factors research dealing with people-CRT interactions.



Wayne is quite active in insurance related research including a research organization that does anticipatory research for the insurance industry as a whole. For example, problems of interest have included analysis of auto injury claims and study of arsonist profiles. Wayne has also testified before Congress and the Secretary of Transportation regarding air bags and 5 mph bumpers. He has published in several nonpsychological journals—even an award winning paper appearing in the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) publication.

Within Division 14, Wayne has served on and chaired the Professional Affairs Committee. In addition, he is an APA Board of Directors appointed member on APA's Insurance Trust. For off-the-job interests, Wayne used to fly small planes, but he looked at some actuarial data and decided to take up bicycling. In addition, Wayne enjoys woodworking and photography. However, Wayne's informal hobby is the salary survey. Wayne's survey principle is to keep the survey as simple as an insurance policy—just collect salary and demographic data. For those who have already participated in the past, renewal simply requires completion of a short section so as to enable Wayne to maintain a longitudinal data base. By the time you will have received this issue of *TIP*, you should have received and returned the 1980 salary survey. A summary of results will appear in the August issue of *TIP*. Division 14 and *TIP* thanks Wayne for conducting the survey, analyzing the data, and reporting on how well off we are. It's been a professional survey—"Like a good neighbor, **Wayne Sorenson** is there."

### SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Division 14 membership is now open to APA Students in Psychology upon application to the I/O Membership Chair. Interested students should address requests for application material to **M. A. Fischl**, U.S. Army Research Institute, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Va. 22333.



## 14 TIPBITS

SHELDON ZEDECK

This issue of *TIP* contains considerable information on truth-in-testing, revision of principles, court decisions and interpretations, discrimination, guidelines, and investigatory panels and commissions. Perusing recent issues of *TIP* yields the impression that Division 14 is primarily interested in and attending to testing and related issues. However, I/O psychology is broader than personnel psychology and *TIP* would like to reflect that broadness. The *TIP* staff urges Division 14 members to use its newsletter to report on all of its activities. The topical editors need input from the members. If not much is forthcoming, then one may presume that there is only "truth" in personnel psychology and not in the other areas comprising I/O psychology.

In *TIP*'s efforts to seek the truth, **Irv Goldstein** has joined the editorial board. His topic deals with training and instruction in work organizations. Irv's first column extends an invitation to all members to participate in the exchange of information. Other columns in this issue, particularly by **Deborah Lauer**, **Laurel Oliver**, and **Jim Thurber**, also request input. Let's increase our exchanges and fulfill the newsletter's purpose.

*TIP* has another appeal. We don't need to remind anyone about inflation but...see your President's message (*Tenopyr's*, not *Carter's*). *TIP*'s printing and mailing costs are high and its income is low. Our "special calls" on members to request that their publishers advertise in *TIP* has not been too successful. Thus, rather than the member contacting the publisher, send **Larry Fogli** the title of your book, the publisher's address, and the contact person, and *TIP*'s business office will approach the publisher. By the way, if your library wants to subscribe to *TIP*, it's a \$15.00 annual rate. Let Larry know and he'll follow it up.

There are several items and notices from APA in this issue pertaining to the handicapped. Another agency, the Health Resources Administration, U.S. Public Health Service, DHEW, is developing a source list of professionals who happen to be handicapped to serve as potential resources for study groups and/or committees. Any individual who wishes to be included for the source list should contact **George Magers, Director, Division Rehabilitation, Bureau for Blind and Handicapped, Room 3316, Mary Switzer Memorial Building, 330 C Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 21201.**

One of the advantages (?) of being editor is that you are on the APA newsletter exchange mailing list (N is about 190). The Winter 1980 issue of the Minnesota Psychological Association reported their search for a new editor. The personality attributes which were necessary but not sufficient for the job of Newsletter editor include: literacy, masochism, and willingness to expose oneself. *TIP* is not bothered by the lack of an extensive job analysis but is concerned that the prediction model—compensatory or multiple cutoff—to be used was not specified.

### NEWS AND NOTES...

This issue recognizes Division 14 members who are serving on the Division's committees and APA Boards. *TIP* congratulates the most recent electee to the APA Policy and Planning Board, **Paul Thayer**. *TIP* also recognizes the contribution of Division 14 members **Ed Fleishman**, **Lorraine Eyde**,

and **Bob Guion**, who are serving as Past-President, Secretary-Treasurer, and Member-at-Large to Executive Committee, respectively, in Division 5 (Evaluation and Measurement)...**Ann Howard** has been appointed to the APA Task Force for the White House Conference on Aging which will take place in November 1981. Ann is particularly interested in the topics of older workers and retirement...Belated recognition to those who participated in Division 14's appearance before the congressional subcommittee last October (see the February 1980 issue of *TIP*). Largely through the efforts of **Paul Thayer** and **Frank Erwin**, Division 14 got a slot to testify. **Ed Fleishman** and **Wilfredo Manese** prepared the testimony. **Vic Vroom** and **Lew Albright** delegated their authority as members of the Division 14 Emergency Action Committee to **Paul Sparks** and **Mary Tenopyr**. The draft testimony was reviewed, revised slightly and approved at a meeting in Princeton by **Paul Thayer**, **Bob Guion**, **Paul Sparks**, and **Mary Tenopyr**. By the way, copies of **Frank Erwin's** testimony are available from **Bill Howell** (see his article in this issue).

*TIP* thanks **J. R. Simon**, **Eugene Jacobson**, and **Ted Cutler** for sending in back issues. The archives have already served a purpose in that *TIP* was able to accommodate a request for a copy of an article in an "old" issue and even found a reply to the article in a later issue...**Lynn R. Anderson** has received a Fulbright award to do research on multi-cultural management at the University of Auckland, New Zealand; **Jacob E. Hautaluoma** has also received a Fulbright, to lecture in industrial psychology and management at the Helsinki School of Economics in Finland.

Several developments involving Division 14 members have beefed up the doctoral program in I/O at NYU. **Madeline Heilman**, previously at Yale, is now an associate professor at NYU. As a result of closer relationships with NYU's Graduate School of Business Administration, the program is now getting teaching and/or advisement inputs from **Simcha Ronen**, **Sam Rabinowitz**, and **Steve Stumpf**. And a consortium has been formed between NYU and I/O psychologists in nearby companies, one being an advanced seminar on contemporary issues being team taught by **George Hollenbeck**, **Allen Kraut**, and **Joel Moses**...**Ken Wexley** has "tired" of Akron and will be retreaded at Michigan State University in September 1980. He will have a joint appointment in the Departments of Management and Psychology...**Jay Finkelman** has left his position as Dean of Students at the Baruch College, City University of New York, to accept the position of Executive Vice President of ArtCarved-A Lenox Company. He will maintain an affiliation with the Doctoral program in Business and remain a consultant with BFS Psychological Associates, Inc. Some people just have great difficulty in giving things up!

From Frito-Lay, in Dallas, **Thomas H. Brittain, Jr.** announces the promotion of **Thomas E. Tice** from Manager of Management Development to Manager of Compensation Planning and the promotion of **Ben E. Dowell** from Manager of Management Development to Manager of Human Resource Planning. *TIP* is waiting to hear who will be the new Manager of Management Development...**Frank McCabe** and **Henry Morgan** announce the formation of McCabe Morgan Associates, Inc. (230 Park Avenue, Suite 1930, New York 10017). Most recently, Frank was Sr. Vice President and Director of Personnel for ITT Corp. Henry is author of *The Interviewer's Manual: Fair and*

*Effective Interviewing* (revised 2nd ed., 1980). Before his recent position as Sr. VP of Drake-Beam & Associates, Henry had been Director of The Psychological Corporation's Industrial Services Division. McCabe Morgan will provide consulting services in human resources management... Another change is by **Warren L. White** who was Compensation Consultant with A. S. Hansen, Inc. and is now Compensation Manager at Scientific-Atlanta (3845 Pleasantdale Road, Atlanta, Ga., 30340). Warren is interested in exchanging information with others on practical developments in the areas of compensation such as performance appraisal, job analyses, incentive plans or job evaluations.

A new member of Division 14 has a new position. **Robert C. Sapinkopf** has left the Personnel Research and Development Center of the Office of Personnel Management for a position with The Proctor & Gamble Co. in Cincinnati as a consumer psychologist... **Jofannie Houk**, in Human Resource Planning at Crocker Bank (79 New Montgomery, 4th floor, San Francisco, Ca. 94105, 415-477-2042) is most interested in corresponding and/or talking with other HRPers working in large organizations. She'll be happy to share information about Crocker's HRP process with respondents.

**Frank Schmidt** spent some time on the West Coast. First, he participated in January, along with **Shelly Zedeck**, **Dick Reilly**, **Lyle Schoenfeldt**, **Jerry Niven**, and **Steve Brown**, in a Berkeley Institute of Industrial Relations (the home of *TIP*) conference on alternatives to paper-and-pencil testing. Then Frank went to Los Angeles to speak to the Personnel Testing Council of Southern California on the Behavioral Consistency Model... **Lorraine Eyde** also spoke to the Council, in February, on the New York State Police case (see **Jim Sharf's** column for a description of this case)... Finally, there is no printable news from or about **Mickey Kavanagh**.

THE DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF ITEMS  
FOR THE MAY ISSUE OF TIP IS  
JUNE 15, 1980

## CONTENT VALIDITY: WHITHER THOU GOEST?

JAMES C. SHARF

In the three decisions excerpted here, courts relied on the Uniform Guidelines either to throw out the employer's content validity study or to disallow ranking from a content valid procedure in the absence of additional empirical evidence. While public employers such as these typically are required to rank candidates in numerical order thus exacerbating impact, these adverse precedents nonetheless have enormous implications for all content validity users... especially assessment centers which typically have relied on content validity claims to defend the constructs being measured.

To the extent that these adverse decisions show a trend which relegate content validity for use only in setting minimum employment standards, the promise of parity between the validation strategies has been subverted. The government giveth with one hand and apparently taketh away with the other

(since the same Division 14 member who testified for the plaintiffs in each of these cases also assisted the government in preparing both the Uniform Guidelines and the Q&As).

### (1) *Firefighter's Institute for Racial Equality v. City of St. Louis*

In January, 1980, the Eighth Circuit reversed a district court decision which had approved the content validity study for a fire captain's promotion exam. Thirty percent of the exam was written, multiple-choice items and 70% an assessment center comprising three exercises: written responses to a "fire scene" situational test; preparation & presentation of a training lecture; and an interpersonal confrontation. The pass rate for incumbent blacks was 42.5% that of white firefighters.

The Appeals Court had previously set a deadline for completion of this validation study but before the court had decided on the merits of the study which had been submitted, the City of St. Louis had: 1) administered the multiple choice and assessment center components of the exam; 2) ranked candidates on test results; and 3) hired 16 white fire captains without notifying the plaintiffs as the court had stipulated. Seven more whites and one black were hired before the Federal Government obtained a temporary restraining order barring further promotions.

A district judge vacated the restraining order on grounds that even though the City had ignored the court's instructions in using a test that had not been approved by the Court, the black plaintiffs had little likelihood of prevailing. The district judge had observed that the City would have rebutted the prima facie case based on the impact of the exam because the recently conducted validation study had demonstrated that the selection process was job related.

In reversing the decision of the district court, the Circuit Court threw out the validity evidence and reasoned that:

"The captain's job does not depend on the efficient exercise of extensive reading or writing skills, the comprehension of the peculiar logic of multiple choice questions, or excellence in any of the other skills associated with outstanding performance of a written multiple choice test. Because of the dissimilarity between the work situation and the multiple choice procedure, greater evidence of validity is required... (a fire captain's job is) physical, hands-on... it involves complex behaviors, good interpersonal skills, and the ability to make decisions under tremendous pressure, and a host of other abilities—none of which is easily measured by a written, multiple choice test."

"Because the test is a written, multiple choice examination purporting to select those firefighters who can be expected to perform the best in a physical, stressful job, empirical evidence that the examination will actually accomplish that goal is required. None has been presented."

"Because these test results were used to rank candidates, St. Louis must prove that the results are associated with different levels of job performance. The EEOC's 'Questions and Answers'... explicitly address the requirements for using written examinations which measure knowledge to rank job candidates. They specifically require *empirical* evidence that mastery of more knowledge is linked with better performance on the job."

"St. Louis's expert... testified that the expert panel analyzed the tested knowledges and abilities to determine whether they were performance-differentiating. These exercises by the panel members, however well-intentioned, are not a form of empirical evidence. They are basically opinion and conjecture, not actual obser-

vation of the correlation between the extent of mastery of the knowledges and abilities sought to be measured by the test and job performance."

"The multiple choice test has not been shown to be content valid for the additional reason that St. Louis has not shown that the selection procedure measures 'those aspects of performance which differentiate among levels of job performance'."

"The fire scene simulation (of the assessment center) like the multiple choice examination cannot avoid testing the candidate's proficiency in the written exercise of verbal skills which is certainly not a critical or necessary job behavior for a fire captain... To justify the use of this portion of the examination as a ranking device, St. Louis is again required to demonstrate 'from empirical evidence either that mastery of more difficult work behaviors, or that mastery of a greater scope of knowledge corresponds to a greater scope of important work behaviors (Q & A #62).'"

"The appellants also criticize two aspects of the validity of the administration of the assessment center portion of the examination. First, they note that each candidate was observed for a very short period of time. The candidates were not observed at all during the fire scene simulation and were observed for a total of only about thirty minutes during the other two exercises. We consider this to be a substantial criticism, especially considering the Guidelines' requirement of additional evidence to validate a procedure for ranking candidates rather than for ascertaining minimum competence. Second, they criticize the assessor's role in the administration of the examination. They argue that the steps taken to assure the thoroughness of the training of the assessors and uniformity of evaluation among the various assessor groups was not sufficient. These arguments are not without merit... those assessing the interview and training simulations received only two days of training, and those assessing the fire scene received one day of training."

"In our view, the assessment center portion of the examination comes the closest to comporting with the Guidelines and would, thus, be the fairest basis for the selection of the eight black firefighters... St. Louis must fill these vacancies on the basis of one black firefighter for each two white firefighters that are promoted to the position of fire captain. These firefighters are to be chosen for promotion on the basis of their rank on the assessment center portion of the examination."

## (2) *Louisville Black Police Officers v. City of Louisville*

In September, 1979, the Federal District Court in Louisville decided this case brought against the City of Louisville Civil Service Board by the Black Police Officers and a class of blacks who are or would have been police officers. The prima facie case was challenged by the City on grounds that: "...none of the class action representatives were rejected because of their failure to pass... the Multi-Jurisdictional Police Officer Examination (MPOE) #165.1." The Court, however, contended that:

"The designation of the class action representatives is broad enough to confer capacity upon the class action representatives to put in issue all of the allegedly arbitrary, capricious and racially discriminatory practices on the part of the defendants with reference to employment, hiring practices and recruiting, even though these plaintiffs did not suffer concrete injury as a result of the individual defendant's use of the MPOE 165.1."

"It seems reasonably clear that if a substantial underrepresentation of blacks occurs in a selection process and the selection procedure is susceptible to abuse, as was the case in the years 1969-73 because of the invalidated written examination and the subjective oral interview, this supports the presumption raised by the

statistical showing, and a prima facie case of discriminatory purpose is made out."

In 1966-67... 36.3% blacks passed and 78% whites passed MPOE, and... "After the oral interview which was given, 48 blacks remained on the eligibility list and 401 whites so that at that stage, 12% of the persons eligible for appointment were blacks, which if taken by itself would probably not represent a substantial underrepresentation of blacks as compared with the figure of 15% projected by the Court as being the 'norm.' However, the next process of selection for recruitment school was based only upon rank, and only one black ranked in the first 40 eligibles and only five in the top 100 eligibles."

"Under the system then in use of calling approximately 30 to 40 recruits a year, where the second ranking black was 42 on the list, it was apparent that only 1 or 2 blacks at most would be chosen for the recruit school."

"The Court reaches the conclusion that MPOE 165.1 is content-valid. The Court has compared it closely to the test that was given in *Washington v. Davis* and finds that MPOE has greater relevance to the functions of a police officer than does the test in *Washington v. Davis*, which the Supreme Court held to be valid."

Note that in *Davis* job-relatedness for a test of verbal ability was established with criterion related validity, not content validity as was the study on which the judge commented immediately above.

"The Court notes first that neither the ranking method of choosing candidates for the Police Force nor the use of a passing score of 85% was endorsed or approved by the national association which formulated the test. While the Court realized the need of the Police Department to have highly professional, well educated police officers on the Force, it becomes apparent that the ranking devices used by the defendants in connection with MPOE 165.1 has precluded the admission of qualified blacks to the Police Recruit School. When this fact is taken into consideration along with the significant underrepresentation of blacks during the years 1969-73 and the years 1976-77, the Court believes that Title VII requires that the ranking method not be used with respect to black applicants who have achieved the passing grade of 85% (emphasis added)... In reaching the conclusion that the defendants may not use the ranking method by which to select candidates for the recruit school, the Court notes that there is no testimony in the record to the effect that those persons who scored the highest on the written examination will necessarily be the best qualified policemen."

"...this Court's thinking that the use of a ranking device such as that used by the defendants should not be sanctioned, where its disproportionate impact upon a minority race is so dramatically exhibited."

"The Court, by this holding does not wish to prevent the defendants from continuing to use MPOE 165.1 if it desires to do so. They may in fact, if they wish to, continue the ranking device to select their white officers. Also, when employing black officers under the remedy devised by this Court, the ranking device may be used to select the most qualified blacks, but may not be used to defeat the specific remedies imposed by this Court... The Court believes that... 1 out of every 3 persons appointed to recruit school is (to be) black during the years 1979-1984..."

## (3) *U.S. v. Connelie* (New York State Police)

In September, 1979, the Federal District Court in the Northern District of New York rejected the claim of content validity for the exam used by the State for selection of recruits to the NYSP academy. The case had been brought by nine white males who had challenged the hiring of minorities without regard to strict numerical order of eligibility after an earlier court

decision held that the NY State Constitution required merit appointments to be made in numerical order. The Court observed that less than 1% of the NYSP was black, hispanic or females combined, although these groups were 11%, 3% and 39% respectively of the labor market.

Over \$1¼ million had been spent on the development and administration of the '75 exam which had been built with technical assistance provided to the State by the then U.S. Civil Service Commission. (A number of federal officials involved in writing the Uniform Guidelines were involved in the litigation for both the plaintiffs and the State).

A "job-element/j-coefficient" validation effort had been undertaken under Civil Service Commission direction where "element = a worker characteristic which influences success in a job including combinations of abilities, skills, knowledges or personal characteristics." A panel of 155 "subject matter experts" from the NYSP generated 1400+ job elements which were consolidated into the following 15 elements (to which 223 "subelements" were assigned suggesting what activities/situations could be used to measure the job elements as defined by the subelements):

- Possess good judgment
- Thoroughness
- Ability to function while in physical danger
- Ability to assume responsibility
- Ability to make decisions
- Ability to work without supervision
- Possess dependability
- Have common sense
- Ability to take orders
- Ability to combine personal resources: mental and physical
- Enthusiasm toward the job
- Ability to act under pressure
- Ability to communicate well with others
- Possess motivation for the job
- Ability to make decisions under pressure/Ability to act under pressure

Of 30k applicants, 22k took and 4k passed the exam which had two parts: 1) 65% written "situation test" of hypothetical/simulated police situations/activities which was passed by 21% of the whites, 10% of the hispanics and 8% of the blacks; 2) 35% physical performance (half competitive and ranked) which was passed by 98% of the males and 67% of the females. Twenty-two percent of the males got veterans' preference but 0% of the females. Of 1100 offers made, the 545 subsequent appointments were 2.6% black, 1.5% hispanic and 0% female.

The District Court threw out the validity evidence and awarded a remedy in which 40% of each new class of recruits was to be black and hispanic and 10% female. The following verbatim excerpts are from the Court's opinion:

"Jobs may be placed on a continuum. One end of the continuum are jobs involving processes that are directly observable. At the other end of the continuum are jobs involving processes that are abstract or unobservable. In a worker-oriented job analysis, the workers are making inferences about the individual differences of characteristics that are associated with superior performance. The lower the job on the continuum, i.e., a job consisting primarily of observables, the less of an inference is made between what is done on the job and the personal characteristics necessary to do the job. For instance, in a typing job the task is typing and the

inference about individual characteristics, the ability to type, is not speculative. Likewise, in a task-oriented analysis, the closer one is to the abstract or unobservable end of the continuum, the inference as to what psychomotor activities are associated with performance of the job becomes highly speculative. The more speculative the inference is from observable, the greater is the "inferential leap." Therefore *content validity alone is an appropriate strategy to follow only at or near the observation end of the continuum such as trade and craft jobs, where the inferential leap is small* (emphasis added)."

"The 1975 trooper examination developed by the NYSP constituted an effort to test for good judgment, common sense, ability to size up a situation, thoroughness, reliability, dependability and a host of other intangible characteristics and mental processes. While it is certainly true that a trooper must possess good judgment, it is questionable whether the utilization of a content validity strategy alone was appropriate for such an examination."

"...the job element method of job analysis as followed by the NYSP in development of the 1975 trooper examination does not focus on what troopers actually do on the job, but only on the underlying traits or characteristics that troopers believe characterize successful job performance."

"In the NYSP development of the 1975 trooper examination, a definition of job tasks and responsibilities is not documented. A study of job tasks or duties was not conducted in the course of development of the trooper examination. In addition, relative frequency, importance and skill level of job tasks or duties were not identified. Furthermore, there was no study of the relative criticality of the subelements and the relative importance of the different subelements was not established. To the extent that the job analysis for the position of trooper did not study the tasks and duties for the position of trooper and did not study the frequency, importance, and skill level of such tasks and duties, it was a departure from professional standards and federal guidelines dealing with content validity. Although this information may have been within the collective knowledge of members of the job analysis detail, it was not and could not have been brought before members of the psychological profession or the Court for scrutiny and consideration."

"The 1975 written examination for the position of trooper was a situations test which, in essence, sought 'will do' responses to situation that normally do not occur behind a desk. The fact that someone selects a particular course of action as appropriate on such an examination does not mean that the same course of action would be followed by that individual under different circumstances in a real life situation...Sitting at a desk selecting the best alternative and the worst alternative in response to a written situation, I find, is quite different from being in a real life situation deciding what to do and doing it effectively. Essentially, the situations test developed by the NYSP represents a sampling of a portion of the job content universe for the position of New York State Trooper that had been gathered under the rubric of judgment along with thoroughness and common sense. No one, however, is able to determine which subelements under these job elements are actually measured by the measuring instruments. A review of the documentation of the job analysis and test development does not show what the examination measures. Members of the job analysis detail and various evaluation and rating panels, collectively, are the only ones who know what subelements are sampled by the situations test. This information, however, was not and could not have been presented to members of the psychological profession or the Court for scrutiny. Furthermore, there are no written operational definitions of the 223 subelements upon which the 1975 trooper examination was based, although a few are self-explanatory behaviors such as 'Ability to take accurate measurements such as using a 50' tape measure at an accident scene.' To this extent, there has been no showing that the subelements identified through the job analysis



are necessary for critical or important job behaviors and represent a departure from professional standards and federal guidelines."

"A task-oriented analysis was not done during the development of the 1975 trooper examination. There is no documented linkage between the content domain of the examination and the actual tasks, duties, and activities of the position of New York State Trooper. To the extent that this was not done, the development of the 1975 trooper examination based on a content validity strategy was not in accordance with professional standards or in compliance with federal guidelines on employee selection."

"Insofar as the NYSP appointed a class of...troopers...on the basis of a selection procedure that excluded females, this was a violation of Title VII. The pre-existence of an eligible list cannot be used to escape the obligation of prevailing law."

"The generally accepted procedures adopted by the psychological profession reflect the present inability of the science of psychology to set forth definitively proper standards or principles to follow in the validation of employee selection procedures under all circumstances."

"Inasmuch as the legal principle to be applied with regard to the job-relatedness of an employee selection procedure is one of generally accepted standards of the psychological profession, a court cannot be expected to draw solely upon its own resources in fashioning such standards. Of necessity, therefore, a court must rely in its search for the proper interpretation of applicable law on the various federal agencies whose responsibilities include enforcement of this legislation and the psychological profession itself for guidance. To this end, the salutary purpose behind the new Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures is to be greeted with weary relief. Indeed, a lack of coordination of policy and independence of counseling, I am sure, has led to ramifications that Congress could not have envisioned. Nonetheless, it must be recognized that the Uniform Guidelines as well as previously issued federal guidelines, the APA Standards, and the Division 14 Principles, all of which are written in a style that would make the works of Shakespeare appear to be written for children, merely represent the evolving standards of the psychological profession and are not set in cement. Although the Uniform Guidelines were not finally adopted until after the trial of this action was completed, I do not believe it is improper for the court to give them consideration along with all other writing, published before, during and after 1975, representing the thinking of members of the psychological profession. Moreover, in my judgement, the Uniform Guidelines do not represent a radical departure from previous thinking in the psychological profession as some would contend. Furthermore, while great deference should be accorded to guidelines interpretive of Title VII, this deference should not blind a court to new and generally accepted methodologies as they are developed by members of the psychological profession."

"...the evidence also supports the conclusion that certain parts of the Physical Performance Test portion of the 1975 trooper exam could have been scored differently thereby reducing adverse impact on females and at the same time serve the New York State Police's legitimate and creditable interest in obtaining a highly qualified applicant pool from which to make appointments to the position of trooper. In my judgement, as administered, the 1975 Physical Performance Test was nothing more than a speed and agility test and to the extent indicated above was an independent violation of Title VII."

"The unfortunate, although I am sure ultimately salutary, clash between civil service and equal employment opportunity laws must not be used to put an end to the underlying principles that precipitated either's enactment, but rather to bring about a synthesis beneficial to our society."

## TAKING PROFESSIONAL LICENSING TO TASK

C. J. BARTLETT

In 1978, the American Association of State Psychology Boards (AASPB) awarded a contract to the Professional Examination Service (PES) to carry out a project for content validation of the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP). The EPPP is used by all the states and several provinces as one requirement for professional licensure of psychologists. The purpose of the EPPP as described in "Information for Candidates" distributed by AASPB to candidates for licensure is as follows:

The test is intended to evaluate the professional competence of the candidate with the equivalent of a doctorate and one or two years of experience, by measuring knowledge of the major fields of psychology at a level that candidates, regardless of their specialty, may be expected to have attained; and by assessing ability to integrate and apply this knowledge, and capacity to exercise ethical judgments.

A licensing examination, unlike other examinations, has the purpose of protecting the public by eliminating the unqualified from professional practice. It is not designed to identify the most competent members of the profession, but to assure a minimum level of competence among its members.

The EPPP is intended for use in generic licensure. Thus, the same examination is used for all specialty areas, although individual state boards may require additional information or assessment of candidates.

The strategy adopted for the initiation of the content validation of the EPPS in 1978 was to appoint a "blue ribbon" panel of ten psychologists, two each in Clinical, Counseling, Industrial, School and General Psychology. (Mary Tenopyr and I were the I/O representatives.) The "blue ribbon" panel reviewed the current examination and was asked to list the major roles that define the practice of an entry level psychologist along with a list of the major areas of knowledge necessary for the competent performance of these roles.

The panel met in November of 1978. Although we generated lists of roles and knowledges, which were later to be scaled on importance, frequency, difficulty, etc., we raised some issues that are likely to be of much greater importance, are certainly being discussed with greater frequency and may have even caused some difficulty. These issues include such things as whether generic licensure makes any sense for certifying competency, whether ten "experts" sitting around a table for a few hours generating role and knowledge statements constitute an adequate job analysis for content validation, and whether the psychology profession should follow its own standards or the legal standards as defined by the Uniform Guidelines. The difficulty of carrying out such complex studies on a budget of \$12,000 which was allotted to PES for this study was acknowledged. The "blue ribbon" panel adjourned and the roles and knowledge statements we had generated were sent out for scaling to a select sample of 100 psychologists, including 20 I/O psychologists.

A number of the I/O psychologists completing the questionnaire expressed concern for the procedures being used, some writing me as Chair of the Professional Affairs Committee of Division 14. As a result, a resolution was adopted by the Executive Committee to send a letter to the Board of Professional Affairs of APA expressing our concern. The following letter was sent:

September 6, 1979

Pat DeLeon, Ph.D.  
c/o Richard R. Kilburg, Ph.D.  
Administrative Officer for Special Programs  
in Professional Psychology  
American Psychological Association  
1200 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Dr. DeLeon:

At a recent meeting in New York the Executive Committee of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology (Division 14) passed a resolution expressing concern for the procedures being used to measure competency of psychologists for purposes of licensing or certification. I have been asked as Chair of the Division 14 Professional Affairs Committee to share this concern with you.

The concern has arisen as a function of the large number of professional activities which have been aimed at improving the quality of professionalism, as well as a clarification of the identity of professional psychologists. These efforts have included the standardization of education and credentialing of training models through the designation of psychology programs, an attempt to content validate the Professional Practice Examination, and the development of Standards for Providers of Psychological Services. Although all these efforts have been toward a goal of improved quality of professionalism, that goal is unlikely to be achieved unless appropriate methodology is incorporated in the development of these programs.

Methodology exists within the field of applied psychology to aid professions to develop better education and training models, better assessment and credentialing procedures for accreditation and licensing and better standards for practice. These methodologies have been spelled out in the APA *Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests*, the Division 14 *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*, and have even been incorporated into the federal *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* (1978), which have the effect of law.

These procedures, which have been developed by our own profession, for evaluating measures of competence have not been consistently followed in evaluating professional psychologists for competency. Although evaluation of competency measures may follow several validation strategies, all strategies require a full needs assessment or job analysis which includes an analysis of the tasks, persons and organizations where the tasks are performed. The competency measures must then be evaluated by matching them with the critical aspects of the job. This is usually achieved by developing relevant performance measures for a criterion related validity strategy, or carefully matching elements of the competency measures with the critical elements of the job through a content validity strategy.

It is distressing to know that our own profession is not following the procedures which we have developed and codified as standards. Some may believe that proper validation cannot be accomplished for professional level jobs, yet other professions are following our procedures. The National Council of Architects is seeking the help of psychologists to conduct a proper validation of their licensing requirements. Federal agencies are using psychological principles and procedures for evaluating a variety of professional groups. Professional psychology should be leading the way and setting an example for the other professions. Thus far it has not.

Some may feel that the development of valid competency measures may be too expensive, but the potential benefits are high. The development of thorough study of the job of professional psychology could yield a much clearer definition of the uniqueness of the profession and improve the quality of professional practice and training by setting a more specific set of standards. Furthermore, a clear definition of competence should provide maximum protection of the public by assuring that

those who are credentialed are competent. Finally, the utilization of any measures to evaluate competency and regulate professional entry may be subject to discrimination against minorities. Failure to follow the procedures spelled out in the APA Test Standards and the federal Uniform Guidelines may be illegal. Professional certification and licensure procedures are not exempt, and failure to follow the proper procedures can be costly.

For all of the reasons stated above I urge the APA Board of Professional Affairs to study the matter. I would like to suggest the possibility of a Task Force for Competency Assessment being developed under the auspices of BPA. I would see the Task Force studying the feasibility of developing and validating competency testing as well as overseeing any potential projects. One way of testing the feasibility of such endeavors might be to pilot a project on some segment of professional practice (e.g., psychotherapy, vocational counseling or personnel selection, etc.)

I appreciate your consideration in this matter. If I can be of any help, please let me know [(301) 454-5423].

Sincerely,  
C. J. Bartlett  
Professor

As a result of this letter, BPA responded by calling a conference on Professional Assessment in February, 1980. The purpose of this conference was to discuss the issues raised and to make recommendations regarding their resolution. The conferees represented a broad base including representatives from AASPB and PES. Although I was the official representative of Division 14, we were represented by other I/O members, as well: **Lorrie Eyde** (Division 5), **Paul Sparks** (Committee on Tests and Assessments), **Ben Shimberg** (ETS), and **Ken Schenkel** (BPA) as the Conference Chair.

The most important point of agreement at the conference was that in order to accomplish a content validation of licensing procedures, consistent with our professional standards, a thorough job analysis is essential. The AASPB representatives indicated that they are allocating \$20 of each licensing applicant's fee for such a purpose. This will amount to \$100,000 or more per year. Although it was recognized that more funds will be needed, this is a good start. In order to aid AASPB with this effort, it was recommended that an advisory committee be established to include, among others, members of Divisions 5 and 14.

A major point of disagreement between I/O psychologists and health care providers has been on the issue of general vs. specialty licensure, along with the question of whether all professional psychologists should be licensed. Two resolutions were passed unanimously by this conference, which may indicate that I/O psychologists' views are being heard:

The conferees recognize that the magnitude of that component of psychological practice which is generic in nature has yet to be revealed by appropriate job analyses, and that consequently decisions regarding the most appropriate model of licensure (generic, generic plus specialty, or specialty) should consider, among other factors, results ensuing from such job analyses.

In accordance with the recently approved specialty guidelines for providers of psychological services,\* it is recognized that not all of the components of psychological practice require licensure.

\*The recently approved (by APA Council) Specialty Guidelines for Providers of I/O Psychological Services indicated that most I/O psychological activities should not require licensure.

What will happen to the recommendations from this conference and what will be their impact? The recommendations go back to the Board of Professional Affairs. Their action will have an impact on AASPB and eventually on all state licensing boards. AASPB is independent of APA and is not bound by any APA actions. State licensing boards are bound by their state laws and changes in independent state laws are likely to be slow and unpredictable.

The day when you can burn your license may never come, but the process that has already begun may help assure that a license to practice psychology will be more meaningful because professional standards are being applied to professional assessment in psychology. I believe that this has been accomplished because I/O psychology has helped take professional licensing to task (analysis).

## OD

JAMES A. THURBER

What I have chosen *not* to do in the space allocated to an OD section of *TIP* was write little tidbits of upcoming events, past events, who's doing what where and with whom, or grave issues that face us as professionals.

What would be interesting—at least to me—would be to collect some data about where OD'ers call "spiritual" and "professional" "home." A wise and then-old professor once advised that the absence of response in a well-designed experiment should be equally significant as the responses obtained.

Therefore, I am requesting all those who consider themselves an OD'er—meaning whatever you want it to—who read this to in some fashion by June 15 to communicate their interest in and/or contributions to a brief questionnaire, said questionnaire to be printed in the next issue of *TIP* on the general topic of "spiritual" and/or "professional" home(s) of *TIP*-reading OD'ers.

Hello, hello. Write to **Jim Thurber** at **Westinghouse, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222**.

### IMPORTANT NOTICE

If you are planning to write a book, have just written a book, wrote a book several years ago and the sales are down, or you simply read books, request that the publishing company advertise in *TIP*. It is expensive to produce *TIP*; we can use all the revenue *you* can generate. Have the publisher contact **Larry Fogli** at the *TIP* offices or pass along the advertising rate information which appears at the end of this issue.

## THE PES PSYCHOLOGY EXAMINATION: GEORGIA VIES FOR THE TOP OF THE HEAP

(EDITOR'S NOTE: In light of the previous article by **Jack Bartlett**, *TIP* decided to provide some information about the use of PES. The following is reprinted from the August 1979 issue of *Georgia Psychologist*. *TIP* thanks **Ted Ballard**, editor, for permission to reprint the article.)

With the PES written examination now a part of the licensing process in 49 of the 50 states (Michigan, in between licensing laws, will adopt it in 1980), the District of Columbia, and several Canadian provinces, controversy rages over such issues as its validity, applicability, and utility as a device for identifying adequately-read psychologists and/or screening against incompetent, fraudulent, or sub-educated ones.

Perhaps nothing is more indicative of the controversy surrounding the use of the PES than the inability of psychology boards around the country to agree on the appropriate level at which to cut licensure candidates. Cutting scores in the April, 1979, examination ranged from a high of 75% of perfection in Georgia, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, and Mississippi to a low of 25% in Louisiana, with a variety of clusters in between.<sup>1,2</sup>

If controversy has grown up around the use of the PES, there is irony as well. Consider, for example, some of the properties of the PES.

First of all, the examination is so far ranging and difficult that those already test-wise and examination-weary Ph.D.'s and advanced masters who took the PES in April were able to amass a national mean of only 71%.

Secondly, although APA policies expressly forbid one from practicing outside the areas for which one is trained, the PES plumbs rigorously into areas far afield from which any one person is likely to be trained or well-read.

Thirdly, some pool items are so obscure as to represent arcane knowledge. This writer recently searched more than a dozen major texts on statistics, mathematics, experimental design, and test construction theory to find the answer to one PES question on a statistical theorem. None of them made any reference whatsoever to the rare theorem. There is a question as to whether items which range so far from the mainstream of psychological information really assist in protecting the public and the profession.

Fourthly, although the APA *Casebook on Ethical Standards of Psychologists* is expressly critical of psychologists engaging in enterprises aimed expressly at helping individuals to pass examinations (APA, 1967, p. 5) a national industry is now developing out of the survival needs of psychologists, geared to offering costly crash courses to aid candidates in passing the PES.

Allowing that there may be some body of general knowledge that all practicing psychologists might reasonably be expected to know, the setting of PES cutoff scores is a crucial matter. If they are too near to 25% of perfect, candidates could be expected to pass it on the basis of random responding. But if it is at the high end, for instance above the national mean, the test may favor recent graduates and full-time academicians and penalize those who may be well-established, well-credentialed practitioners who happen to choose to practice in Georgia. Were this to happen it would be a loss both to the public and to the profession.

The PES examination may well be here to stay and will hopefully pave the way for reciprocal licensing procedures so that psychologists are not abruptly stripped of their identity and autonomy for lengthy periods of time simply because they cross a state line. That is why it is so important to maintain a continuing dialogue on this issue.

<sup>1</sup>As best as could be determined, PES cutoff scores for the April, 1979 examination were as follows:

Rank	No. of States	Cutoff (rounded)
(1)	5	75% (of perfect score): Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi
(2)	10	71% (National mean): Alabama, Arizona, California, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Ontario, Oregon, Wisconsin, Wyoming
(3)	3	70% (of perfect score): Ohio, Utah, Quebec
(4)	6	68% (one-half SD below national mean): Idaho, North Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington
(5)	1	67% ( $\frac{1}{2}$ SD below national mean): Kansas
(6)	5	66% ( $\frac{3}{4}$ SD below national mean): Maine, Maryland, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Tennessee
(7)	12	65% (one SD below national mean): Alaska, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Kentucky, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, West Virginia
(8)	1	65% (of perfect score): Pennsylvania
(9)	2	62% ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ SD below national mean): Indiana, Minnesota
(10)	2	60% (of perfect score): Montana, Manitoba
(11)	1	56% (of perfect score): New Mexico
(12)	1	40% (approximately—above lower quartile): Connecticut
(13)	1	35% (of perfect score): Florida
(14)	1	25% (of perfect score): Louisiana
(15)	5	0% In Michigan, Alberta, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan, licensing is by credentials review and oral examination until cutoffs are set, generally in 1980.

\*Source: Lahman, personal contacts with boards

<sup>2</sup>California, which had a 75% cutoff score has recently revised its criterion to the National Mean.

#### REFERENCES

- Casebook on ethical standards for psychologists.* APA, 1967.  
 Lahman, F. *Licensure requirements for psychologists: USA & Canada.* University of Evansville (Ind.) Press, 1978.

## Division 14 Members Serving as Officers, or Members of the Board Committees, Council of Representatives of the American Psychological Association

### APA OFFICERS

Treasurer: **Robert Perloff** (1974-82)

### COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES

**Earl A. Alluisi** (1978-80) Div 19  
**Milton R. Blood** (1979-81) Div 14  
**Richard J. Campbell** (1979-81) Div 14  
**Milton D. Hakel** (1980-82) Div 14  
**Michael G. McKee** (1979-81) OH  
**Robert Perloff** (1974-82) Treasurer  
**Virginia E. Schein** (1978-80) Div 14  
**Kenneth F. Schenkel** (1979-81)  
 GA/NC/SC  
**Paul W. Thayer** (1979-81) Div 14

### COMMITTEES AND BOARDS REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Committee on Structure and Function of Council*  
**Kenneth F. Schenkel** (1980-82)  
*Board of Directors*  
**Robert Perloff** (1974-82) Treasurer

### BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS REPORTING DIRECTLY THROUGH THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

*Membership Committee*  
**Douglas Bray** (1978-80)  
*Finance Committee*  
**Robert Perloff** (1974-82) Chair  
**Donald L. Grant** (1980)  
**Mildred E. Katzell** (1979-81)  
**Earl A. Alluisi** (1980-82)  
*Investment Committee*  
**Robert Perloff** (1978-82) Chair  
**Lyman Porter** (1978-82)  
*Policy and Planning Board*  
**Paul W. Thayer** (1980-82)  
*Publications and Communications Board*  
**Robert Glaser** (1975-80)  
**Earl A. Alluisi** (1977-82)  
**Robert Perloff** (1974-82) *ex officio*  
*Education and Training Board*  
**Samuel H. Osipow** (1979-81)  
*Board of Professional Affairs*  
**Kenneth F. Schenkel** (1978-80)

### Board of Scientific Affairs

**Robert M. Guion** (1979-81) Chair  
**J. Richard Hackman** (1980-82)  
*Committee on International Relations in Psychology*  
**Harry C. Triandis** (1978-80)  
**Edwin A. Fleishman** (1979-81)  
*Committee on Employment and Human Resources*  
**Edward M. Glaser** (1979-81)  
*Commission on the Organization of APA*  
**Kenneth E. Clark** (1979) Co-Chair  
**Richard J. Campbell** (1979)  
*Committee on Legal Issues*  
**Mary Tenopyr** (1980)  
*Scientific Manpower Commission*  
**Ralph R. Canter** (1975-80)  
**COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS REPORTING THROUGH THE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL AFFAIRS**  
*Committee on Professional Practice*  
**Paul Williams**  
*Committee on Health Planning*  
**Robert B. Garber**  
*Task Force on Specialty Criteria*  
**Jeanne M. Brett** (1980)  
*Task Force on Education and Credentialing*  
**Jack Menne** (1980)  
**Samuel Osipow** (1980)  
**COMMITTEES REPORTING DIRECTLY THROUGH THE PUBLICATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS BOARD**  
*Journal of Counseling Psychology*  
**Samuel H. Osipow** (1976-81) Chair  
**COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS REPORTING THROUGH THE BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS**  
*Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment*  
**Melvin Novick** (1980)  
**Paul Sparks** (1978-81)  
*Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects*  
**Robert F. Boldt** (1979-82) Chair  
**Joseph D. Matarazzo** (1978-81)

(Inform Frank Smith [Sears, Roebuck & Co., BSC 33-19, Sears Tower, Chicago, Illinois 60684] if your name and/or committee has been omitted from the above list.)



# Principles for the Design and Use of Admissions Testing Programs

Representatives of five organizations responsible for major national testing programs have announced a set of public interest principles to guide future developments in their standardized tests used for admissions. Leaders of the College Board, the Graduate Record Examinations Board, the Graduate Management Admission Council, the Law School Admission Council, and Educational Testing Service (ETS) have joined in developing general guidelines and some specific operational proposals for the testing programs for which they are responsible.

The guidelines include increased publication of the content of the tests, publicly visible procedures for eliminating test bias, and procedures to enable test takers to have their scores verified. They also call for procedures to increase the appropriate use of scores and to discourage misuse, for giving the test takers as much useful information as possible about their performance on the tests, and for giving them a voice in the design of the programs.

The result of months of discussion, these public interest principles will provide a basis for further discussion by the constituencies of each organization and also by educational and student groups concerned with testing. Many of the principles have been cornerstones of some testing programs, and the statement calls for renewed emphasis on them. As further agreements are reached, each sponsoring organization will work with ETS on how to move the guidelines into operation. Changes must be developed by each organization separately because the testing programs differ substantially in accordance with the purposes of the different institutions that use them.

The public interest principles are consistent with some of the goals of testing laws enacted in California and New York, as well as legislation proposed elsewhere. The principles, however, apply to all the admissions testing programs of the sponsoring groups whether or not they are covered by present laws. The test sponsors are concerned, moreover, that such laws often do not take into consideration the diverse needs of test takers who need to be examined at different times of the year and for whom the added costs of the specific changes proposed in some legislation would be burdensome. The sponsors are also concerned that any changes in the programs not impair the quality of the tests or their comparability, which makes them fair for students tested on different dates.

ETS develops, administers and scores the tests under policies set by the testing sponsors. The tests covered are: The Admissions Testing Program of the College Board, including the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and Achievement Tests, and the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Scholarship Merit Qualifying Test; the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) Aptitude and Advanced Tests; the Law School Admission Test (LSAT); and the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT).

## PUBLIC INTEREST PRINCIPLES

### for the Design and Use of Admissions Testing Programs

Recently there has been widespread debate about the design and use of national standardized testing programs for admission in higher education. In New York State and California, laws related to testing have been enacted. It is clear that while the

testing programs are meeting most educational objectives well, contributing significantly to orderly, equitable decision-making in admissions, they are not satisfying other criteria in equal degree. Accordingly, they should be re-examined and improved wherever possible.

The main concerns that have been raised have to do with providing more information about the tests to test takers, test users and the public, and with the appropriate use of the information derived from testing programs. These issues need to be discussed and possible solutions need to be explored by the several parties at interest, including students, institutions that use the scores, associations that sponsor the programs and agencies that administer them.

We are convinced that it is important for students and institutions alike that the tests indicate as accurately as possible the educational progress already made by individual students and their readiness to succeed at the next higher level of instruction. Therefore, in looking for ways to improve the testing programs with which we are associated, we are committed to finding solutions that will strengthen rather than weaken the quality of the information they provide.

We propose that discussions of the issues be expanded in coming weeks and that as many as possible of the critical principles of test program operation be decided upon and, where they are not already in effect, put into practice without delay. Toward that end, we are issuing the attached draft of principles and procedures for reaction and discussion. We are doing so in advance of any opportunity for review of the document by the constituencies we represent: they will make their own contribution to the discussions and will reach their own conclusions. But we strongly support the principles as a basis for constructive deliberation and action.

## Principles

A number of the principles enumerated below have been cornerstones of most testing programs for some years. We believe it is important, however, to reaffirm them here to provide a fuller view of our beliefs and our expectations for the future.

1. We recognize the legitimate interest of the public in knowing what the tests contain and their efficacy in performing their intended functions. Therefore, we will implement the principle of publication of test content to a degree limited only by reasonable safeguards of efficiency, cost, quality, and the educational impact of the programs.
2. We fully support the principle of equity and we will continue to maintain and strengthen credible procedures for detecting bias and eliminating it from the content of the tests, while making such procedures visible to the public.
3. We recognize the need for routine procedures that allow the test taker to arrange for verification of the accuracy of the procedures determining the score attributed to him or her.
4. We believe that tests should be readily available to all individuals, regardless of conditions such as physical handicap or religious beliefs that may prevent the taking of exams under circumstances that meet the convenience of the majority.
5. We recognize that tests, together with the procedures for scoring them and reporting the results, should be designed to provide test takers with as much useful information as may be feasible about the specifics of their performance on the tests.
6. We reaffirm the right of individuals and institutions to privacy with regard to information by and about them, which should be safeguarded from unauthorized disclosure.
7. We recognize the need to formulate, maintain, and publish widely principles of appropriate use of scores and other test information derived from testing programs and to be alert to and actively discourage misuse.

8. We recognize that both the institutions making use of test scores and the test takers themselves should have mechanisms through which to express their legitimate interests concerning the design and operation of testing programs and the use of the information derived from them.

#### *Operational Elements*

The separately constituted and governed groups sponsoring testing programs may choose to implement these principles in different ways. This probable diversity stems from differences in the nature and purposes of the tests in the several programs and from the specifics of their structure and operation. Examples of possible approaches include the following:

1. Each prospective examinee should be able to receive a full-length sample of each test, similar to the one he or she will take, with the intended answers and with instructions for self-administration and self-scoring.
2. For tests given to a sufficient number of students annually to support the cost, at least one operational form of the test should be published periodically, in addition to the regular sample. A specific schedule of publication should be designated for each program.
3. Non-technical information about the testing program should be furnished routinely to test takers, users, and the general public. It should include a description of what each test measures, the error of measurement, how the scores are intended to be used, and a summary of the validity of the scores for the intended uses.
4. A technical publication should provide information on the same topics in sufficient depth to permit professionals in the field to assess the evidence and the accuracy of the non-technical summary.
5. Studies of the use of the test by professionals other than those in the sponsoring or administering agency should be actively encouraged and facilitated by provision of the necessary data with safeguards for individual privacy. The results of those studies should be published in regular journals and also incorporated in the technical and non-technical publications.
6. The test sponsor should ensure that operational forms of the test are independently reviewed before they are given. The review should include the appropriateness of the content of the test and in particular should seek to detect and remove potential racial, cultural or sex bias or other influences extrinsic to the characteristics, skills or knowledge to be measured. The review should also determine that the operational form is fairly represented by the sample test already distributed.
7. Test takers should have the right to question the accuracy of scoring, administrative procedures, specific questions in a test, or allegations of irregularities in test administrations. Current procedures to deal with this right should be reviewed and modified if necessary to ensure a fair and prompt response.

We hope communication of these principles and operational guidelines leads to greater understanding and constructive dialogue about the important issues surrounding testing. We stand ready to work with all interested groups in discussion of the policies and improvement of the procedures under which testing programs are conducted.

For further information contact:

**Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ (609) 921-9000**

**Robert Moulthrop, ext. 3234 or Mary Churchill, ext. 3183**

**The College Board, New York, NY**

**Charles Holloway: (212) 582-6210, ext. 300; home, (201) 768-1756**

**The Law School Admission Council, Washington, D.C.**

**Bruce Zimmer: (202) 387-5750**

**Graduate Record Examinations Board**

**Bernard Khoury: (609) 921-9000, ext. 2960**

**Graduate Management Admission Council**

**Barbara Burgess Wolfe: (609) 921-9000, ext. 2219**

## **"Truth in Testing" Update**

MILDRED E. KATZELL

The following are legislative developments, concerning admissions testing, known as of March 17, 1980:

COLORADO—postponed

CONNECTICUT—Bill similar to New York law in committee

FLORIDA—Committee reported that legislation is not needed

INDIANA—Legislation introduced and killed

MARYLAND—Two bills introduced in late February are considered dead for this session

MASSACHUSETTS—Six testing bills have been introduced

MINNESOTA—Bill similar to New York's introduced in February

MISSOURI—Two bills introduced in January; one defeated, other not scheduled

NEW JERSEY—Still in committee

NEW YORK—Bills to amend LaValle Act have been and will be introduced

OHIO—Bill similar to New York law in committee

OKLAHOMA—Bill similar to New York law introduced in February considered dead for this session

PENNSYLVANIA—Companion bills in House and Senate, similar to New York law

SOUTH CAROLINA—Bill similar to New York law introduced in February; still in committee

TENNESSEE—Bill similar to New York law introduced in January, defeated in committee and withdrawn

TEXAS—No action expected this year

FEDERAL—Weiss and Gibbons bills expected to be reintroduced

(EDITOR'S NOTE: A pro and con presentation on "truth-in-testing" can be found in "Searching for the Truth About 'Truth-in-Testing' Legislation" by Rexford Brown. This backgrounder was published in January 1980 by Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln St., Suite 300, Denver, Colorado; 303-861-4917. It is available for \$6.50 prepaid, including postage and handling.)

## AD HOC STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

BILL HOWELL

Efforts are continuing toward the completion of our roster of state contacts. Presented below is a list of those currently serving in this capacity. If you live in a state that is not represented and would like to participate, please contact the regional coordinator in your area (also listed below).

The committee is in the process of surveying the states regarding the existing licensing and certification laws, "sunsetting" activities, "truth in testing" activities, and other information of general interest to Div. 14. About half have reported.

For states fighting "truth in testing," we can make available copies of the very cogent arguments presented by **Frank Erwin** and **Ed Fleishman** in the congressional hearing. Other materials on this are also available. Call **Bill Howell** at (713) 527-4850 if you wish further details.

*Northeast Region, J. Marshall Brown,*  
Coordinator

New Jersey—**Paul Ross**  
Connecticut—**James Mitchell**  
Pennsylvania—**J. Marshall Brown**  
Delaware—**Harry Loveless**

*Southeast Region, William H. Mobley,*  
Coordinator

Virginia—**Daniel Johnson**  
West Virginia—**Robert Decker**  
Tennessee—**John Larsen**  
North Carolina—**William McGehee**  
Mississippi—**Ernest Gurman**  
Alabama—**John Hopkins**  
D.C.—**Charles Allen**  
Florida—**Herb Meyer**  
Georgia—**Edward Loveland**  
Kentucky—**Glenn Williams**  
Maryland—**Irwin Goldstein**

*Southwest Region, James W. Hering,*  
Coordinator

Texas—**James W. Hering**

*Midwest Region, Milton Hakel*  
Coordinator

Michigan—**Fred Wickert**  
Wisconsin—**Paul Williams**  
Ohio—**Milt Hakel**  
Iowa—**John (Jack) Menne**

*Rocky Mountain, Lynette B. Plumlee,*  
Coordinator

New Mexico—**Lynette Plumlee**

*Far West, Frank J. Ofsank, Coordinator*

California—**H. Rogosin**  
**R. Scalpone**

Nevada—**H. Hesse**  
Oregon—**J. Matarazzo (tentative)**  
Washington—**Peter Scontrino**  
Alaska—**Cheryl Friar**  
Hawaii—**M. Hopkins**

### MESKIMEN'S LAW:

There's never time to do it right, but there's always time to do it over.

## Preferred Areas of Professional Competence for Masters Level Industrial/Organizational Psychologists Among State Departments of Personnel

BERNARD G. BENA and RAYMOND M. MENDEL

The major purpose of this study was to identify those technical skills employers prefer of masters level industrial/organizational psychologists. This information should provide guidance to I/O job seekers as how to best present their competencies and to graduate training programs seeking to design their programs so as to be responsive to public personnel needs.

To determine the preferred skills, surveys were mailed to all 50 state personnel departments requesting distribution of 100 points among the following personnel areas: selection system validation, interviewing skills, job analysis procedures, training techniques, performance appraisal systems, EEOC regulations, attitude survey skills, and job classification and evaluation. The assignment of the points was to be based upon the relative importance of skills in these areas for masters I/O psychologists seeking public personnel positions. Job descriptions of those positions for which a personnel director would consider a masters level industrial/organizational psychologist were also requested.

With forty-three states responding, twenty-eight states weighted the importance of each background area. Fifteen states could not assign weights due to the "specialized nature of the positions within their personnel system." For example, some states hired specialists whose sole duty was test validation while others hired specialists whose sole duty was training.

Along with the eight background areas appearing on the survey, thirteen other areas were written in and included in the weightings. To be included in the analysis, however, at least two states had to prefer the area for consideration of employment. The findings indicated: Selection System Validation was deemed most important with 20% of the total points; Job Analysis was second with 19.2%; and Job Classification was third with 18.8%. Next was EEOC Regulations with 11%, Interviewing Skills with 10%, Performance Appraisal Systems with 8% and Training Techniques with 7%. Least important were, Attitude Survey Skills with 3%, and Labor Relations, Writing Skills and Statistical Analysis, all with 1%. A few of the areas deemed important by only one state included Computer Skills, Collective Bargaining, Recruitment, and Compensation. A total of 116 descriptions were collected with 77 different job titles. A few of the most common job titles are: Personnel Officer, Personnel Director, Personnel Analyst, Employment Interviewer, and Research Analyst.

In reviewing the job descriptions for some of the 77 different jobs, it was evident that the major difference between many of the jobs was the title alone. Many of the duties listed under different jobs were exactly the same and therefore these jobs should require the same areas of concentration. It is evident that those seeking public personnel positions in this area ought to be aware of the multiplicity of job titles in the public arena under which these skills are being sought.

Although areas such as EEOC Regulations, Performance Appraisal Systems and Statistical Analysis were assigned relatively few points, it is necessary to note the importance of possessing skills in these areas in order to be proficient in Selection System Validation. Most of the states that assigned points to areas other than Selection System Validation said that they would consider masters level industrial psychologists for more specialized jobs such as research analyst or equal employment opportunity specialist thus placing more emphasis on the specific areas.

Since the public personnel area affects literally millions of workers, typically operates under a merit system mandate, and at best can generally attract masters level rather than doctoral industrial/organization psychologists, the importance of providing masters level psychologists with thorough selection system validation skills is underscored.

### **I/O STUDENTS**

DEBORAH A. LAUER

In the fall of 1979, the first edition of this column appeared in *TIP*. I had hoped that this column would serve as a means of information exchange among I/O Psychology and Organizational Behavior graduate students and also as a means of establishing an informal network for professional relationships among I/O Psychology and Organizational Behavior students throughout the country. Although I have received several supportive letters regarding this column, I have received no information from any students as to the projects with which they are involved, special areas of concern and/or interest, etc. Consequently, this column has not appeared in the last two issues of *TIP* as I have had no information to relay. I realize that as graduate students we are all busy with classes, exams, dissertations and the like, but I strongly believe that by sharing our knowledge and ideas we can further advance the field of I/O Psychology.

As I write this column, I am looking forward to attending the 1st National Conference for I/O Psychology and Organizational Behavior Graduate Students. I believe this conference is an important step in establishing a sense of community among us. While at the conference, I plan to try to generate some enthusiasm for this column or a similar endeavor. Should you have any suggestions or comments regarding this column, please contact me at: **Department of Management, 413 Stokely Management Center, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37916; 615-974-3161.**

## **28th ANNUAL INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY WORKSHOPS**

**Presented as part of the annual convention of  
The American Psychological Association**

**Sunday, August 31, 1980**

**Queen Elizabeth Hotel  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada**

### **WORKSHOP COMMITTEE**

**David W. Lacey, Chair**  
**Stanley B. Silverman, Treasurer**  
**Richard D. Arvey**  
**Richard S. Barrett**  
**V. Jon Bentz**  
**Gary B. Brumback**  
**Jeffrey H. Greenhaus**  
**Tove H. Hammer**  
**Terence R. Mitchell**  
**Robert A. Ramos**

Division 14 is approved by the American Psychological Association to sponsor continuing education in psychology. Division 14 workshops are offered for seven (7) hours of continuing education credit.



## WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Sunday, August 31, 1980

Queen Elizabeth Hotel

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

- 8:15 a.m. — 9:00 a.m. Registration  
9:00 a.m. — 12:30 p.m. Morning Sessions  
12:30 p.m. — 1:30 p.m. Lunch  
1:30 p.m. — 5:00 p.m. Afternoon Sessions  
5:30 p.m. — 7:30 p.m. Reception
- Section I Career Management Systems: Implications for Individuals and Organizations  
**Tod White**
- Section II From Performance Appraisal Theory to Practice...Some Stepping Stones  
**David L. DeVries and Sandra L. Shullman**
- Section III Applications and Evaluation of Job Analysis Methods  
**Edwin T. Cornelius and Edward L. Levine**
- Section IV Review of Relevant EEO Cases: Implications for Professional Practice  
**Lawrence Z. Lorber**
- Section V Is Horatio Alger Dead or Merely Ill? The New Breed Worker and the New Work Values  
**Bruce Charnov**
- Section VI Unions and Organizational Effectiveness: Managing the Labor Contract  
**Thomas A. Kochan**
- Section VII Increasing Productivity through Behavioral Interventions  
**Gary M. I. Latham**
- Section VIII The Determination of Adverse Impact  
**Donald J. Schwartz and Patricia Shahan**
- Section IX Office Automation and Its Impact on the Organization  
**Lawrence K. Williams and Thomas Lodahl**
- Section X The Measurement of Physical Abilities  
**Edwin A. Fleishman**
- Section XI Assessment Centers for Higher Level Managers  
**Len W. Slivinski**

## SECTION I (Full Day)

### Career Management Systems: Implications for Individuals and Organizations

**Tod White**

President, Blessing/White, Inc.

This workshop is intended to demonstrate a proven and successful career management process. Its introduction and continued use by over 100 major corporations provide sufficient evidence of its value to these organizations and their individual employees.

In this workshop participants will experience a shortened version of the career management process. During this simulated experience participants will discuss the individual career management issues of: (1) Motivational factors associated with professional/managerial careers, (2) trade-offs between personal, family, community, and organizational values; (3) self-assessment techniques; (4) the relationships between development needs and skill improvement opportunities; and (5) the preparation for and content of career development discussions. Also, this workshop will focus on specific ways to integrate a career management system with other elements of a human resources system, e.g., performance appraisal, succession planning, and affirmative action. As part of the career management process demonstrated in this workshop, all participants will bring a skills analysis completed by themselves and their supervisors.

**Tod White**, a University of Minnesota Ph.D., is president of Blessing/White, Inc. His consulting firm's area of special interest is career management systems.

Coordinator: **Jeffery Greenhaus**, Stevens Institute of Technology

## SECTION II (Full Day)

### From Performance Appraisal Theory to Practice...Some Stepping Stones

**David L. DeVries and Sandra L. Shullman**

Center for Creative Leadership

"Why is it that appraisal systems most examined in the literature so seldom find their way into practice? Why do my managers find appraisal so irrelevant, so much a chore?"

This workshop will address major themes and design issues faced in developing performance appraisal systems, with particular emphasis on the issues, problems, and key decisions faced by those who are responsible for implementing performance appraisal systems in organizations. Workshop participants will be briefed on recent PA issues addressed in the literature and have the opportunity to apply this information to their own organizations. A critical decision sequence will be presented and participants will use this tool in formulating an initial plan of action for performance appraisal in their own organizations. The workshop focuses largely on those responsible for performance appraisal design and development in applied settings. It will also address issues of relevance to organizational consultants and to personnel researchers. The workshop format will include short briefings and structured individual and small group discussions and presentations. Participants should be prepared to complete a pre-assessment instrument to contribute relevant information about their own performance appraisal approaches in discussion sessions.

**David L. DeVries** is Director of Research at the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina. He is a member of APA, Division 14, and has published

in several social/industrial topic areas. Since 1976, he has been part of a Center Performance Appraisal program focused on issues of successful application of appraisal principles. As such, he has supervised numerous workshops and internships for both human resource professionals and advanced graduate students. He received an M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Illinois-Champaign-Urbana in Social Psychology.

**Sandra L. Shullman** is Project Manager and Research Psychologist at the center for Creative Leadership. She received a MEd from Harvard University and a Ph.D. from the Ohio State University in Counseling Psychology. She has published in the topic areas of counseling and assessment. Since 1977, she has been part of the Center's Performance Appraisal program and has focused on performance appraisal interventions in corporate settings and has conducted numerous performance appraisal workshops. She is an APA member.

Coordinator: **Gary Brumback**, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

### SECTION III (Full Day)

#### Applications and Evaluation of Job Analysis Methods

**Edwin T. Cornelius** and **Edwin L. Levine**  
The Ohio State University University of South Florida

This workshop will proceed from a discussion of basic issues in job analysis to a description of various methods and their applications. Then, a framework for evaluating the efficacy of the various methods will be proposed, and, finally a summary of extant research evaluating the efficacy of the various methods will be encouraged throughout the session.

The section on basic issues will cover the notion of how jobs come about, what constitutes a job and the several dimensions along which approaches to studying jobs may vary, including, for example, the type of data (tasks, abilities, etc.) that is the central focus. A listing of the purposes that job analysis may serve will conclude this segment and serve to introduce the next segment, in which a number of job analysis methods, e.g. the Position Analysis Questionnaire and Critical Incidents, will be described. Each of the methods will be linked to those applications for which they seem best suited.

The question of how to evaluate the utility of the various methods empirically will be dealt with by proposing a set of criteria including the cost of conducting a job analysis study and several potential research designs. Also the workshop leaders will discuss research which has addressed the comparative efficacy question.

**Edwin T. Cornelius**, who was in charge of the APA Symposium on job classification last year, received his Ph.D. from Texas Christian University. He has conducted research for the U.S. Coast Guard, the American Petroleum Institute, and the U.S. Department of Labor. Currently he is developing a biographical prediction instrument for the Employment Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. He has published papers in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Psychometrika*, and *Personnel Psychology*, of which he is on the editorial board.

**Edward L. Levine**, who received his Ph.D. at New York University, focuses his research on job analysis and employee selection. Last year he won the APA Division 13 Research Award. Before becoming an Associate Professor at the University of South Florida, he was Chief of Selection for the Personnel Division of the State of Arizona. He has published books on interviewing and reference checking.

Coordinator: **Richard Arvey**, University of Houston

### SECTION IV (Half Day)

#### Review of Relevant EEO Court Cases: Implications for Professional Practice

**Lawrence Z. Lorber**  
Breed, Abbot & Morgan

During this workshop, selected court cases dealing with specific employment policies and practices will be reviewed. Those which have been viewed with some consistency as contributing to fair and non-discriminatory staffing systems will be identified and elaborated upon. Additionally, court cases with the potential for significant impact upon personnel decisions will be discussed. Decisions affecting criteria for employment policies and procedures, documentation requirements, and court presentations will all be reviewed. This workshop is geared to personnel practitioners, practicing industrial psychologists, and persons with responsibility in making personnel decisions and policies. The workshop will consist of presentations followed by question and answer periods as necessary.

**Lawrence Z. Lorber** is currently a partner in the law firm of Breed, Abbot, and Morgan. Prior to joining this firm, he was with the OFCCP representing employees in labor relations matters including equal opportunity. When director of OFCCP, he was representing the Labor Department in the negotiations which resulted in the FEA Guidelines, and adopted them for the Labor Department. He also supervised the recodification of the Affirmative Action regulations for the Labor Department.

Coordinator: **Stan Silverman**, Organizational Consulting Group

### SECTION V (Half Day)

#### Is Horatio Alger Dead or Merely Ill?: The New Breed Worker and the New Work Values

**Bruce Charnov**  
Yankelovich, Skelly, and White, Inc.

Emerging from the decade of the 70's is a new group of workers, who have been classified as "New Values." This description now applies to 4 of every 10 workers, and to 50% of all workers under age 35. Given their pervasiveness in the workforce, this workshop will focus on the expectations and attitudes of "New Values" workers. Using Y.S.W. survey data, this workshop will examine the needs of "New Values" workers, as they relate to job structure and content, incentive packages, the quality and quantity of communication, career development, and supervision. Successful management of these key issues is one of the major human resource challenges of the 80's, as organizations recruit, retain, motivate, and develop this young and growing segment of the workforce.

During this workshop, each participant will:

- 1) Acquire a framework of social change covering the 1950-1980 time frame, and
- 2) Understand how, within the framework of general social change, the role of work (work values) has changed, and
- 3) Understand how changes in family structure, definition of success, the "good life," the changing definition of maturity and evolution of new lifestyles are impacting upon work values, and
- 4) Understand the parameters of the new work values by examining in detail two groups within the under-35 work force in terms of a) commitment to work, b) job

structure preference, c) need for personal communication, d) implications for supervision, training and development, career planning, incentive motivation, etc.

5) Be able to place new values workers within the following classifications: a) those who demand meaningful work, and b) those for whom the major commitment is to be found in leisure time and other-than-work activities, i.e., those for whom work has become a means-to-an-end, a facilitator of the full, rich lifestyle, and

6) Explore implications and evolve new incentives for the new values workers.

**Bruce Charnov**, a Ph.D. from United States International University, has contributed to the design of and marketed SIGNAL, a research service product of Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc. SIGNAL is a continuing study of changing work values and employee motivations. As a result of his work on SIGNAL, Bruce Charnov has made presentations to senior management of Fortune 500 companies on the implications of changing demographics and new worker values for human resource policies. Prior to his work at YSW, he was a naval officer and visiting professor at the University of Maryland's Far East Division.

Coordinator: **David W. Lacey**, INA Corporation

#### SECTION VI (Half Day)

##### Unions and Organizational Effectiveness: Managing the Labor Contract

**Thomas A. Kochan**  
Cornell University

This workshop will focus on the labor union, the labor agreement, and contract management within the organization. It is designed to familiarize participants with recent research on the impact of unionization on selected aspects of organizational effectiveness, and to define a more active role for the I/O psychologist in labor contract management.

The workshop will deal with the following aspects of an organization's labor-management relationship; 1) the climate of labor relations; 2) the content of the union contract; 3) the work stoppage history of the firm; 4) the organization's adjustments to conditions in the labor contract, and their effects on employee turnover, performance, and job satisfaction, compensation costs, occupational safety and health, selection and placement policies. Practical issues of labor contract management such as the role of grievance procedures, labor-management committees, and selected contract provisions will be covered. A portion of the workshop will be devoted to a discussion of the kinds of data one would want to collect to monitor and evaluate the effects of an organization's labor-management relations on outcome variables of interest to I/O psychologists.

A paper by the workshop chairman will be circulated to those who plan to attend prior to the meeting. This will allow for maximum discussion and interchange among the participants at the workshop.

The workshop is intended for both researchers and practitioners in the I/O field who work with or within unionized organizations as well as for psychologists interested in research in the area of unionization.

**Thomas A. Kochan** is Associate Professor of Collective Bargaining at the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. He has done extensive research in the area of collective bargaining and bargaining outcomes, and effects of unions on the economic performance of companies and the stability and work attitudes of employees. He works as an arbitrator and mediator in labor dispute settlements and contract negotiations.

Coordinator: **Tove Helland Hammer**, Cornell University

#### SECTION VII (Half Day)

##### Increasing Productivity Through Behavioral Interventions

**Gary M. I. Latham**  
University of Washington

This workshop will focus on specific behavioral methods for increasing individual productivity within an organization. Behavioral methods or interventions have been selected from the human resource areas of motivation, training and development, and performance appraisal. Major, new techniques in each of these three areas will be reviewed and demonstrated. Also, the workshop leader will present the results of using each technique in an organizational environment. Extensive use of films, case studies, exercises, and demonstrations will further acquaint the participants with each intervention and clearly document its effectiveness.

**Gary Latham**, a University of Akron, Ph.D., is a faculty member of the University of Washington and a Fellow of Division 14. He is a member of SOB and the Summit Group and has authored numerous publications on behavioral interventions in industry.

Coordinator: **Terence R. Mitchell**, University of Washington

#### SECTION VIII (Half Day)

##### The Determination of Adverse Impact

**Donald J. Schwartz and Patricia Shahan**  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

This workshop is intended to provide the participants with direct assistance in understanding, interpreting, and applying the provisions in the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* related to adverse impact. The leaders will discuss the *Uniform Guidelines*, the *Questions and Answers*, and recent interpretations of the enforcement agencies. Participants are invited to bring with them specific questions and data which can serve to illuminate the issues involved in determining whether adverse impact exists. The topics will include: record keeping, the computation of adverse impact, and the adjustments that are made to take into account the specific circumstances of the employer and the labor market.

**Donald Schwartz** is a psychologist who served with the Civil Service Commission from 1972-1976 and the Department of Labor from 1976 until he moved to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1979. He helped to draft the FEA Guidelines and served on the staff committee that drafted the *Uniform Guidelines* and *Questions and Answers*.

**Patricia Shahan** is an attorney who has helped to interpret the law and the *Uniform Guidelines* for the public.

Coordinator: **Richard S. Barrett**

## SECTION IX (Half Day)

### Office Automation and Its Impact on the Organization

**Lawrence K. Williams**  
School of Industrial and  
Labor Relations  
Cornell University

and

**Thomas Lodahl**  
School of Business and  
Public Administration  
Cornell University

This workshop will focus on some of the issues confronting I/O psychologists as word processing, electronic mail and other new technologies are introduced into the office environment. Specific topics will include: managerial productivity, measuring and tracking office performance, job delegation, understanding resistance to change, job design, and the role of the I/O psychologist during implementation of advanced technology in white collar settings.

Office environments continue to be labor intensive and are currently receiving considerable attention as organizations seek higher productivity. This workshop should be useful for anyone who currently has or may have the office force as their clients.

The introduction of office automation provides an opportunity to rethink the office in terms of work balancing. A job delegation process which usually results in enrichment of secretarial and clerical work will be discussed.

Data will be presented from several sites bearing on the issue of managerial productivity. Of particular concern is the amount of work on the manager's desk that belongs at a lower level. Cost benefit analyses indicate that the amount of \$10,000 work on \$40,000 desks is exceedingly high.

This workshop should be appropriate for "in house" or external consulting I/O psychologists. A major focus will be on introducing change in the office environment. Knowledge of office automation technology is not necessary.

Participants will receive articles and other material on office automation in advance of the workshop. The format of the workshop will consist of a presentation summarizing some of the research and experience of the presentors followed by extensive periods devoted to questions and answers.

**Lawrence K. Williams**, Professor of Organizational Behavior, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University and **Thomas Lodahl**, Professor of Organizational Behavior, School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University, have collaborated on research and consulting in the area of office automation for the past several years.

Coordinator: **Tove Helland Hammer**, Cornell University

## SECTION X (Half Day)

### The Measurement of Physical Abilities

**Edwin A. Fleishman**  
President, Advanced Research Resources Organization

This workshop is intended to review the state of the art with respect to concepts and methods for evaluating the physical requirements of jobs. Therefore, the leader will discuss the conceptual and methodological background of physical abilities analysis, a method for determining the physical requirements of jobs and for linking these to test measures which evaluate these requirements. The background research on physical abilities identified, their operational definitions, and tests identified to measure these abilities will be described, as well as the development of job analysis

methods to estimate physical ability requirements of jobs. Recent applications in a variety of applied situations will be reviewed and analyzed. The workshop will include demonstration materials.

**Edwin A. Fleishman** is a former President of Division 14 of the American Psychological Association, and also past president of both Division 5 (Evaluation and Measurement) and Division 21 (Engineering Psychology). He is a former Editor of the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and is currently President of the International Association of Applied Psychology. His books include *Structure and Measurement of Physical Fitness*, *Studies in Personnel and Industrial Psychology*, and *Psychology and Human Performance*. He is the author of more than 100 journal articles, a chapter of Human Abilities in the *Annual Review of Psychology*, and encyclopedia articles on aptitude testing and human motor performance.

Coordinator: **Robert A. Ramos**, AT&T

## SECTION XI (Half Day)

### Assessment Centers for Higher Level Managers

**Len W. Slivinski**  
Director, Personnel Psychology Center  
Public Service Commission  
Canadian Government, Ottawa, Ontario

While assessment centers hold great promise for evaluation of higher level skills, this technology has only rarely been used with upper level executives. This workshop will focus on the special needs and problems associated with adapting assessment procedures for higher level executive positions. Dr. Slivinski has, in addition to applying multiple assessment techniques to personnel needs at various levels within the Canadian Government, developed a unique and highly innovative process for assessing high level officials. His experience will allow workshop topics to range over the inter-relationships among such areas as job analysis, definition of assessment dimensions, exercise development (both individual and group), assessor selection and training, and individual feedback. All—with special reference to higher level assessment.

**Len Slivinski** received his Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Ottawa, where he has taught courses on tests in measurement since 1965. He has worked intermittently for the Public Service Commission of Canada since 1969. He is now the director of the Personnel Psychology Center and the Career Assessment Program with the Public Service Commission. He is on the board of directors of the Executive Study Conference and has been a member of the Assessment Center Research Group. In addition to the American Psychological Association, he has given presentation for the Canadian Association of Administrative Science, International Management Association, and the International Congress of Assessment Centers, which he will chair this June.

Coordinator: **Jon Bentz**, Sears, Roebuck and Company



## REGISTRATION

### 28th Annual APA Division 14 Workshops

Queen Elizabeth Hotel

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Sunday, August 31, 1980

NAME (Please Print) \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

MAILING ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PHONE (        ) \_\_\_\_\_ EXT. \_\_\_\_\_

APA DIVISION MEMBERSHIP(S) \_\_\_\_\_

#### A Note to Registrants:

Three (3) of this year's workshops have been designated as day long workshops. When filling out your registration form, please take this fact into account. If you request a full-day session as one of your options, please do NOT indicate an additional half-day session within that same option. PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU EITHER CHOOSE TWO HALF-DAY SESSIONS OR ONE FULL-DAY SESSION.

	Section #	and	Section #
My first choice:	_____		_____
My second choice:	_____		_____
My third choice:	_____		_____
My fourth choice:	_____		_____

Registration is on a first-come, first-serve basis. All workshops will be limited to 25 participants.

\$100 Division 14 Members and Student Affiliates	\$125 APA Members	\$150 Non-APA, Non- Division 14 Members
---	-------------------	--

Fee includes: All registration materials, lunch, social hour. Additional tickets for social hour are \$8 per guest.

Please make check or money order payable to: APA Division 14 Workshop Committee (U.S. currency please).

Mail form and  
registration fees to:

**Stan Silverman, Treas. Division 14 Workshop Committee**  
**Organizational Consulting Group**  
**483 Overwood Road**  
**Akron, OH 44313**  
**(216) 836-4001 or (216) 929-8949**

## EVENTS IN THE TRAINING WORLD

IRWIN L. GOLDSTEIN

Since I recently agreed to write and coordinate a quarterly column for *TIP* on training issues, it is now time to face the written page and express some hopes for the use of this space. In future issues, I would like to present material related to training and instruction in work organizations. Discussions and announcements of work on needs assessment, evaluation, particular methodologies and training techniques will be featured. Particular columns may also focus upon the discussion of a special issue, e.g. the use of training data in fair employment practice cases or innovative evaluation methodologies or the development of new technologies. Also, I will try to describe the publication of particular articles and books on the training process as well as announce forthcoming meetings and workshops.

Hopefully, this will result in useful exchanges of information about training and instruction in work organizations. One comment often heard about issues involving training is that many developments are occurring in a variety of organizational environments that no one ever hears about. Perhaps, this column can serve as a forum for announcements and short descriptions of these developments. Then interested parties can contact each other to obtain further information. As part of this process, I will search for and report on various activities. However, the success of this column depends upon input from *TIP* readers who have information about their own and other persons' activities. Please send it on to me in any form you have it (notes, clippings, scribbles on backs of envelopes and napkins). I promise to try to get it all in print. You can reach me by writing to **Irv Goldstein, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742** or by calling **301-454-6103**. Please let me hear from you. As an opening contribution, I would like to announce that my chapter, *Training in Work Organizations*, was just published in the *1980 Annual Review of Psychology*. As long as they last, free reprints are available. If you write for a reprint and have news about other training activities, I would sure appreciate hearing about it.

### COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REQUEST

Nominees for Division 14 Committees needed!

If you have an interest in, or are willing to serve on any committees of Division 14 please submit your name and address to:

**Dr. Frank J. Smith**  
**Sears, Roebuck & Co.**  
**BSC 33-19, Sears Tower**  
**Chicago, IL 60684**

Those responding will receive a nominating form describing committee assignments and committee preferences.

Do not let humility, shyness, or even lack of experience prevent you from volunteering. Committee membership is most frequently achieved by self nomination.

## APA Research Ethics in Revision

R. F. BOLDT

*Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants* is an APA-published booklet that interprets the ethical standard for research. It is being revised by the APA Ad Hoc Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Psychological Research; we seek your help in the revision. It's worth our trouble to help because, as APA members, we have agreed to abide by the Ethical Standards. We need a balanced interpretation of that to which we agree, and by which the ethics of our behavior as researchers is judged. The present version of *Principles* has an overemphasis on research in academic settings, a defect admitted in the current edition, and its clinical orientation is also apparent where applied research is discussed. The sensitivities and responsibilities connected with research in other applied areas should receive due consideration.

The original edition of *Principles* leaned heavily on written accounts of incidents bearing on the ethical use of human subjects. The present committee has also asked division chairs to supply accounts of incidents that update the existing *Principles*, or that point up their weaknesses. We urge you also to help us in this way.

Some substantive issues that you might address follow. Among the specific issues important to industrial psychology are those relating to dual relationships with research subjects. Examples of subjects in a dual relationship with psychologists are clients or students; pure examples would be when the researcher is also the therapist, or the subject is in the researcher's class. The current *Principles* puts the employee in the same category as clients and students with no distinction except to give special emphasis on the possibilities for undesirable coercion by the employer. Perhaps a distinction is needed on grounds that the psychologist-employee relationship is not the same in the employment setting as it is with teacher-student or client-therapist relationships. For example, participation in some industrial research can be understood as part of the management of a person's work. A requirement for participation in business-related studies probably should be made an explicit part of the employer-employee agreement. Other issues include: Is there a different ethical problem connected with making participants in management research a condition of continued employment for hirees as opposed to incumbents? If an employee refused to participate in management research, should punitive action be taken to get his data, keeping in mind that the data might be bad? Do morale surveys have the same degree of business relatedness as do validity studies, hence the same status with respect to agreements about business-related research?

Division 14 needs to help make the distinction between inmates and employees that didn't get made the first time around. Please help us make it. Send comments and incidents to **Bob Boldt, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08541.**

## GOVERNMENT RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

LAUREL WEBER OLIVER

I'd like to thank **Ted Rosen** of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) who alerted me to some of the interesting research activities at OPM's Personnel Research and Development Center (PRDC) in Washington, D.C. One such activity which may be of particular interest to readers of this column is the "alternatives task force" that was established in PRDC last fall to research selection techniques which might serve as alternatives to written tests for entry-level white collar occupations.

Functions of the task force group include conducting both field and experimental research to develop alternatives which reduce adverse impact and retain utility and providing technical assistance to agencies on the appropriate use and evaluation of alternatives. The group is currently investigating nine alternative selection techniques. These alternatives are: miniature training and evaluation examinations, assessment centers, biographical data and application forms, work samples and simulations, self-ratings, measures of expected work motivation, interviews, reference checks, and the probationary period. A modification of the behavioral consistency approach to examining, which was originally designed for mid-level jobs, is being developed for use with entry-level jobs. The task force group has prepared a report which provides brief reviews of the nine alternatives and procedural steps for selecting and applying them. In addition, the group has provided technical assistance to the Federal Aviation Administration on the use of bio-data as a selection device and to the Department of Immigration and Naturalization on the use of the interview as a screening procedure. They are also working with Social Security on an evaluation of the Social Security Administration's new examining procedures for Claims Representatives. For additional information on the alternatives task force, please contact **Tressie Muldrow, Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, Room 3G28, Washington, D.C. 20415.**

Again, let me remind you that this column is primarily dependent upon your input. If you are involved in (or know of) some Government research that would be of interest to readers of *TIP*, please let me know. Write me at the **Army Research Institute, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333**, or phone me at **(202) 274-8293 (AUTOVON 284-8293).**

(NOTE: In the last issue of *TIP*, this column described some research on women being conducted at NPRDC (Navy Personnel Research and Development Center) in San Diego by **Patricia Thomas** and **Kathleen Durning**. Due to an error, **Pat Thomas'** last name was omitted. Our apologies, Pat!)

### ANNOUNCEMENT

Having trouble receiving *TIP*? If so, write the APA Circulation Office, 1200 Seventeenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036. *TIP* uses mailing labels purchased from APA; all address changes are handled through the Circulation Office.

## Panel on Testing of Handicapped People

C. PAUL SPARKS

The National Research Council's Panel on Testing of Handicapped People is conducting a study for HEW's Office of Civil Rights. The Panel is examining the extent to which tests given to disabled people reflect their abilities rather than impaired skills, unless the latter are what the test is designed to measure. The Panel is also assessing whether being identified as disabled during the selection process, because of special testing conditions such as tests in braille, discriminates against the handicapped. One purpose of the Panel is to study regulations issued pursuant to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 relating to current testing methods.

An open meeting was held March 14-15 at the National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC so that invited associations and individuals could present their views and supply data to the Panel. Among the 22 organizations making presentations was the Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, represented by **Paul Sparks**. About half of the presenters represented associations committed to improving the lot of persons with a particular handicap. Three test publishers, two federal agencies, and two other professional associations were also represented. The meeting was low key with the Panel obviously interested in collecting information and avoiding confrontations with the presenters.

The Panel is chaired by clinical psychologist **Nancy Robinson** and, in keeping with National Academy of Sciences philosophy, includes persons from experimental psychology, school psychology, educational psychology, rehabilitation psychology, sociology, economics, statistics, medicine, and law, avoiding representation of what might be called vested interest groups. A going-in position of the panel appeared to be, "In short, the regulations require what science cannot yet supply—tests that measure aptitude or achievement independent of sensory, manual, or verbal handicaps." This statement was taken from the NAS proposal to DHEW and was echoed and expanded in Division 14 testimony.

(Editor's Note: Copies of Paul's testimony can be obtained by writing to him at **Exxon Company, U.S.A., Employee Relations Dept., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Texas 77001.**)

### An Important Announcement for Readers with a Disability

Psychologists with Disabilities is a special interest group within the A.P.A., organized by handicapped psychologists to facilitate the common goals of psychologists and students in psychology who have a visual handicap, hearing impairment, medical/physical disability. If interested in learning more about this organization, contact **Dennis Shulman, Coordinator, Psychologists with Disabilities, 200 West 57th Street, Suite 1301, New York, N.Y. 10019.**

## PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

JERRY NIVEN

The mailing early this year of Division 14's publication, "A Career in Industrial Organizational Psychology" has resulted in over 50 requests for Division 14 speakers for Psi Chi Chapter meeting speakers. **Madeline Heilman**, with the assistance of other committee members, is coordinating the identification of Division 14 speakers. **Elma Bragg** has prepared a topical outline, together with suggested references, which can be used by members who will be making these presentations. This resource can be obtained from **Jerry Niven, The Boeing Company, P.O. Box 3707, MS 10-28, Seattle, WA 98124.**

**Mary Tenopyr** reports that the American Society for Personnel Administration has also requested Division 14 speakers. **Jerry Niven** is coordinating this activity.

**Ed Robinson** has developed a proposed outline and format for Division 14 presentations to business groups or organizations. **Paul Duffy** is collaborating with him in the refinement of this future resource.

**Paul Duffy** also indicates that the printer has forwarded copies of the newly revised publication "The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist." Copies have been provided to APA for distribution. Division 14 members can obtain copies by contacting the Secretary-Treasurer, **Lew Albright**.

**John Bernardin**, Department of Psychology, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia, has recently joined the committee, replacing **Clarence Von Bergen** who has resigned from the Public Relations Committee.

Once again, members are encouraged to respond to requests for their assistance in making presentations descriptive of the I/O Psychologist's role and activities.

## SCIENTIST/PRACTITIONER COALITION

MILTON BLOOD

The Scientist/Practitioner Coalition met on the evening prior to the January meetings of the APA Council of Representatives. Division 14 members continued their active role in the coalition. All five of Division 14's representatives participated in the meeting (**Kitty Katzell, Paul Thayer, Richard Campbell, Milton Blood, and Milt Hakel**). The purpose of the coalition is to discuss Council agenda items of interest to divisions with shared concerns. Attendees represented at least seven divisions and two state associations.

Discussion ranged over a number of issues that were to come before the January Council meeting. These included the Specialty Standards for the Providers of Psychological Services, possible reorganizations of APA, the proposal for a National Institute for Psychology Policy Studies, the choice of future convention sites, a Designation and Credentialing Task Force, representation on APA committees, and the unchecked proliferation of APA committees. The discussion was useful, and there was agreement to reconvene the coalition prior to the August meeting of the Council.

**Milton Blood** (Division 14) was elected chair of the coalition for the coming year. **Lenore Harmon** (Division 17) was elected secretary.

# An Abstract of the First Report from the Commission on Organization of APA

MILTON D. HAKEL

Summarizing a year of deliberations, the Commission on Organization of APA made its first report to the Board of Directors in January. The report is a working document and the Commission welcomes comment from any APA member. Division 14 members might best address their comments to **Kenneth Clark**, University of Rochester, chairman of the Commission; or **Richard Campbell**, AT&T, member.

The report's first section surveys problems and dissatisfactions which have led some members to call for reorganization. There are many complaints: Dues are high relative to other scientific societies and dues are allocated to activities which some psychologists would prefer to receive no funds. Income generated by some of the journals is used to "subsidize" other activities or products that some see as unessential or undesirable.

The annual convention is a source of several complaints concerning timing, expense, amount of time allocated to division programs, size and the impersonal nature of the convention, and inadequacy of the format. The APA Monitor is another focus of complaint, both for the public image of psychology it conveys and the lack of information about items of interest to researchers and scientists. The increased politicization of APA is another concern, encompassing organized campaigns for APA president and campaigning for election to the Board of Directors. APA's role in a large number of diverse public policy issues is a source of concern where, as one member says, "everything seems to concern us."

The Council of Representatives is a focus for concern as is the relationship between APA and state associations. A reduction in the number of members in some of the scientifically oriented divisions, the increase in the number of divisions ("proliferation"), the size and complexity of the APA bureaucracy and the intrusion of divisions on other divisions' territory are additional concerns. Altogether, the report details 15 pages of concerns. In surveying them all, it is hard to imagine that there might be a resolution to them which would be satisfactory to everyone.

## Apprehensions about Change

A second section of the report deals with apprehensions and concerns about change per se. Some groups are quite comfortable and satisfied with APA's structure and the way the association is meeting their needs. Other groups such as women and minorities feel that their recent gains would be wiped out or compromised by reorganization. Other groups such as state associations have expressed concern that their voices not be diluted by a possible reorganization. Still other groups (such as Division 14) have been concerned that reorganization might create a membership plan which would not well serve the group's needs and interests. The assembly plan was a prime focus for this concern.

## Criteria for Reorganization

The Commission identified four criteria for evaluating reorganization proposals. A successful plan should: 1) make membership in APA more attractive to all psychologists, 2) involve changes likely to be approved by the membership, 3) be sufficiently flexible to permit evolution to meet further change within psychology in the short term or orderly retrenchment from any or all structural changes, and 4) deal with issues of autonomy in a way that would a) permit consent of each major interest group to let each other such group pursue its own interests, b) allow for resolution of real conflicts, c) provide for united action on mutual concerns and on issues not peculiar to particular scientific or professional groups and d) increase the likelihood for preserving a single organization representing all of psychology.

## Proposed Model for Reorganization

With these criteria in mind the Commission has tentatively proposed a "section" model for a four-year tryout. The Association would be divided into two sections, one comprised of health care providers (section of professional psychologists) and the other identified with teaching and/or research (section of academic and research psychologists). Individual APA members would join one or the other section. The plan permits the creation of up to two additional sections as the need arises, each one having at least 21% of the seats on the full Council. Each section would have separate dues structures and each section would elect a semi-autonomous section council. The section councils would meet to consider their own business and to ratify business conducted by the other council(s). These section councils would meet together annually as the full Council of Representatives to conduct business of interest to the association as a whole. Thus, this plan preserves some desirable features of the assembly model while at the same time avoiding other undesirable features ("ghettoization"). Each division would indicate the section of the council in which its representatives would serve. Members of the sections would take turns nominating the APA president, insuring that every N years an APA president would be chosen from one's section. The Board of Directors would be senatorial, with each section electing a fixed number of directors. The powers of the Board are to be expanded, but details on this are not yet specified. Finally, each section would gain greater control over the convention program and the possibility of a sectioned convention or even separate conventions is likely.

Assuming that appropriate mechanisms can be worked out for devising agenda for section councils and coordinating the activities of the two (or more) sections, this plan may have considerable likelihood of success. Copies of the complete report are available from **Steven Nelson** at the APA central office.

## On Revising the Principles

C. PAUL SPARKS, WILLIAM A. OWENS, JR., and MARY L. TENOPYR

At the August 1978 Incoming Executive Committee Meeting the president was instructed to appoint editors and an ad hoc advisory committee for the purpose of revising the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* published in 1975. William A. Owens, Jr. and Mary L. Tenopyr accepted an invitation to serve as co-editors. Twenty-six Division 14 members were invited to serve on the advisory committee. The invitees were chosen to represent as fully as possible the wide range of experience, work settings, and persuasions found among the Division 14 membership. The possibility of inviting knowledgeable persons who were not members of the Division was considered and rejected, the reasoning being that the publication in its final form would be a statement of principles by the Executive Committee. One invitee declined and one other resigned later for personal reasons. The remaining twenty-four have been and are active participants in the revision process, albeit to a highly varying degree. Comments made at meetings and conferences, even recently, suggest that many persons still do not know the composition of the ad hoc committee. The members are L. E. Albright, P. Ash, R. S. Barrett, C. J. Bartlett, B. N. Baxter, V. Boehm, W. C. Burns, J. T. Campbell, J. E. Doppelt, M. D. Dunnette, F. W. Erwin, E. A. Fleishman, D. L. Grant, R. M. Guion, J. J. Kirkpatrick, H. Osburn, C. A. Pounian, E. P. Prien, F. L. Schmidt, P. W. Thayer, G. C. Thornton, H. J. Tragash, K. N. Wexley, and S. Zedeck.

The co-editors first asked that each committee member review the 1975 *Principles* with a view toward necessary or desirable changes. The responses ranged from: 1) no response; 2) no changes are needed; 3) critical comments on specific issues, and 4) rewrites of entire sections. The co-editors and the president developed a first-draft revision based on these comments and sent copies to all members of the advisory committee and all members of the Division 14 Executive Committee. Replies slowly trickled in, including a number from persons who were not members of either committee. A Rice University graduate student collated these, organized them by section and by topic, and met with the writers for an extended discussion of their implications. The writers rewrote extensively and met again to develop what was hoped to be a penultimate product.

In the meantime numerous comments surfaced to the effect that the membership had inadequate opportunity to comment prior to the actual publication of the 1975 *Principles*. The Executive Committee asked that the new draft be sent to each Division 14 member before preparation of the final copy. The Division 14 mailing list was secured from APA. Names and addresses of new members not yet on the APA list were secured from the editor of *TIP*. A copy of what was actually the third draft was mailed, together with a questionnaire which asked for a rating of the extent to which the reader agreed with the principles or recommendations of each of the 12 sections of the draft plus the References and the Glossary and for a rating of the clarity with which the material was presented. As of February 11th a total of 231 questionnaires had been received. In addition, a number of letters were received without accompanying questionnaires and a number of other individuals simply marked up the draft and sent it back. The extent

to which the responses are a good representation of the members who are involved with selection procedures is unknown. We do know that many of the Division 14 members are organization development specialists, human factors researchers, or practitioners or teachers in still other fields. Of the 231 questionnaires received, eighty-six percent answered "Yes" to the question, "Are you involved with any aspect of validation or use of personnel selection procedures?" Those completing questionnaires indicated involvement as follows:

- 74% Basic or applied research
- 46 Teaching or lecturing
- 32 Preparation and/or publishing of tests or manuals
- 28 Giving depositions or testifying

They gave their work settings as follows:

- 46% College or university
- 46 Consulting firm
- 41 Private business or industrial organization
- 17 Government entity
- 9 Civil service jurisdiction
- 4 Test publication enterprise

The writers met, reviewed each comment or criticism, rewrote some sections extensively, and agreed to disregard a few comments where it was felt that the author was uninformed. Many of the comments were both voluminous and strongly worded, particularly those which were critical of one or more aspects of the document. Parenthetically, some very interesting debates might develop if authors of opposing views were pitted against each other. Table 1 shows the complete distribution of questionnaire responses for both "Agreement" and "Clarity" along with the Mean and the Standard Deviation for each major section of the document. By the time you read this it is anticipated that the members of the advisory committee and the Executive Committee will have had the next draft for review. Discussed below are some of the detailed criticisms and what the writers tried to do about them.

Eighty-two percent agreed or strongly agreed with the *Definition of Validity* but twenty-five percent felt that it was difficult or very difficult to understand. The major problems were occasioned by introduction of the concept of *Internal/External Validity*. The section was rewritten so that the traditional concepts of validity were discussed. This led to the elimination of the section entitled *External Validity* and substantial modification of the section entitled *Content Oriented Test Development*. The writers, as individuals, agreed that researchers interested in exploring the Internal/External paradigm should be encouraged to publish in refereed professional journals.

Only fifty-six percent agreed or strongly agreed with *A Comment on the Statistical Definition of "Fairness"* and twenty-five percent felt that the section was difficult or very difficult to understand. The section entitled *A Comment on "Fairness"* fared somewhat better, seventy-five percent agreeing and only nine percent feeling difficulty in understanding. Both sections suffer from the fact that there is a lack of consensus among the Division 14 members themselves. Comments ranged from criticism of the strict psychometric position taken without a greater recognition of "social" responsibility to criticism of a perceived abdication of professional responsibility through the suggestion that "policy makers" might ultimately decide what is "fair."



Table 1  
Distribution of Questionnaire Responses  
231 Respondents

Agreement Rating								Clarity Rating								
M	$\sigma$	X	1	2	3	4	5	Section	M	$\sigma$	X	1	2	3	4	5
4.20	0.84	0	5	9	5	127	85	Statement of Purpose	3.97	0.84	0	0	14	42	113	62
3.93	1.00	1	8	21	13	125	63	Definition of Validity	3.32	1.04	2	8	49	59	87	26
4.00	1.13	5	11	16	29	74	96	Comment on Fairness	3.96	1.05	6	7	13	47	72	86
3.51	1.17	2	16	29	55	78	51	Statistical Definition	3.34	1.13	3	15	41	56	81	35
4.30	0.86	2	3	8	18	88	112	Application of Principles	4.10	0.89	2	4	5	41	91	88
4.19	0.87	3	3	10	20	103	92	Objectives of Validation	3.98	0.99	4	3	22	30	94	78
3.99	0.97	2	6	16	23	112	72	Job Analysis	3.79	0.96	1	3	23	47	102	55
4.20	0.88	1	6	8	10	116	90	Criterion-Related	3.84	0.84	2	1	12	60	106	50
3.97	0.99	3	8	14	27	107	72	Content Oriented	3.48	0.99	4	7	31	68	89	32
3.86	1.04	4	11	16	26	114	60	External Validity	3.36	1.03	3	13	30	72	87	26
4.30	0.86	2	4	9	10	98	108	Implementation	4.15	0.77	3	0	6	33	107	82
3.89	1.12	10	12	15	36	81	77	Legislation, etc.	4.27	0.86	6	2	7	28	78	110
3.98	0.98	51	1	7	52	54	66	References	4.42	0.88	41	1	0	27	52	110
3.99	0.94	41	1	11	45	64	69	Glossary	4.22	0.86	34	1	7	28	72	89

Legend: X = No Response; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = No Opinion; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree

Legend: X = No Response; 1 = Very Difficult; 2 = Difficult; 3 = Neither; 4 = Easy; 5 = Very Easy

Legend: X = No Response; 1 = Strongly Disagree;  
2 = Disagree; 3 = No Opinion; 4 = Agree;  
5 = Strongly Agree

Legend: X = No Response; 1 = Very Difficult;  
2 = Difficult; 3 = Neither; 4 = Easy;  
5 = Very Easy

One writer commented to the effect that he understood the authors' problem and sympathized with them. The writers chose to stay with the psychometric treatment and to delete reference to the "policy makers." The decision is certain to be applauded by some and soundly criticized by others.

The *Job Analysis* section was agreed to by eighty percent. Ten percent disagreed and eleven percent found it difficult to understand. The problems most commonly cited involved its brevity or the fact that no procedure was recommended. The section was expanded slightly and the reason for not recommending a specific procedure or system was amplified.

Twelve percent felt that the section on *Legislation, Regulation, and Court Decision* did not belong in the *Principles*. The writers agreed with the substantial majority and did some rewriting in an effort to explain why.

Isolated comments on the other sections led to improvements in the language of the document. Several should protect against misinterpretation. Changes were made by expanding the *Glossary* and by removing from the *References* those which are not readily accessible. The writers believe that the next draft will approach a consensus, though certainly not a consensus omnium.

## Construct Validity Colloquium

FRANK SCHMIDT

A "Colloquium on Construct Validity," sponsored jointly by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management and the Educational Testing Service, was held last October 7-9 at the ETS Henry Chauncey Conference Center. The objectives of this conference were:

1. To identify issues relating to applications of construct validity in competency testing in employment and education.
2. To stimulate professional and scientific activity in clarifying issues and solving problems relating to construct validity so as to develop professional consensus regarding proper applications.
3. To stimulate research to broaden the body of scientific knowledge and theory of construct validity as it relates to competency testing.

Among those addressing the conference were **Bill Gorham, Chuck Hulin** (for an ill **Lloyd Humphreys**), **John Carroll, Norm Frederiksen, Dick McKillip, Hilda Wing, Bob Sternberg, Clark Glymour, Doug Jackson, Sam Messick, Barbara Lerner, and John Hunter**. **Mary Tenopyr** chaired a lively panel discussion that included **Lee Cronbach, John Hunter, and Bob Linn**. At the end, **Marv Dunnette** summarized colloquium issues. Conference host was **E. Belvin Williams** of ETS. Attendance was purposely limited to 50 to maximize opportunities for discussion from the floor. About half of those in attendance were Division 14 members.

A number of recent developments bearing on construct validity stimulated this colloquium. The first development is the growing awareness among applied psychologists in education and employment of the technical and economic infeasibility of basing all assessment procedures on criterion-related and content validity. It is now clear that few if any employers could

afford the high cost of criterion-related validity studies for all their selection procedures, even if such studies were technically feasible. Recent research indicates that such studies are much less frequently technically feasible than previously believed. Content validity studies are also expensive—although less so—and content validity may often be inappropriate where applicants lack previous experience on the job. **Dick McKillip** and **Hilda Wing** described a large-scale application of construct validity to Federal employment selection which indicated that construct validity procedures can help to solve this problem.

The second development is the current pressing need for clearly defined professional standards for construct validity in applied psychological assessment. **Bill Gorham** pointed out that professional standards in this area are vague and inadequate, and that this fact served as an open invitation to lawyers, judges and Federal bureaucrats to usurp the scientific function of defining professional standards. In theory, such individuals are interested only in enforcement of the relevant laws. In practice, however, they may in fact be implementing a not-so-hidden extra-legal agenda, as **Barbara Lerner** argued. Unless psychologists act to establish clear standards in construct validity, this important domain may be permanently lost to their purview.

The third development is a resurgence of interest in traits (constructs) as a useful and productive foundation on which to build a theoretical and applied psychology. Under the impact of the work of situationalists such as Mischel, human traits, considered as stable response dispositions, were called into question in the late 1960's and early 70's. Important new evidence has now emerged which casts serious doubt on the empirical foundations of these criticisms. It now appears that trait instability was an illusion conjured up by measurement deficiencies in earlier studies. In this colloquium, **Doug Jackson** presented additional strong evidence in support of the utility of traits in the personality domain. In addition to the new evidence for trait stability, evidence has emerged showing that relations between traits and real-world performance are quite stable across situations. **John Hunter** summarized research demonstrating that the apparent situational specificity of aptitude test validities was due to sampling error and other artifacts. These developments open the way for the generalization of criterion-related validities of constructs across settings and organizations.

The fourth development is broader and more basic than any of the others. It is really two developments which proceeded independently for some time and are now merging. Starting over two decades ago, experimental psychologists, especially those in learning, began to question the fruitfulness of behaviorist assumptions and methods. Many came to reject the behaviorist emphasis on the primacy of physically observable behaviors and the concomitant denigration of "unobservable" cognitive processes. Beginning in the early 1960's, behaviorist influences began to make themselves felt in differential psychology. In this colloquium, **John Hunter** and **Bob Sternberg** questioned and rejected these influences and assumptions as thwarting rather than facilitating research progress. During this same period of time, developments in the philosophy of science were leading to rejection of the philosophical basis of behaviorism, logical positivism. The result is an emerging consensus on a post-positivist philosophy of science that was nicely articulated by **Clark Glymour**, a philosopher of science. This new

philosophy of science—a kind of sophisticated philosophical realism—is much more supportive of psychological constructs, and of cognitive psychology in general, than was logical positivism. Reflecting these developments, the psychology of individual differences has taken a sharp turn in the cognitive direction in recent years. There is now strong research interest in determining how people process information and solve the problems or items that have been used to define cognitive constructs (e.g., inductive reasoning). Papers by **Sternberg**, **Carroll**, and **Frederiksen** exemplified this important new development. Jackson's paper illustrated that the cognitive shift has occurred in research on personality constructs as well. As a result of this change, prospects for genuine advances in understanding and theory development appear brighter than they have in decades.

Taken together, these four developments create unprecedented opportunities for professional and scientific advances in construct validity.

The colloquium was organized by **Bill Gorham**, **Dick McKillip** and **Frank Schmidt** of the Office of Personnel Management, and **Al Maslow** of Educational Testing Service. The proceedings (including questions and comments from the floor), will be published within a month or so by ETS and will be disseminated widely. It is hoped they will be useful to the committee that will shortly begin the revision of the *APA/AERA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests*. They are also expected to be of interest to Division 14 members. For information on the proceedings, call or write: **Albert P. Maslow, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08541 (609-921-9000)**.

## Journal of Occupational Psychology

An international journal of research into people at work. Published quarterly, covering industrial, organizational, engineering, vocational and personnel psychology, as well as behavioural aspects of industrial relations and human factors. Innovative or interdisciplinary approaches with a psychological emphasis are particularly welcome.

### Contents of Volume 53, Part 1, 1980

- N.A. Rosen, N.J. Georgiades & G. McDonald* An empirical test of a leadership contingency model for teaching behavioural science concepts to managers
- D. Jacobson & M. Eran* Expectancy theory components and non-expectancy moderators as predictors of physicians' preference for retirement
- R.A. Snyder* Cross-lagged correlation analysis and the Zeitgeist
- J.A. Athanasou, P. Hall, G.A. Fox & J. Jenkins* Classification of vocational interest factors on the Brook Reaction Test
- J. Cook & T. Wall* New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment
- A.J. Boyle* 'Found experiments' in accident research
- R.J. Forbes & P. Jackson* Non-verbal behaviour and the outcome of selection interviews
- C. Brotherton* Paradigms of selection validation: Some comments in the light of British Equal Opportunities legislation
- A. Keenan & A.I. Wedderburn* Putting the boot on the other foot: Candidates' descriptions of interviewers
- Book reviews*

### Special price to APA members using APA order form

Volume 53 (1980) \$36.00

(Retail price for Volume 53 (1980) \$55.00)

Orders to:

**The British Psychological Society**

The Distribution Centre, Blackhorse Road, Letchworth, Hertfordshire SG6 1HN, UK

## The Federal Diary

MIKE CAUSEY

### Minorities Getting A Break on Testing

Blacks, Hispanics, Oriental-Americans and American Indians who took the tough Foreign Service entrance in December will get a 5-point scoring break over nonminority test-takers.

State Department officials call the new system "differential scoring" and say it will be used to select people who will be offered FS jobs this year and in the future.

More than 10,000 people took the FS test. Of that number, about 225 will be hired for jobs in the State Department and International Communication Agency. Those jobs start at \$13,900 and \$16,200.

Under the differential scoring system, which other federal agencies may adopt to expand the hiring of minority group members, minorities can be considered for FS jobs if they get a score of 70 or better. Non-minority candidates must score 75 or better.

State Department officials estimate that 3,800 of the 9,000 nonminority candidates taking the December FS test passed with scores of 75 or better. An estimated 200 minority group members of more than 1,000 who took the test will pass with scores of 70 or better.

The new program is designed to increase the number of minorities in the U.S. Foreign Service. It now has 3,400 employees, only 8 percent of whom are members of minority groups.

Last year the Foreign Service hired about 200 new officers, 39 of them minority group members. This year, officials say, they are "aiming for" 47 minority group members to be among the approximately 225 to be hired.

State made the grade-score changes which go into effect today for the test taken in December, as part of a program to enlarge the pool of minority group applicants available to the FS.

Under departmental rules, minority group members do not have to take the FS test at all, although nonminority group candidates are required to take it. Minority group applicants may, if they choose, come in under affirmative action programs, which permit their college degrees and grades to be substituted for passing scores on the FS entry test. Or they may compete through the regular FS test program, with the new 5-point advantage.

State Department officials say the assessment of candidates for beginning FS jobs began yesterday. Those assessments include day-long oral exams before FS selection boards, exhaustive medical tests and security and background checks.

Backers of the differential scoring system defend it on grounds that preference in government has been given to veterans who could get 5 points added to test scores, and disabled vets who get 10-point benefits. This is believed to be the first time that any federal agency has given test score preference on the basis of minority status.

For purposes of the program, race and/or ethnic background is limited to blacks, Hispanics, Oriental-Americans and native American Indians). Women are not considered minorities for this program, unless they also are either black, Hispanic, Oriental-American or Indian.

## Weber v. Kaiser Aluminum: A Response!

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The Supreme Court had overturned the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, ruling that invalidated a voluntary affirmative action training program. The following are the February 1980 comments by the Circuit Judges.)

Before WISDOM, GEE and FAY, Circuit Judges.

### I.

GEE, C. J.: Obedient to the mandate of the Supreme Court, we vacate the trial court's judgment, as well as ours affirming it, 563 F.2d 216, and remand the cause to that court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion above.

### II.

For myself only, and with all respect and deference, I here note my personal conviction that the decision of the Supreme Court in this case is profoundly wrong.

That it is wrong as a matter of statutory construction seems to me sufficiently demonstrated by the dissenting opinions of the Chief Justice and of Mr. Justice Rehnquist. To these I can add nothing. They make plain beyond peradventure that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 passed the Congress on the express representation of its sponsors that it would not and could not be construed as the Court has now construed it. What could be plainer than the words of the late Senator Humphrey—defending the bill against the charge that it adumbrated quotas and preferential treatment—that "the title would *prohibit* preferential treatment for any particular group..."? The Court now tells us that this is not so. That it feels it may properly do so seems to me a grievous thing.

But sadder still—tragic, in my own view—is the Court's departure from the long road that we have travelled from *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537, 16 S.Ct. 1138, 41 L.Ed. 256 (1896), toward making good Mr. Justice Harlan's anguished cry in dissent that "[o]ur Constitution is

color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." *Id.* at 559, 16 S.Ct. at 1146. I voice my profound belief that this present action, like *Plessy*, is a wrong and dangerous turning, and my confident hope that we will soon return to the high, bright road on which we disdain to classify a citizen, *any* citizen, to any degree or for any purpose by the color of his skin.

Though for the above reasons I think it gravely mistaken, I do not say that the Court's decision is immoral or unjust—indeed, in some basic sense it may well represent true justice. But there are many actions roughly just that our laws do not authorize and our Constitution forbids actions such as preventing a Nazi Party march through a town where reside former inmates of concentration camps or inflicting summary punishment on one caught redhanded in a crime.

Subordinate magistrates such as I must either obey the orders of higher authority or yield up their posts to those who will. I obey, since in my view the action required of me by the Court's mandate is only to follow a mistaken course and not an evil one.

Vacated and remanded.

[Concurring Opinion]

WISDOM, C. J.: With deference to the views expressed by the majority of this Court, I express the view that the decision of the Supreme Court in this case is profoundly right for the reasons stated in my dissenting opinion. *Weber v. Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation and United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO*, [15 EPD ¶ 7935], 5 Cir. 1977, 563 F.2d 216, 227.

# APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

JUDI KOMAKI

## Mark Your Calendars

A four-day track devoted exclusively to behavioral applications in work settings is scheduled for the Association for Behavior Analysis Convention. If you'll be in the Dearborn, Michigan area between May 24th and 27th, I'm sure you'll be most welcome. Please contact ABA, Department of Psychology, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008 (616) 383-1629 for further information.

## Funding Patterns and Possibilities

In the late sixties, behavioral studies in organizations were initially conducted by in-house personnel. **Ed Feeney** was vice president for system performance when he initiated the reinforcement programs at Emery Air Freight ("Performance audit," 1972). **Bill Dattel** (1972) was an Army psychologist when he helped design and implement the Merit Reward System for basic trainees at Ft. Ord. These in-house efforts are still one of the most likely sources of support, e.g., **Bourdon** (1977), **Kempen & Hall** (1977), and these will, no doubt, increase as the behavioral approach becomes more widely accepted.

Within the last five years, businesses and industries have begun to contract with behavioral consulting firms for their services. Tarkenton and Associates, formerly Behavioral Systems, Inc., and Praxis provide training and help implement reinforcement programs in private industries and businesses. Government agencies have also started to seek out assistance in implementing in-house programs. HUD and GAO, for instance, have contracted with **Edward J. Feeney Associates**.

As usual, academics continue to conduct research on a non-reimbursement basis (e.g., **Komaki, Heinzmann, & Lawson**, in press; **Sulzer-Azaroff**, 1978). Recently, however, select government agencies have begun to sponsor behavioral research in work settings. Within the last three years, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has initiated and funded multi-year contracts with **Bill Hopkins** at the U. of Kansas and Safety Sciences. Presently, I am conducting research in private industry in connection with a NIOSH grant and in a military setting under the auspices of the Office of Naval Research and the Naval Personnel Research and Development Center. Other untapped possibilities for support are those agencies which have funded Div. 14 members such as the National Science Foundation (**Terry Mitchell**), the Army Research Institute (**Marv Dunnette**), the Department of Labor (**Richard Hackman**), and the newly renamed Office of Personnel Management (**Lyman Porter**). Any other promising but unnamed sponsors are cordially invited to identify themselves. As always, I can be contacted at the **Georgia Institute of Technology, Engineering Experiment Station, Atlanta, GA 30332 (404) 894-3844**.

## REFERENCES

Bourdon, R. D. A token economy application to management performance improvement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 1977, 1, 23-38.

Dattel, W. E. *The Fort Ord Merit-Reward System*. Fort Ord, Calif: Fort Ord Training Management and Evaluation Committee, June 1972. (NTIS No. AD-743213).

Kempen, R. W., & Hall, R. V. Reduction of industrial absenteeism: Results of a behavioral approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 1977, 1, 1-22.

Komaki, J., Heinzmann, A. T., & Lawson, L. Effect of training and feedback: Component analysis of a behavioral safety program. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1980, in press.

Performance audit, feedback, and positive reinforcement. *Training and Development Journal*. November, 1972, 26, 8-13.

Sulzer-Azaroff, B. Behavioral ecology and accident prevention. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 1978, 2, 11-44.

## REPORT FROM THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

WALT TORNOW

The Program Committee received proposals for 89 papers and 27 symposia, which were discussed at their February 15 and 16 meeting in Washington. Since Division 14 has been allocated only 35 core substantive hours for the 1980 convention, selection was inevitable and quite difficult. Each proposal was read and independently evaluated by four members of the Committee. At the meeting, discussion centered on those proposals where there were pronounced differences of opinion among the reviewers.

**Ed Cornelius**, a member of the Program Committee, did some analysis of the Committee's ratings of this year's submissions.

First, he looked at the extent of agreement that existed both before and after group discussions. The criterion for agreement he used was the number of instances in which the ratings from all four panel members were within one scale point of each other, using a 1-4 rating scale. Ed found that 52% of the submissions met this criterion prior to discussion, whereas 68% did so after the discussion. So, the discussion did have the effect of bringing the Committee's ratings closer in harmony despite the fact that it was not necessary to meet consensus.

Ed also did a pair-wise analysis of inter-rater agreement, looking at the percentage of time that the evaluations for each rater pair were within one scale point of each other. This analysis was based on initial ratings only, i.e., prior to any discussion. He found inter-rater agreement ranged from a low of 64% to a high of 100%, with the average overall inter-rater agreement for the entire committee being 85%.

The 1980 Convention will be held in Montreal, Canada, September 1 through 5. Division 14 will have its assigned meeting facilities at the Hotel Bonaventure and Hotel Hyatt Regency Montreal. Because of insufficient demand in past years, no informal programming elements are planned.

Again, an Open Forum will be held to permit discussion of major issues and concerns that have implications for the long-range planning of Division 14. **Victor Vroom**, President-Elect, will chair the session with **Ben Schneider**,

chair of the Long Range Planning Committee, **Frank Schmidt** and **Kenneth Wexley**, Members-at-Large, serving as a panel.

All in all, the planned program should meet its goal of offering diversity yet balance, breadth and interest in its appeal to the wide spectrum of our scientist-practitioner membership. We hope the program, combined with the attractiveness of the setting, will draw record attendance for Division 14.

When you register for the convention, indicate that you are a member of Division 14. Program time is allotted on the basis of the numbers registering, by Division, for the convention. The more we register, the more hours of program time for Division 14.

### BOARD OF CONVENTION AFFAIRS

#### Announcement #1

The Board of Convention Affairs would like each person with a disability who is planning to attend the convention to identify himself or herself and to provide information on how we can make the convention more readily accessible for his or her attendance. APA will provide a van with a lift as transportation for persons confined to wheelchairs, interpreters for deaf individuals, and escorts/readers for persons with vision impairment. We strongly urge individuals who would like assistance in facilitating their attendance at the convention to register in advance for the convention on the APA Advance Registration and Housing Form which will appear in the March through July issues of the *American Psychologist*. A note which outlines a person's specific needs should accompany the Advance Registration and Housing Form. This is especially important for persons who are deaf and require interpreting services.

#### Announcement #2

**Volunteers Wanted!** The Board of Convention Affairs would like to enlist the assistance of Division members to escort persons with disabilities, particularly blind individuals, to Division Social Hours. We would like to encourage social interaction with these persons and feel that having a member of the Division handling the social niceties would facilitate the process. If you are willing to serve as an escort, would you please send your name, address, and divisional affiliation to Candy Won, APA Convention Office, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 by August 1, 1980. Once we have your name, we will send you additional information. Thank you.

## JOURNAL REVIEW SERVICE

R. F. BOLDT

Reviewers: **A. R. Bass, R. E. Boldt, P. J. O'Neill, L. B. Plumlee, R. Rosenfeld**

### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AND LEGAL ISSUES

Diamond, E. E. Sex equity and measurement practices. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement*. Jossey-Bass, 1979, No. 3, 61-78. Summarizes findings on sex differences in testing related to such variables as construct being measured and item context; discusses importance for norms and prediction. Over 50 references. (LBP)

Ironson, G. H. and Subkoviak, M. J. A comparison of several methods of assessing item bias. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 4, 209-225. Applied 4 methods to a variety of item types; also compared traditional vs. non-traditional types, and black/white bias with white/white bias. (LBP)

Lerner, B. Tests and standards today: Attacks, counterattacks, and responses. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement*, Jossey Bass, 1979, No. 3, 15-31. Examines basic "test bias" arguments, citing relevant court decisions and pertinent research. Extensive reference list. (LBP)

*Management Science*, August, 1979, 25, 762-776. The following two articles provide a statistical analytical evaluation of the 4/5 rule and give evidence on the probability of both Type I and Type II errors: Greenberg, I. An analysis of the EEOC 'four-fifths' rule. Boardman, A. E. Another analysis of the EEOC 'four-fifths' rule. (LBP)

McGure, J. P. The use of statistics in Title VII cases. *Labor Law Journal*, 1979, 30, 361-370. Implications of two major cases suggest procedure for trial of a Title VII case involving class-based and individual injunctive relief. (RFB)

Rubin, R. B. The uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures: compromise and controversies. *Catholic University Law Review*, 1979, 28, 605-634. Good coverage and lots of references but check accuracy, e.g. differential validity is misinterpreted. (RFB)

Scheuman, J. A method of assessing bias in test items. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 143-152. Presents a practical, easy to use procedure for determining bias in test items. (PJO)

Underwood, B. D. Law and the crystal ball: predicting behavior with statistical inference and individualized judgment. *The Yale Law Journal*, 1979, 88, 1408-1448. Objections, ambivalent reactions and unarticulated values toward various types of prediction in several factual contexts. (RFB)

### MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

Bechtel, G. G. A scaling model for survey monitoring. *Evaluation Review* (formerly Evaluation Quarterly), 1979, 3, 5-42. Use of logit scaling in consumer satisfaction surveys allows allocation of sources of variation. (RFB)

Beuchert, A. K., & Mendoza, J. L. A Monte Carlo comparison of ten item discrimination indices. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 109-117. Compares 10 item discrimination indices across a wide variety of item analysis situations; found small differences. (PJO)

Callender, J. C., & Osburn, H. G. An empirical comparison of Coefficient Alpha, Guttman's Lambda-2, and MSPLIT maximized split-half reliability estimates. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 89-99. A cross-validation procedure applied to maximized split-half reliability estimates suggests their superiority over the Guttman and Alpha coefficients. (PJO)



Fleiss, J. L. & Cuzick, J. The reliability of dichotomous judgments: unequal numbers of judges per subject. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1979, 3, 537-542. Proposes an index, with significant test, for ascertaining interrater agreement when different subjects are judged on a dichotomous trait by different numbers of judges. (ARB, LBP)

Howard, G. S. Response shift bias: A problem in evaluating interventions with pre/post self-reports. *Evaluation Review*, 1980, 4, 93-106. Discusses loss of common metric in pre/post evaluations. (RFB)

Howard, G. S., Schmeck, R. R., & Bray, J. H. Internal validity in studies employing self-report instruments: A suggested remedy. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 129-135. To achieve a common metric, a Retrospective Pretest-Posttest Design requires subjects, after the posttest, to answer a questionnaire as they perceived themselves to be before training began; findings show that the retrospective measures agree better with actual behavioral changes observed than do ordinary pretest measures. (PJO)

Larson, J. R. Jr. The limited utility of factor analytic techniques for the study of implicit theories in student ratings of teacher behavior. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1979, 16, 201-211. Critique of factor analytic (correlational) methodology for investigation of the extent to which implicit personality theory accounts for observed covariance among rating scales, suggesting that this methodology does not indicate the accuracy of the implicit theories or the amount of "error" they contribute to the rating process. (ARB)

Lohnes, P. R. Factorial modeling in support of causal inference. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1979, 16, 323-340. The paper presents a new model for analyzing correlational data for purposes of making causal inferences. (ARB)

Lomax, R. G., & Algina, J. Comparison of two procedures for analyzing multitrait multimethod matrices. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 177-186. Compares (1) Jackson's multimethod factor analysis using Campbell-Fiske criteria and (2) exploratory factor analysis, with empirical examples. (PJO)

*New Directions for Methodology of Behavioral Science* (entire issue). Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1979, No. 1. The entire issue concerns techniques and uses of unobtrusive measures in research, including cross-cultural studies. (LPB)

Terwilliger, J. S., & Lele, K. Some relationships among internal consistency, reproducibility, and homogeneity. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 101-108. Maximum value of  $KR_{20}$  is attained when the test has "perfect" reproducibility; the minimum  $KR_{20}$  occurs when there is complete lack of reproducibility or homogeneity. (PJO)

## STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Brewer, J. K. Effect size: The most troublesome of the hypothesis testing considerations. *Center on Evaluation, Development and Research (CEDR) Quarterly*, Winter 1978, pp. 7-10. Estimate what size treatment effect would be of practical significance so that use of a formula after setting alpha and power to determine the proper sample size would be easy. (PJO)

Drasgow, F., Dorans, N. J. & Tucker, L. R. Estimators of the squared cross-validity coefficient: a monte carlo investigation. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1979, 3, 387-400. Evaluates three different estimators of squared cross-validity coefficient and proposes that the third estimator developed by the authors is more accurate and less biased than the others. (ARB)

Gibson, J. W., & Prien, E. P. Validation of minimum qualifications. *Public Personnel Management*, 1977, 6, 447-456. Reports on a study that evaluated the predictive

effectiveness of job qualifications, but the question of necessary minima remains open. (MR)

MacCallum, R. C., Cornelius, E. T. III & Champney, T. Validity and cross-validity of metric and nonmetric multiple regression. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1979, 3, 463-468. Comparison of metric and nonmetric multiple regression in terms of cross-validity and shrinkage suggests the general superiority of the metric model. Cites MORALS computer program for non-metric regression, obtainable from Forrest Young, L. L. Thurstone Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514 (ARB, LBP)

Pajer, R. B. Selection research data: federal agencies as a source. *Public Personnel Management*, 1977, 6, 442-446. Reports on a survey of federal agencies as sources of data for selection research and provides detailed list of sources, information on how they can be used, and addresses for contacts. (MR)

Ware, W. B., & McLean, J. E. A note on overlimiting the use of analysis of covariance. *Center on Evaluation, Development and Research (CEDR) Quarterly*, Winter 1978, pp. 16-19. Describes the techniques and problems of using analysis of covariance (ANOCOVA); corrects the belief that ANOCOVA should not be used if groups have similar pretest scores. (PJO)

Schmeidler, J. On Cooper's nonparametric test. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1978, 38, 913-915. Challenges the Cooper trend test on grounds it does not meet the independence requirement for a binomial distribution. (LBP)

## MISCELLANEOUS

Bolles, R. C. Whatever happened to motivation? *Educational Psychologist*, 1978, 13, 1-13. Discusses the evaluation of the concept of motivation to a modern view in which motivation is more cognitive and less stimulus- or physiological state-bound. (PJO)

Braskamp, L. A., Caulley, D. & Costin, F. Student ratings and instructor self-ratings and their relationship to student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1979, 16, 295-306. Construct validity analysis of instructor self-ratings of teaching effectiveness and student ratings of instructor effectiveness. (ARB)

Colligan, M. J. and Murphy, L. R. Mass psychogenic illness in organizations: An overview. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 1979, 52, 77-90. Identifies factors that are potential precipitating conditions of psychogenic illness, on basis of published and unpublished reports. (LBP)

Driscoll, J. W. A behavioral-science view of the future of collective bargaining in the United States. *Labor Law Journal*, 1979, 30, 433-438. New pressures imply changed future roles of participants in collective bargaining. (RFB)

Peng, S. S. & Jaffe, J. Women who enter male-dominated fields of study in higher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1979, 16, 285-294. Investigation of background characteristics of women who enter what have been considered traditionally male-dominated fields of study in college. (ARB)

Place, H. A biographical profile of women in management. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 1979, 52, 267-276. Describes evaluation of factors in managerial success. Study results for 130 New Zealand female managers. (LBP)

Ross, J. A. Decision rules in program evaluation. *Evaluation Review*, 1980, 4, 59-74. Pros and cons of explicit formulation of action-choosing rules on program evaluation. (RFB)

(If you would like to review articles from sources not typically used by I/O psychologists, contact **Bob Boldt, ETS, Princeton, New Jersey 08541.**)

## Court of Appeals Rejects EEOC's Claim that Everyone in Labor Market Is Equally Qualified for All Jobs

(...and but for discrimination, the workforce would reflect parity with the labor market)

JAMES C. SHARF

In January, 1980 in *EEOC v. United Virginia Bank*, the Fourth Circuit (MD, VA, NC, SC, WVA) rejected the EEOC's typical argument that a prima facie case of discrimination exists because of disparities between the employer's workforce and the general labor market.

This case is noteworthy in three respects;

1) lower courts are beginning to respond to the 1977 teachings of the Supreme Court in *Teamsters* ("...figures for the general population might not accurately reflect the pool of qualified job applicants...") and *Hazelwood* ("When special qualifications are required to fill particular jobs, comparisons to the general population (rather than to the smaller group of individuals who possess the necessary qualifications) may have little probative value");

2) the court of appeals construed the burden of defining the qualified labor market to be on the plaintiff (EEOC) in establishing the prima facie case initially; and

3) in rejecting the plaintiff's prima facie arguments, the court assumed that the employer's use of qualifications was satisfactory rather than relegating the burden of defending the job-relatedness of those same qualifications had the prima facie case been established.

The following are verbatim excerpts from that decision:

"At trial, the EEOC presented the following as evidence of discrimination:

1) the principal part of its case was a statistical comparison of black employees at UVB with black people in the total area work force; 2) a statistical comparison of black and white applicant to hire ratios; 3) specific policies which allegedly discriminate against blacks, e.g., credit checks and a high school education requirement; and 4) individual instances of discrimination, mainly relating to an alleged failure to hire qualified black applicants when openings were available.

The centerpiece and keystone of the EEOC's case both in the district court and on appeal, is that the proper statistical comparison in this case is between the percentage of black employees working in various job classifications at UVB and the percentage of black people in the local labor force...

The fundamental problem with the EEOC's statistical evidence lies in the fact that UVB's workforce was compared with the work force as a whole. As the district court correctly recognized, this comparison was improper. It is clear that:

'When special qualifications are required to fill particular jobs, comparisons to the general population (rather than to the smaller group of individuals who possess the necessary qualifications) may have little probative value.' *Hazelwood School District v. U.S., Teamsters v. U.S.*...

The EEOC, however, rigidly continues to argue that all the black local labor force is qualified for the office and clerical positions at UVB. This is simply not true. Tellers must be able to deal with the public, handle and account for money, and operate adding machines, typewriters and other office machines. The district

court found that the entire percentage of black people in the local labor force would not provide an appropriate statistical group for comparison with UVB black employees. Since this determination was a factual one, it will not be disturbed unless clearly erroneous. We, therefore, need not engage in a detailed re-examination of the job qualifications in this case for the district court's decision was obviously not clearly erroneous...

The EEOC failed to present any evidence as to the percentage of persons in the labor force qualified to hold the various positions at UVB...the burden was on the EEOC to prove discrimination and to produce evidence to support its position. The SMSA report constitutes the only evidence which even remotely speaks to qualifications. Without these figures, the EEOC's case is virtually without any statistical evidence to support it.

Further problems emerge when an attempt is made to compare the SMSA percentages with the UVB employees. When the EEOC prepared its figures for black employees and applicants, it made no efforts to exclude employees hired prior to the effective date of Title VII (July 2, 1965). Thus, the figures EEOC presents are weighted against UVB to the extent that white employees hired prior to the time Title VII was in effect were included in the employment figures...It is therefore clear that the June 9, 1975 employment lists as a whole was improperly used against UVB because the EEOC made no attempt to factor out the pre-Act hires...

Taking all of these things into consideration, we are of opinion the statistical evidence we have just discussed does not suffice to prove a prima facie case of discrimination...

It is simply not realistic to say that every member of the labor force has the qualifications to be a bank teller for example. It is even more unrealistic to say that every member of the labor force has the qualifications to be a bank manager or official. Despite the examination of the sands of employee records covering a period of nine years, the EEOC did not present evidence of one person who was qualified to be a bank official or manager, who had applied for the job and who was denied employment...

Another set of statistics argued by the EEOC deals with the number of applicants compared with the smaller number of hires...(a simple comparison of the total applicant flow, with no attempt to prove the qualifications of the applicants, may have little meaning, if any. *Hazelwood*...points this out). The evidence shows that in 1973-74...12.4% of the white applicants were hired and 4.4% of the black applicants. The EEOC argues that this is prima facie evidence of discrimination since whites had a nearly three times better chance of being hired than blacks. Once again, however, the EEOC, not carrying the burden of proof which is on the plaintiff, has not produced any evidence as to the relative numbers of blacks and whites although the applications were apparently at hand, who were qualified for the jobs at UVB. The EEOC again asks us to find that all black people in the local labor force are qualified for the jobs available at UVB. To repeat, for the reasons stated in our discussion of the general hiring statistics, we reject this argument...

The burden of proof was on the EEOC, and it failed to present any evidence of the post-Act hires or on the percentage of black people in the labor force qualified to work at UVB in its various job categories. We have taken the time to show that even on the sparse evidence in the record the EEOC has not proved its case, and we note that failure of proof is the primary basis for our decision."

(EDITOR'S NOTE: A more comprehensive treatment of workforce/labor market prima facie case law can be obtained from Jim Sharf, Richardson, Bellows, Henry & Co., Inc., 1140 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.)

## DIVISION 14 1979-1980 COMMITTEES

### Committee on Committees

Frank Smith, *Chair*  
Lyman Porter  
Lawrence Cummings  
Tom Standing

### Professional Affairs

Arthur C. MacKinney, *Chair*  
William F. Grossnickle  
Ann Howard  
Paul D. Jacobs  
Bert T. King  
Herbert H. Meyer  
Benjamin Shimberg  
Laurence Siegel  
William D. Siegfried  
William M. Vicars

### Public Relations

Jerold R. Niven, *Chair*  
Emma W. Bragg  
Paul J. Duffy  
Neil S. Dumas  
Madeline E. Heilman  
Edward J. Robinson  
John Bernardin

### Education and Training

Stephen L. Cohen, *Chair*  
Dennis M. Courtney  
Daniel R. Ilgen  
David C. Munz  
Jerome Siegel  
James R. Terborg  
Jan P. Wijting  
Hilda Wing

### Workshop

David W. Lacey, *Chair*  
Richard D. Arvey  
Richard S. Barrett  
V. Jon Bentz  
Gary B. Brumback  
Jeffery H. Greenhaus  
Tove H. Hammer  
Terence R. Mitchell  
Robert A. Ramos  
Stanley B. Silverman

### Fellowship

Karlene H. Roberts, *Chair*  
Fred E. Fiedler  
Donald L. Grant  
Robert M. Guion  
W. Clay Hamner, Jr.  
William A. Owens, Jr.

### Scientific Affairs

Virginia R. Boehm, *Chair*  
Wayne F. Cascio  
Charles J. Cranny  
Robert G. Downey  
John J. Leach  
Manuel London  
Patrick R. Pinto  
Richard R. Reilly

### Program

Walter W. Tornow, *Chair*  
Kathryn M. Bartol  
Edwin T. Cornelius  
Randall B. Dunham  
Charles L. Hulin  
Edward L. Levine  
William H. Mobley  
Richard J. Ritchie

### Membership

Myron A. Fischl, *Chair*  
Robert F. Burnaska  
Richard M. Steers  
Francis C. Walker

### Public Policy & Social Issues

Robert F. Boldt, *Chair*  
Roger N. Blakeney  
Sidney A. Fine  
Nita R. French  
David A. Grove  
Mary S. Khosh  
James Ledvinka

### Ad Hoc Continuing Education

Irwin L. Goldstein, *Chair*  
Brian S. O'Leary  
Adela Oliver  
Erich P. Prien

### Ad Hoc Innovations in Methodology

J. Richard Hackman, *Chair*  
Thomas J. Bouchard  
Joel T. Campbell  
Joseph L. Moses  
Barry M. Staw  
Victor H. Vroom  
Karl E. Weick

### Ad Hoc Legal Issues

C. J. Bartlett, *Chair*  
Richard A. Hansen  
James W. Herring  
Harold J. Tragash

### Long Range Planning

Ben Schneider, *Chair*  
Victor Vroom  
Frank Schmidt  
Ken Wexley

### Ad Hoc State Affairs

Bill Howell, *Chair*  
(see Howell's report, p. 26,  
for listing of  
regional coordinators)

## Michigan I/O Association Elects Officers

The recently formed Michigan Association of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists (MAIOP) held its first election of officers earlier this year, with the following results:

**Alan R. Bass**, President, Wayne State University; **Neal Schmitt**, President-Elect, Michigan State University; **Mark L. Lifter**, Secretary-Treasurer, Arthur Young & Company; Members at Large are **Howard Carlson** of General Motors Corporation, **William Roskind** of Detroit Edison, and **Frederic Wickert** of Michigan State University.

Membership in MAIOP has grown rapidly to approximately 90. The Association sponsors bi-monthly or quarterly educational meetings, and is also expected to assume an active role in representing the interests of I/O psychologists in the area of credentialing. Recent speakers have included **Jack Hunter**—Michigan State University, **Graham Staines**—Institute for Social Research, and **Steve Cohen**—Assessment Designs. No geographic limitations have been put on membership; individuals in surrounding states with interest in affiliating with the group are welcome. Membership applications or further information about MAIOP can be obtained from **Mark Lifter**, Arthur Young & Company, 100 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan, 48243.

## Meetings and Conferences

1) **Organization Development Institute** (11234 Walnut Ridge Road, Chesterland, Ohio 44026), a non-profit educational association has plans for 2 conferences; (1) Management Development on a schooner, Penobscot Bay, Maine, June 16-21, 1980; and (2) 2nd World Congress on Organization Development, to be held in Cambridge, England, August 17-22, 1981. The topic will be "Conflict Resolution Technology." Write to the OD Institute for details.

2) The **USAF Occupational Measurement Center** will host the 3rd Annual International Occupational Analyst Workshop 20-22 May 1980, at Randolph AFB TX. The last such conference (May 1979) involved over 70 participants from all US services, representatives of the Australian, Canadian, and West German forces, other federal agencies, civilian industry, and the academic community. The purpose of the workshop is direct exchange of ideas by working-level job analysts and development of an understanding of what others are doing. For details, write **USAFOMC/OMY (Attn OA Workshop)**, Randolph AFB TX 78148.

3) The **Division 14 Workshop**; August 31, 1980, Montreal. See this issue for details and registration form.

## POSITIONS AVAILABLE

LARRY FOGLI

- (1) The Department of Psychology at the University of Waterloo has an opening in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the Assistant Professor level. While applicants in all areas of I/O will receive full consideration, those with special competence and interest in organizational behavior will receive special consideration. Regardless of area of specialization applicants should show considerable promise as a scholar and a commitment to the development of a strong, independent, sustained research program. In addition to research, responsibilities include teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and supervision of student research. The person hired will be expected to make a significant contribution to the development of a Ph.D. program in I/O and to an on-going Master of Applied Science program in I/O. The salary is competitive; final appointment depends on availability of funds. Persons eligible for employment in Canada at the time of application will receive first consideration. Applications will be accepted until May 15, 1980 or until the position is filled; the appointment can begin as early as September 1, 1980. Direct a complete *vita*, the names and addresses of at least three references, and samples of scholarly work (e.g., reprints or preprints) to **Dr. Gary Waller, Chairman, Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1.**
- (2) Management consulting company specializing in compensation consulting needs an experienced psychologist/personnel specialist to handle management and organizational development projects with clients across the country. An excellent opportunity to develop a broad range of consulting services. Company is located in idyllic town between Philadelphia and New York. Compensation, up to \$50,000 plus bonus, will be commensurate with experience, ability, and performance. Mail resume in confidence to **Dr. James F. Smith, Suite 313, 3384 Peachtree Rd., N.E., Atlanta, Ga. 30326.**
- (3) Organization Consultant: The **Organization Consulting Group**, a small but select team of psychologists seeks an additional person to join in our rapid growth and development. If you possess an entrepreneurial spirit and are willing to market as well as do, we would like to visit with you. Salary is competitive and includes a generous profit sharing plan. Please forward your resume to: **Michael R. Perlson, Ph.D., Vice President, Organization Consulting Group, 756 East Main Street, Rochester, N.Y. 14605.**

# Presenting

## The Newest 1980 Texts

**PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**—Herbert G. Heneman, III, Donald P. Schwab, John A. Fossum, and Lee Dyer

**INTRODUCTION TO ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: Text and Readings**—L. L. Cummings and Randall B. Dunham

**EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOR IN ORGANIZATIONS: Learning From the Interplay of Cases, Concepts, and Student Experiences, Revised Edition**—Allan R. Cohen, Stephen L. Fink, Herman Gadon, Robin D. Willits, with the collaboration of Natasha Josefowitz

**MANAGING ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: Achieving Results Through Understanding and Action**—Cyrus F. Gibson

**ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: Its Data, First Principles, and Applications, Third Edition**—Joe Kelly

**ORGANIZATION THEORY AND DESIGN, Revised Edition**—Robert A. Ullrich and George F. Wieland

**RICHARD D. IRWIN, INC.** • **Homewood, Illinois 60430**

**PSYCHOLOGY OF WORK BEHAVIOR, Revised Edition**—Frank J. Landy and the late Don A. Trumbo

This text examines the role of organizational, environmental, and worker characteristics on behavior of individuals in work settings. It emphasizes the scientific approach to solving problems of a psychological nature in the work environment.

**THE DORSEY PRESS** • **Homewood, Illinois 60430**

*Examination copies for adoption consideration available on request; please indicate course title and text presently used.*

## ADVERTISE IN TIP-TARGETED AUDIENCE

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 2000. This group includes both academics and professional-practitioners in the field. In addition, **TIP** is distributed to foreign affiliates, graduate students, and to the leaders of the American Psychological Association generally. Present distribution is approximately 3000 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, "position available" ads are available at the charge of \$25.00 per position. For information, or for placement of ads or listing of positions, write to **Larry Fogli, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.**

### ADVERTISING RATES

RATES PER INSERTION	Size of Ad	Number of Insertions	
		One time	Four times
	Two-page spread	\$250	\$180
	Cover	175	135
	One-Page	150	110
	Half Page	100	70
PLATE SIZES	Size of Ad	Vertical	
		Horizontal	
	One Page	7½"	4½"
	Half Page	3½"	4½"
OTHER INFORMATION	Printed by offset on offset stock, saddle stitch binding.		
CLOSING DATES	March 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15.		

Pass this information on to an author or publisher!