

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
Larry Fogli

Editor
Business Manager

Editorial Board

Bob Boldt
Irv Goldstein
Tove Hammer
Judi Komaki

Joel Moses
Laurel Oliver
Neal Schmitt
Jim Sharf

President

Victor H. Vroom
Box 1A
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520

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
Profile: Mildred Katzell	2
14 TIPBITS	4
Applied Behavior Analysis	6
Reaction to Incorporation	10
New Fellows	14
In-Basket Correspondence	15
Meetings: Past and Future	17
EEO Issues	21
Public Relations Committee Report	24
Government Research Activities	25
More EEO Issues	27
Journal Review Service	29
APA Committee on Women in Psychology Report	35
Positions Available	44

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

IRWIN

Richard D. Irwin • Homewood, Illinois 60430

new for 1981 . . .

BEHAVIOR IN ORGANIZATIONS

H. Joseph Reitz

*Revised
Edition*

ORGANIZATION THEORY: A STRUCTURAL AND BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS

*Fourth
Edition*

William G. Scott • Terence R. Mitchell • Philip H. Birnbaum

also available . . .

EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOR IN ORGANIZATIONS

*Revised
Edition*

Allan R. Cohen • Stephen L. Fink
Herman Gadon • Robin D. Willits

PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Herbert G. Heneman, III • Lee Dyer
Donald P. Schwab • John A. Fossum

INTRODUCTION TO ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: TEXT AND READINGS

L.L. Cummings • Randall B. Dunham

DORSEY

The Dorsey Press • Homewood, Illinois 60430

available now . . .

PSYCHOLOGY OF WORK BEHAVIOR

Frank J. Landy and the late Don A. Trumbo

*Revised
Edition*

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

A Message From Your President

VICTOR H. VROOM

One day last week, I was sorting through my mail and discovered a handwritten letter from a clinical psychologist in private practice. He reported that his practice was moving increasingly into industrial contexts, and confessed little knowledge of industrial psychology. He asked me to send him any manuals or workbooks that might be helpful to him in working with his industrial clients.

Moving quickly through the large stack of mail, I discovered another letter—this one from APA. This letter announced a meeting on employment of psychologists in industry sponsored by the APA Education and Training Board. Attached was a report written by **Saul Sternberg** of Bell Labs and **Geoffrey Keppel** at Berkeley entitled "Some Suggestions for Making Academic Experimental Psychology More Effective in Industry." Division 14 was invited to send a representative to discuss the recommendations of the report which included the establishment of an APA task force to examine opportunities for employment of academic psychologists in industry and soliciting NSF funds for retraining of academic psychologists to work in industry.

The two pieces of mail—one casual and personal, the other formal and bureaucratic, represented a common theme—the actual or potential movement of other groups of psychologists into spheres of activity and influence that are close to our own. It also symbolizes one of the dilemmas that I have experienced in my short tenure as your president.

I will not take the time here to describe how I responded to these two requests. The important learning for me came from a contrast of two alternative ways of looking at them. Frankly I found it fairly easy to view both developments with suspicion, if not apprehension. How else is one to view such a naive request for aid as that received from the clinician and the proposed use of precious APA funds to support an endeavor which, even if successful, would enable academic psychologists to compete with Division 14 members for jobs. Guild concerns, reminiscent of the American Medical Association or even the Sharks and the Jets (of West Side Story fame) could frame a response to both.

I then remembered an event in my early history of involvement with Division 14. I had joined Divisions 8 and 9 but had forsaken Division 14 because its membership application process seemed more cumbersome. Besides, I viewed myself as a social psychologist with no interest in either testing or its application in personnel selection and placement. I remember a conversation with the late **Donald Taylor** who convinced me to view the boundaries of industrial psychology more broadly. He argued persuasively that the boundaries of applications of psychology in industry required continued rethinking. In Taylor's view, different disciplines and different perspectives were indispensable to the search for new problems and new methods to solve old problems.

Looked at through Taylor's eyes, both letters should be welcomed for both represented potential members of our division and, of even greater importance, potential new perspectives and ideas which would enhance the range

and scope of the application of psychology to the enhancing effectiveness of organizations and the humanity of life within them.

It occurred to me that these two letters and the alternative ways of viewing them symbolized not only much of my experience during three months as your division president but also many of the policy options that will face our division in the months and years to come.

Profile: Mildred Katzell

One of the newest members of APA's Board of Directors is Division 14's **Mildred "Kitty" Katzell**. Kitty was elected by the Council of Representatives to a three year term on the Board whose purpose is to provide an oversight function for APA. Kitty had been Division 14's outspoken representative to Council (1977-80); now she will be serving on their administrative body.

Kitty was born in Chicago, spent 9 years of her childhood in India (where her mother was a missionary), went to high school in Iowa, and began her college pursuits in Northfield, Minnesota at Carleton College. She completed her Bachelor's and Master's work at Syracuse University in 1948 and then settled down in the New York area where she has held several positions, each dealing with some aspect of testing and measurement. One of her first positions was as a counseling assistant at the Psychological Services Center at Syracuse University. She moved up at the Center to Administrative Assistant and served in that capacity to its new director in 1949, **Ray Katzell**. Kitty has also been a research assistant at ETS, a supervisor of employment testing at Macy's in NY, and from 1967-73 was the Director of Measurement and Evaluation for the National League for Nursing. *TIP* predicts that her Directorship for the nursing league will provide considerable and valuable insight as she works with and encounters the behaviors of members of APA's Board and Council.

In 1967, Kitty received her Ph.D. in Measurement and Evaluation from Columbia University where she studied with **Albert Thompson, R. L. Thorndike, and Elizabeth Hagen**. Since 1973 she has worked for The Psychological Corporation. Her current position carries the title of Senior Staff Psychologist. Her responsibilities include writing proposals, technical reports, and interpretative reports—all in a staff relationship to those responsible for test development.

Kitty has been quite active in Associations and Divisions other than 14. She was President of the Division of Personnel Psychology (NY State Psychological Association), Trustee of the National Vocational Guidance Associa-



tion, Vice-chair of the NY State Board for Psychology, and Chair of the membership committee for the Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance.

Kitty's services extend to community organizations. Believing that "everyone should be doing something for his or her community," Kitty has worked with the NY Lung Association, the Christmas Seal Organization, in several capacities (Board and Committee Member, 1973-present; Vice-President, 1976-77; President-Elect, 1977-79; President, 1979-81).

When Kitty isn't serving professional and community organizations, she relaxes by tending to home, enjoying New York, and working with Ray on restoration of antique cars. In sum, Kitty has been quite active; it's almost as if she had nine lives!

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 3, 1980 (edited by Peter Warr, MRC/SSRC Social and Applied Psychology Unit, University of Sheffield, UK)

Moshe Krausz & Dafna N. Izraeli. Differences in stage of occupational field and subfield choice among students of three engineering subfields

Tova Bloch. Sex differences in interest measurement

Michael H. Banks, Chris W. Clegg, Paul R. Jackson, Nigel J. Kemp, Elizabeth M. Stafford & Toby D. Wall. The use of the General Health Questionnaire as an indicator of mental health in occupational studies

Andrew D. Szilagyi. Causal inferences between leader reward behaviour and subordinate performance, absenteeism, and work satisfaction

Ross M. Gurney. The effects of unemployment on the psycho-social development of school-leavers

Boas Shamir. A note on individual differences in the subjective evaluation of flexitime

Allan P. O. Williams & Sally Woodward. A note on Steers & Braunstein's behaviourally based measure of manifest needs

Peter Herriot, Russell Ecob & Maureen Hutchison. Decision theory and occupational choice

Book reviews

Special price to APA members using APA order form

Volume 54 (1981) \$25.00

(Retail price for Volume 54 (1981) \$72.00)

Orders to:

The British Psychological Society

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

14 TIPBITS

SHELDON ZEDECK

The recent national elections resulted in a changing of the guard in Washington, D.C. It is too early to determine the affect of the election on the Division 14 community of academicians/practitioners. However, now Division 14 must turn its attention to another election of sorts. In the Spring of 1981, members will be asked to vote on two separate questions: (1) Should we incorporate?; and (2) Should we adopt new proposed bylaws? (See the November 1980 *TIP* issue for the proposed bylaws.)

Though the "straw" votes have been positive for incorporation, the "silent majority" may be rising. *TIP* has received several "notes" reacting to the proposals as outlined by the Long Range Planning Committee in the November 1980 *TIP*. In this issue, we present two "con" positions, by **Phil Ash** and **Ray Katzell**, both former Presidents of the Division. *TIP* urges you to study these positions; "pro" statements can be found in the August and November 1980 issues of *TIP*. When the time comes to cast your vote, there may be a choice in this election.

NEWS AND NOTES...

Chester Cotton has reacted to the notions of incorporation/leaving APA and has written the APA president. Chester believes that APA would become more attractive, and withdrawal less attractive, if APA members would be allowed to choose any of the APA journals (e.g., *JAP*) as their "free" journal instead of the current mandatory subscription to the *American Psychologist* as part of APA dues. Comments about this proposal can be sent to the *TIP* office... Sticking to elections, *TIP* congratulates **Paul Thayer** on his election as Vice-Chair of the APA Policy and Planning Board for 1981 (he will become Chair in 1982) and **Dave Robinson** on his election to the Western Regional Board of ABPP.

Then there are the appointments. **Virginia Boehm** has been appointed to the State Board in Ohio. If you have concerns related to Ohio's licensing law or other professional issues, write to Gini at **SOHIO, 1521 Midland Building, Cleveland 44115** or phone her at **216-575-4192**... **W. Warner Burke** has been appointed Co-Chair of the Department of Psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University. Burke has also recently co-edited a book (with **Len Goodstein**), "Trends and Issues in OD: Current Theory and Practice"... Believing that the pen is mightier than any other instrument of power, **Jerry Bayley** readily accepted his appointment as editor of *The Mississippi Psychologist*. The *TIP* editorial staff wishes him well and hopes that he never incorrectly spells Mississippi. If you have "news and notes" for Jerry, write to him at **P.O. Box 256, Edwards, Mississippi 39066**.

While some are elected or appointed, others retire. **Sid Fine**, Principal Research Scientist at ARRO in Washington, D.C., "eased" into retirement (October 1980) with a lecture tour through the United Kingdom—The University of Sheffield, Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, Herriot-Watt (Edinburgh) and the Independent Research and Assessment Centre (London). He also gave a workshop to the Rhone-Poulenc Group in Paris. His future plans include a book on a systems approach to manpower planning... **Henry D. Meyer** has retired as Management Development Counselor

of Jewel Companies in Chicago after 22 years of employment. He plans to continue active practice as an I/O psychologist in the role of an independent consultant, specializing in manager assessments and manager development. Henry is the senior and primary author of the American Management Association's recent briefing to its total membership entitled, "The Manager's Guide to Developing Subordinate Managers," a condensation of a book done for Jewel Companies entitled, "Action Plans for Management Development."

Ed Locke gave the sixth annual Frederick J. Gandet Memorial Lecture at Stevens Institute of Technology on April 17, 1980. His topic was "The Ideas of Frederick W. Taylor: An Evaluation." By coincidence, Fred Taylor was a Stevens graduate, class of 1883... **Paul Thayer** delivered the keynote address at the IPMA-USA convention in Denver on October 27, 1980... **Erwin S. Stanton** was re-invited to Venezuela this past September to conduct a seminar on the "Sequential Selection System" for the Centro de Transferencia Tecnologica of Caracas... **Chester Cotton** has been invited by the Office of Personnel Management's Executive and Management Development Division to participate in a symposium in Washington, D.C., entitled "Issues and Future Directions for Research on Federal Managerial Career Patterns."

Bob Vecchiotti has established the firm of Organizational Consulting Services, Inc. in Ballwin, Missouri... **Jack Kondrasuk** has been promoted to Assistant to the President and Associate Professor in the School of Business at the University of Portland... **Tom Stone** has left the cornfields of Iowa to visit for a year at York University in Canada... **Simcha Ronen** has recently visited the *TIP* office in Berkeley, attended a conference in Los Angeles, and visited in Israel. These "leaves" from his position at NYU may have formed the basis of his recent book, "Flexible Working Hours: An Innovation in Quality of Work Life"... IBM also has their way of improving the quality of life—of graduate students. **Allen Kraut** reports that IBM's Corporate Personnel Research group had a number of interns over the last two years. Interns from New York University have included: **Victoria Berger-Gross**, **Andrea Goldberg**, **Bill Liggett**, **Roger Uhlich**, **Paul Platten**, **Jane Lucas** and **Nathan Vogel**. Others included **Steve Kozlowski** and **Robert Goldsmith**, (Pennsylvania State University), **Patricia Pedigo**, (University of South Florida), and **Douglas Black**, (University of Maryland), **Marie Guerin**, (University of North Carolina), **Terry Amburgey** and **Joanne Julius**, (Stanford University), **Craig McGee** and **Bob Burt**, (University of Tennessee). Advanced graduate students who would be interested in spending summer, fall or spring semester(s) as interns should be encouraged to apply to Mr. **Richard A. Dunnington**, Personnel Research, IBM Corporation, Armonk, New York, 10504.

THE DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF ITEMS
FOR THE MAY ISSUE OF *TIP* IS
MARCH 15, 1981

APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

JUDI KOMAKI

Take a moment. Think of the last time your boss recognized you for a job well done.

How often does such recognition occur?

_____ 1 x day _____ 1 x year
_____ 1 x week _____ None of the above. _____
_____ 1 x month

Now, recall the last time *you* recognized your secretary for something he or she did well. How often do you provide this kind of recognition?

_____ 1 x day _____ 1 x year
_____ 1 x week _____ None of the above. _____
_____ 1 x month

If your answers don't come close to 1 x day or 1 x week, you're typical of workers in a great variety of business, industry, and government settings.

I've always wondered why this should be the case. It doesn't take an advanced degree to figure out the importance of positive reinforcement. The principle itself is fairly straightforward. Why do you think such an obviously beneficial strategy is so routinely avoided?

1. _____

2. _____

Mail your answers to me at Ga. Tech., EES/EDL, Atlanta, GA 30332. I'll report the results.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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.

(Editor's Note: *TIP* thanks **Jack Bartlett** for searching his archives and finding the following paper. Ghiselli prepared these remarks in 1958 when the University of Maryland's Psychology Department was compiling its history.)

SOME RECOLLECTIONS OF EARLY DAYS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

EDWIN E. GHISELLI

To talk about the beginning of systematic instruction in Psychology at the University of Maryland and the inauguration of graduate instruction I must necessarily talk a good deal about Jack Jenkins, since he established the program and its initial successes were entirely due to his efforts. At the outset I must make my position clear with respect to Jack. He was my friend, my teacher, and my father figure. He influenced my personal life as well as my professional life. He was a leader, a scholar, and a hell of a lot of fun.

In the middle thirties President Byrd was completing his plans to make a great university of Maryland. As part of his program he wanted to develop the Department of Psychology. He asked a number of prominent people in Psychology to name an outstanding man who could establish a good department. Jack was the nominee. During the academic year 1936-1937 Jack was approached by Byrd and they had a number of conferences, the upshot of which was a firm offer to Jack to head the department and Jack accepted it. Because of prior commitments at Cornell Jack could not come to Maryland until January of 1938.

Let me now talk about Jack's general objectives, at least as I remember them after all these years. The achievements of the applied psychology group at Carnegie in the early twenties are now largely forgotten in the rush of history. But they were substantial and set the model for the program Jack had in mind for Maryland. Business and industrial psychology was still a relatively primitive area in 1937. The center of work, such as it was, was at Minnesota under Paterson. But by and large applied psychology was rare and was being done by a relatively few widely separated individuals. One thinks of Viteles at Pennsylvania, Burr at Ohio, and Strong at Stanford. Such work as was being offered was usually in the form of a few single courses. Jack visualized an integrated and systematic program that would provide training up to the doctorate in applied psychology. He saw two main areas, market research and advertising, and personnel and industrial psychology. During our first year at Maryland we all began to see the importance of the area of counseling, but this was not included in the original plan.

Around these two main areas Jack visualized a series of courses basic to all students of psychology. I confess that I've forgotten the details but we did agree that developmental, social, differential, and experimental psychology together with statistics were essential. However, Jack realized that a university the size of Maryland could not afford to be tops in all areas and therefore decided to stress the two applied fields. Courses in the other fields generally were limited to single one semester courses. There were a few service courses, such as educational psychology, which also had to be given.

At the time Jack went to Maryland the Department consisted only of

Sproul and Clarke. Sproul was an older man who had been at the University for some years, and Clarke was young and was still working for his degree at George Washington University. Naturally they felt insecure with a new department head coming in but Jack did, I think, all he could to dispel such feelings. However, during the time I was in College Park his success was not complete. We talked about this matter a great deal and he had me informally do all I could to make the two of them feel secure. Jack was impressed with Sproul's scholarly achievements and mentioned them publicly many times.

Jack did not wish to use his authority to the full and make a clean sweep even though he was advised to do so. Sproul, then, was assured of his position and Clarke stayed on in a kind of a probationary status. However, neither of them participated much in the early days in planning and in the initial spade work. This chore fell to Jack, Roger Bellows, and myself.

As part of the agreement Jack had with President Byrd, two new positions were established in the department in addition to Jack's post. One was at the level of Assistant Professor and the other at the Instructor level. I had heard of Jack's proposed move to Maryland and his program and so I stalked him at the Minneapolis meetings of the APA in the summer of 1937. I collared him just as he came out of the men's room (a fact he never let me forget), and before his physiology had a chance to settle down, talked him into giving me the instructorship. I went to Cornell with Jack in the fall of 1937 and then to Maryland with him in January of 1938.

During that semester at Cornell, Jack's last there, he and I discussed at some length the program he was about to install at Maryland. Jack also visited around, particularly with the people at the Psychological Corporation, seeking ideas and advice. In addition, he had to think about filling the Assistant Professorship. The first candidate for this position, to my knowledge, was Jack Darley. Darley came to Ithaca to discuss the matter but finally decided to stay at Minnesota. So we went to Maryland with the one vacant position.

The United States Employment Service was the "great" psychotechnological experiment of the time, and in Cal Shartle's shop in Washington and in the field offices were many young men of great promise. Indeed, many of the top flight men in industrial psychology today were in that group. Consequently, in the spring of 1938 Jack and I went into Washington to talk with Cal. Cal suggested two people, Jay Otis and Roger Bellows. Because Jay was close by, Jack saw him first, and was so impressed that he made him an offer. However, Jay had other plans and so we went to Baltimore to see Roger. Again we were impressed and Roger was made an offer which he accepted. He came to Maryland in September of 1938. The staff was then complete.

In spring of 1938 the program was launched. Jack and I began the instruction in applied psychology. I can't convey the feeling of excitement we felt. The students—all undergraduates—felt it too and our classes were much larger than anticipated. President Byrd and Dean Broughton were very helpful and encouraging as were the chairmen of social science departments and departments that were geographically close. We liked everybody and everybody liked us. The thrill of the whole thing continued through the academic year and was at its height in the summer of 1939 when I left to come to the University of California. This year and a half were, I think, the best in my life. The sky was the limit, psychotechnology was great stuff of unlimited possibilities, and I was just married.

During that year and a half we had many visitors from other universities who were curious to see the new experiment and to wish Jack well. I couldn't begin to list them all. But their visits were all minor celebrations. We gathered for libation, good fellowship, professional gossip, kidding, and serious discussion. Lazarsfeld, Shartle, Lucas, McGeoch, Bingham, Johnson, Dallenbach, Husband, and Britt, were among the visitors. We averaged about two visitors every three weeks which made for a fine full life.

I can't for the life of me remember the name of the building where we were housed. I think it is earth sciences, engineering, chemistry or some such thing now. But it was a fine building and we had two large rooms all to ourselves. In one there were some half partitions and in it were Jack, the departmental secretary, the ditto machine, Clarke, and myself. The other housed Roger and Sproul together with our tiny library, the calculating machine, and supplies. It also served as a sort of seminar and conference room.

Jack stressed the need for research and, as I remember it, got each of us \$15 in research funds for the year. Jack, Roger, and I each turned out two or three reports of studies we did so the money was perhaps well spent.

In fall of 1938 came our first three graduate students—Guest, Kershner, and Sparks. The first two were after the doctorate and Sparks was after a masters degree. They joined in celebrations for visitors and were almost as much of the family as the rest of us. We were all young and argued furiously with each other on all occasions and in all places. I remember I had a course in statistics which was a battle royal among the three graduate students and myself. The fourth member of the class was a very pretty undergraduate student whom we all loved and who thought we were too cute for words.

In terms of amount of time spent on the premises, loudness of vocal participation, and the like, the department effectively consisted of Jack, Roger, myself, Guest, and Kershner. But it is and was clear that Jack was the center of the group and the energizer. Without him we would have been as pedestrian as any other people. With him we were electrified, self assured, energetic, and literally bursting with the good things of life. Morale was high. Jack stimulated and guided us but never directed us.

On thinking back one might have expected this. First of all there was newness. Then there was youth and smallness of the group. And most important, there was leadership. I suppose that there is no question but that Maryland now has a much better balanced and mature department. But it was a great thrill to have been a part of the beginning. I am as proud to have been a member of the faculty of the Department of Psychology of the University of Maryland as I am of anything in my professional life.

VELILIND'S LAWS OF EXPERIMENTATION:

1. If reproducibility may be a problem, conduct the test only once.
2. If a straight line fit is required, obtain only two data points.

Reaction to Incorporation

The August and November 1980 issues of *TIP* contained presentations regarding the recommendation by Division 14's Long Range Planning Committee (LRP) to incorporate. The November issues specifically requested that members comment on the proposal. The following articles, by Philip Ash and Ray Katzell, are two reactions received by *TIP*.

As outlined by the LRP in the November issue of *TIP*, the following are the next steps in the process:

1. Revise proposed Bylaws based on member comments and conduct mail ballot in Spring 1981. Members will be asked to vote on two separate questions: (1) Should we incorporate? (2) Should we adopt the Bylaws as proposed?
2. If both votes are favorable, proceed with incorporation. By the 1981 APA Convention in Los Angeles, we could be incorporated as the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

THE PROPOSED BY-LAWS AND INCORPORATION: AN OPINION AND COMMENT

PHILIP ASH*

In my opinion, there is little merit to the proposed by-laws or to the proposal before Division 14 that it be incorporated. The reasons advanced for this action (*TIP*, Nov. 80, and previous issues) are for the most part irrelevant, specious, or inaccurate, or all three. And the proposed by-laws should be, with their membership-packing gimmick, thoroughly rejected.

A corporation is a body created by law which can act as a person in legal matters—hold property, make contracts, file suits. It can be fined, sued, put out of existence by law—but not jailed. The corporate form of organization, in the public or private sector, in for-profit or not-for-profit organizations, was created for three main purposes: to give continuity ("life") to the organization whomsoever its current managers or members might be, to provide a device for the assembly of capital to operate, and to limit the obligation of the members for debts of the corporation. The corporate form protects the *individual member* from liability for debts of the corporation. The proposed caveat at the end of Article I of the proposed by-laws ("The purposes for which this corporation is formed are purely scientific...and not for financial gain...") applies to all not-for-profit organizations. "Gain" is not the issue: member liability is.

A corporation may also, under some circumstances, enjoy certain tax advantages, and may more easily confer on the donors to the corporation tax exemption for their gifts. When I was President of Division 14, however, this principle was established for contributions to the Cattell Award, *without* incorporation. In my opinion, none of the activities of Division 14 involve considerations that have a significant relationship to incorporation.

"Political: Incorporation would increase Division 14 clout in APA." Largely nonsense. Very few people in APA even *know* which divisions, if any, are

incorporated. A glance through the APA directories shows that at the headings of the division listings incorporation is *not* indicated (e.g. for Division 8 and Division 9). The members of the Board of Directors could care less.

"Membership: Incorporation might help us attract new members." Total nonsense. I have been part of the management, frequently the president, of about ten psychological organizations over the past four decades. Some were incorporated, usually to protect the cash flow of an active workshop training program. Most members probably never even knew whether we were incorporated or not. Incorporation confers no benefits (except liability for debts) on members, new or old.

"APA Divisions which are also incorporated societies...are not subject to many of the new regulations that APA boards and committees might attempt to impose..." This "reason" is specious and false. APA boards and committees do not issue "regulations" for members or divisions. They submit proposals to the APA Council and the APA Board of Directors. It is these bodies which issue rules and regulations. Division 14, like anyone else in a democratic society, must adhere to them.

"If it ever becomes necessary to withdraw from APA—and we do not believe it is necessary or desirable at present (underlining added)—we could do so expeditiously and without the delays the process of incorporation entails." This, I believe, is the center and heart of the purposes of the group urging the new by-laws (which also provide for packing Division 14 with non-psychologists who will most probably be recruited from among the ranks of the personnel departments of corporate enterprise).

This "reason" is simply untrue.

First, there are some of us, probably a majority, who consider themselves psychologists first, scientists or practitioners second, and I/O specialists last. For us, our ultimate scientific and professional home is APA, and little will change that. We just are not about to leave APA, whatever else we may join. This is indicated in many ways: Slightly over 40 percent of all APA members belong to *no* division, and that includes many I/O types; slightly under 50 percent of all psychologists in the U.S. do not belong to APA at all; and of the 60-minus percent of APA members who make a specialty identification, the average joiner belongs to 1.8 divisions. Even if some of the interests of Division 14 members were to be perceived as better served by another organization, any mass exodus (although with only about 3 percent of APA membership, the exodus of Division 14 could hardly be perceived as "mass") the foregoing data suggest that for the great plurality the issue would be not "APA or" but "APA and."

Second, any group of members of any APA division, or anybody else, may create societies or associations outside APA, as, for example, the Psychonomic Society primarily by members of Division 3. But Division 3 is still in APA, and a Division of APA per se is a creature of APA, which can be created only by the Council of Representatives (APA By-laws, Article V, Section 3), and can be dissolved only by the Council (Section 4). In the event that a division management, say of Division 14, were to generate and present to Council a motion for dissolution, it would not be determinative if a non-seceding group constituting at least one percent of the membership of APA (currently about 550 persons) petitioned for resurrection under the provisions of V3. There are at least that many "loyalists" left in APA. As a matter of

*The author was President of Division 14 in 1967-68.

fact, a "Petition of Reconstitution of Division 14" is under way as insurance. My main point is, the incumbent management of *no* division has the power unilaterally to dissolve the division or take a division out of APA. Even if a new society were organized, and a majority of Division 14 resigned from APA to take up membership in that society, Division 14 would survive, with all the rights and prerogatives, including program time, that accrue to a division of APA. To the would-be seceders, let us say, "Goodby, and good luck."

Aside from the issue of incorporation, the proposed by-laws are bad. I address myself to one: the provisions for members-at-large (which are authorized by the APA Bylaws at V2) are both deceptive in what they can offer these second-class citizens (i.e., non-psychologists in a psychological organization) and in the potential for exercising control over Division 14 by corporate personnel people (the most likely source of this group) with minimal psychological background. The "standards" for evaluating such members-at-large (*TIP*, page 25, paragraphs 3a-3c) are a joke. The escape-word "Ordinarily" (para 3a) makes it clear that the Executive Committee may admit *anyone*, from a personnel janitor to the VP of industrial relations for an oil company, the chairman of the board of a utility, or an "expert" from a law firm.

Notice that psychologists who are APA Members or Associates must be *nominated* by the Executive Committee for election as a Division 14 (old and proposed Bylaws, Article II, para 6) member or associate by the APA members of Division 14. In other words, it is clear that these provisions (3a, 3b, 3c versus 5 and 6) give license to the Executive Committee to pack the Society with non-psychologists and attenuate the influence of the psychologists in the division.

Division 14 is confronted with what I regard as a very bad proposal, designed to serve interests inimical to the science and profession of psychology generally, and to the long and honorable history of industrial psychology from Walter Dill Scott to Edwin Ghiselli in particular. I strongly urge you, Division 14 member, psychologist, to vote down both incorporation and the bylaws.

TO LEAVE OR NOT TO LEAVE (APA)

RAYMOND A. KATZELL*

Methinks I detect a schismatic tone to the reports of the Long Range Planning Committee (*TIP*, August and November 1980) and in much of the surrounding discussion. Incorporation is recommended to facilitate withdrawal from APA, the threat of which is expected to coerce APA into recognizing our "legitimate interests and values" and to "increase our political clout within APA". Division 14 is advised to be prepared to "Go it alone" should it fail to receive "exactly what services it expects from APA" or if "APA moves to require accreditation of I/O programs." Other reasons include

*The author is Professor of Psychology at New York University and was President of Division 14 in 1960-61.

fewer APA-caused problems (although it is conceded that "they have toughened us such that we could cope!"), more freedom from review of our actions by the rest of APA, and meetings that "would be more homogeneous and, thus lively and congenial."

To me, it appears that for Division 14 to quit APA (or threaten to quit) for these reasons is not only to declare independence from APA but to separate itself from the mainstream of psychology. If one really identifies oneself with other *psychologists*, then one doesn't threaten one's colleagues, doesn't demand "exactly" what one expects from them (at least not without offering to render in return what they expect), doesn't reject them because the majority may decide that accreditation is needed. As *psychologists*, we should invite rather than resent the review of our behavior by our colleagues, and should welcome opportunities to interact with them rather than rejoice in our enclave.

Those who deeply feel the other way about these and similar choices need to confront the question: *Are they really psychologists?* Or have they migrated over some invisible boundary into another domain? Perhaps a small-space analysis of their values and beliefs, or a sociometric diagram of their collegial preferences, might reveal them as clustering more closely with management or OB specialists—estimable people, to be sure, but not *psychologists*. If that were the result of such self-scrutiny, there would really be no need to remove Division 14 from APA in order to accomplish those ends—the dissidents could simply re-locate their identity and allegiance to, say, the Academy of Management.

Then consider this prospect. Even if a large number of Division 14 members were to defect from APA—with or without an incorporated organization in tow—would it not be likely that Division 14 would continue to be composed of those who still think of themselves principally as psychologists and choose to affiliate with the general membership society of that science and profession? How schismatic would you want to be?

**FIRST RULE OF INTELLIGENT TINKERING:
SAVE ALL THE PARTS**

New Fellows

W. CLAY HAMNER

During the 1980 APA Convention, seven Division 14 members were elected to Fellowship status. They were: **Mike Beer, Tom Bouchard, John Hinrichs, Dan Ilgen, Ned Rosen, Harold Rothe, and Rick Steers.**

Mike Beer received his Ph.D. from Ohio State University. He is currently with the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard University, and was previously with Corning Glass. Mike has published numerous articles on leadership, human resources, and organizational change and development.

Tom Bouchard has a Ph.D. degree from the University of California, and is currently in the Department of Psychology at the University of Minnesota. His published work focuses on individual differences, problem solving, research methodology, and behavioral genetics.

John Hinrichs received his Ph.D. degree from Cornell University and heads his own consulting firm. Previously he was with the I.B.M. Corporation. He has published approximately 40 articles in the area of training and development, motivation, and cross-national issues.

Dan Ilgen is a University of Illinois Ph.D. He is currently a member of the Department of Psychological Sciences at Purdue University. He has published numerous articles on sex role stereotypes, motivation, supervisory feedback, and work role behavior.

Ned Rosen received his Ph.D. degree from Purdue University and is currently on the faculty at Cornell University. His research in the area of labor relations and negotiation is widely published.

Harold Rothe received his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. Prior to his retirement he was employed by the Beloit Corporation in Beloit, Wisconsin. The majority of his research interests deal with performance assessment and job attitudes.

Rick Steers received his Ph.D. degree from the University of California at Irvine, and is currently a member of the faculty at the Graduate School of Management at the University of Oregon. His numerous research articles have dealt with the topics of motivation, withdrawal, and organizational effectiveness.

The Division 14 Fellowship Committee urges that you let us know whom you would like to recommend for Fellowship status. Please send your request for information to **W. Clay Hamner, 127 Social Sciences Building, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706.** Deadline for application is **April 1, 1981.**

In-Basket Correspondence

(Editor's Note: The November 1980 issue of *TIP* published the correspondence of January 17, 1980, and May 27, 1980 between the Federal agencies which issued the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* and the APA Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment. The following is the June 30, 1980 Federal agencies' response to the May 27, 1980 Committee letter. In addition there are two related letters between Michael Pallak, Executive Director of APA and the Federal agencies. These are being published so that the record will be complete.)

June 30, 1980 letter to T. Anne Cleary, Chair, Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment signed by Preston David, Executive Director, EEOC; A. Diane Graham, Assistant Director for Affirmative Employment Programs, Office of Personnel Management; David L. Rose, Chief, Federal Enforcement Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Dept. of Justice; and by Weldon Rougeau, Director, OFCCP, U.S. Dept. of Labor.

Dear Dr. Cleary:

We are in receipt of your letter of May 27, 1980.

The impetus for the development of these Questions and Answers was the concerns expressed in the Committee's letter of October 22, 1979, and the desire of the Federal agencies to achieve a satisfactory resolution of these concerns, if possible. We worked closely with your predecessor as Chair of Committee for a period of two months in order to achieve mutually acceptable language. Many of the changes in successive drafts of the Questions and Answers were a direct result of his suggestions. The Committee's letter of February 11, 1980, which documented your review and approval of the draft Questions and Answers, did not indicate major concerns with the proposed Questions and Answers.

The letter of February 11 did suggest additions to Questions and Answers 92 and 93, which were carefully considered by the Federal agencies. We adopted your suggested modification to Question and Answer 93. We noted with regard to Question and Answer 92, that your letter stated, "It would certainly be desirable to add this sentence even though we take it to be implied." We assumed therefore, that you did not regard your proposed addition as essential, and we decided not to add that sentence.

The letter of February 11 did not recommend any changes to Question and Answer 91, although you made several valuable suggestions concerning sources for information on alternative selection procedures. Although we welcomed your suggestions, our view was that provision of this type of guidance is more appropriately a function of a professional organization than of the Federal enforcement agencies.

A complete copy of the Questions and Answers, including the Introduction, was sent to your Committee approximately one month before publication. We received no comment from any member of your Committee, and we verified before publication that no comments had been received by the Administrative Office for your Committee.

The letter of February 11, 1980, is, in our view, a matter of public record. Accordingly, we have no objection to your decision to publish this letter in its entirety. Indeed, we welcome that decision so members of the psychological community may judge for themselves the thrust and contents of the letter.

We hope that we will be able to continue the cooperation and dialogue with your Committee, which, as noted in February 11, 1980 letter "has so greatly benefited *Guidelines* development to this point."

Sincerely,

June 25, 1980 letter to Preston David from Michael Pallak, Executive Officer, APA.

Dear Mr. David:

I am writing to you to express my concern over the references to "the American Psychological Association, speaking through its Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment..." included in the *Federal Register* publication of the three new Questions and Answers on the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* on May 2, 1980. As we thought the enforcement agencies understood, comments made by a Board or Committee of the APA are not represented as, nor intended to be construed as, comments from the APA as a whole. Statements of the APA are made only by the Council of Representatives or Executive Officer of the Association. While Boards and Committees are authorized to respond to issues within their charge, such responses are made only in the name of the originating Board or Committee, and present only the views of that body.

Therefore, I would like to emphasize that the comments you refer to in the *Federal Register* are those of the Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment alone, and should not be interpreted as a consensual position of the Association.

Sincerely,

October 10, 1980 letter to Michael Pallak from David L. Rose and Donald Schwartz, Senior Psychologist, EEOC.

Dear Mr. Pallak:

We appreciate the opportunity to have met with you and your staff and Dr. Anne Cleary in Montreal on September 4, to discuss the relationship between the Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment and the American Psychological Association itself, in light of your letter of June 25, 1980. This letter is intended to confirm our understanding of that meeting.

We now understand that the comments of the Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment on the Questions and Answers interpreting the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, like the "Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests" (American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1974) (frequently referred to as the "APA Standards"), do not represent the consensual position of the American Psychological Association as a whole, but represent the views of that particular Committee. In particular, we now understand that the Committee's letters of October 22, 1979 and of February 11, 1980 did not constitute formal action by APA itself and should not be interpreted as a representing action by the Association. We regret any misunderstanding in this regard. Because we assumed that the "APA Standards" had constituted action by the Association, through the Committee, we assumed that similar action or comments by the Committee would be entitled to a similar status. We now understand that neither the Standards nor the comments on the Questions and Answers constitutes a consensual position of the Association itself.

With respect to the future, we all agreed that it is important to the profession and the government to keep open channels of communication with respect to matters of mutual concern. For that reason, we understand that you, in conjunction with the Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment and with Division 14, will attempt to set up a larger meeting at which representatives of the Government and the Committee and the Division can exchange views on problems of concern.

We appreciate your taking the time to meet with us; and we look forward to hearing from you about the larger meeting.

Yours truly,

Meetings: Past and Future

(1) This year, the annual meeting of the **Society of Organizational Behaviorists** was held at Michigan State University on October 9th and 10th. In the past, it was common to have 10-15 presentations of approximately 30 minutes for those wishing to speak to the group. This year a change was introduced which provided for 4 major presentations on the first day and several mini-presentations on the second day.

Major Presentations

Gary Yukl described his recent thinking and writing in the area of leader behavior. He has recently completed a text which will appear sometime next year on leadership, and as a result, has given some careful thought to the past and future research on the topic. Some of his major themes involved the distracting influence of the Ohio State Studies (he felt that this collection of studies substantially impeded leadership research) and the role of power exchanges in leadership situations. There was some polite but resolute disagreement from the audience. The disagreement fell into several piles: 1) those who felt that the Ohio State studies had made a contribution, 2) those who felt that the common approach to leadership (i.e. methods of supervision) was too narrow, and 3) those who felt that the American view of leadership (i.e. the capitalist approach to supervisor/subordinate relations) was somewhat parochial. Contrary to later reports, no objects were *actually* thrown in the course of the discussion (although participles were occasionally dangled and infinitives split).

Abe Korman led a second discussion on the topic of professional success and personal failure. The issue concerns middle-aged professionals who find themselves on the top of the heap and yet are no happier (and sometimes actually more anxious and frustrated) than when they were at the bottom. Abe has explored these issues with managers, business graduate students, and other relevant groups. It is his feeling that much of the "problem" can be attributed to the fact that individuals do a lousy job of anticipating negative consequences of success. For example, individuals assume that as they become more successful, the tedious aspects of their work will disappear, that their family relations will improve, that they will have more control over their own life. In fact, the opposite consequences often occur. There was a sufficient amount of quiet brooding in the audience to suggest that Abe had hit a responsive chord. Most of the discussion centered around the value (or lack thereof) of knowing why the phenomenon occurs. In addition, there was some suggestion that similar symptoms appear in failures as well as successes (this hypothesis was hooted down by the overachiever bloc).

Ben Schneider led a discussion on the topic of work adjustment. He has been funded by ONR to study the issue of turnover in the early phases of employment. The study is longitudinal and involves both traditional questionnaire formats and observations. He has developed an instrument called the **WORK EXPERIENCES SURVEY** which is the major data collection device. This instrument attempts to assess 9 different dimensions of the work setting. The questionnaire is completed by subjects each week for three months and then once each month for the rest of the year. The opportunities for analysis are staggering and the audience was suitably staggered. Since the data are currently being collected, Ben was more interested in novel suggestions for

analysis than instrument modification. The dependent variable is turnover and the results of the past presidential election suggest that Ben may not have to wait as long for the dependent data as originally anticipated.

Peter Dachler, our resident S.O.B. in Europe, brought a colleague with him to present an example of the European style of organizational psychology. **Fred Malek**, a co-worker of Peter's at St. Gallen, presented a paper titled "Conception of Organizations." The presentation was a rather carefully mapped trip through general systems theory. There were elements of organizational theory, sociology, epistemology, cognitive psychology, political theory and economics in the discussion. Fred carefully laid out a series of assumptions on which the work of his unit was based. He then described distinctions and implications of monocentric vs. polycentric organizations, systems which were the result of human design as opposed to those which were not, and layers of control systems which are superimposed (or evolve) in traditional organizations. The discussion was broad but under control, almost as if it were an example of the topic. If it was, in fact, modal with respect to European organizational research and theory building, the American IO community has much to learn (or avoid).

Mini-Presentations

John Wanous is completing a re-make of his 1977 hit single in *Psychological Bulletin*. He continues to examine the impact of disconfirmed expectations and is also examining the choice process of those deciding among MBA programs. **Ken Wexley** continues to be consumed with the structural and process parameters of the supervisor/subordinate dyad. He also began some investigations of the problems of laid off auto workers. This last topic is not to be confused with the studies of laid back auto workers currently being conducted in California. **Bob Pritchard** is currently working on the development of a feedback taxonomy. His experimental work deals with the combination of feedback and goal setting strategies. His preliminary report was optimistic. He has discovered some combinations which increase production and decrease errors on clerical tasks. **Jim Terborg** described some extensive work he has been doing on the topic of unionization activity. Particularly, he is looking for clues in archival data which are available for small work units. **Bill Scott** described his latest thoughts (sic) and research in the operant paradigm. He is particularly interested in identifying the foundation of "reinforcement." His initial hypothesis is that stimulus change is directly involved. As you might expect, the activation paradigm plays a major explanatory role in his thinking. **Neal Schmitt** is interested in mass hysteria. On the basis of careful questioning, we were able to determine that he was not studying tenure and promotion decision processes, assessment center research, or discussions of the latest EEOC guidelines. Instead, he is interested in the correlations between reported cases of mass hysteria in work settings and various aspects of perceived stress. In addition, he is trying to determine what role, if any, attitudes play in the syndrome. **Pat Smith** asked for help in setting up a system for unequivocally identifying subjects in a longitudinal study which would still allow for complete anonymity. For example, a combination of the first several letters of the respondent's middle name, the middle digits in a social security number, and the code letter for a favorite food. Send ideas along to Pat if you have some. **Denise Rousseau**

described her year in California. She engaged in some rather bizarre behavior—even by California standards. She thought. In her attempt to model organizations, she discovered that problem solving was central to the definition. She is currently examining schools in an attempt to further develop her thinking in the area. **Gregg Oldham** is interested in office space. Specifically, he is testing various models of "satisfaction" with space. These models include the social facilitation and privacy models. He is looking at parameters such as size, location of supervisor, and number of employees. Department chairs would suggest he include distance from the parking lot in his list. **Nigel Nicholson**, another brick in the Wall of Sheffield University in England, is spending the year at the University of Illinois. The British Steel Industry has been ripped by bitter labor disputes. Nigel is examining the dynamics of this strike and looking particularly at the role of the union steward in labor management relations. **Frank Landy** described the serpentine manner by which a grant was obtained from OPM and ONR for the support of a national conference on Performance Evaluation, to be held in November of 1981. The process was only slightly less complicated than replacing your driver's license by mail.

There were other presentations in the mini-sessions which are not reported here. The Center for Creative Leadership has graciously consented to produce a major motion picture of the conference. As a result, you will be able to review those presentations in a theater near you soon.

(Editor's Note: This review was written by **Frank Landy**.)

(2) **Meeting of the Southeastern Industrial-Organizational Psychological Association.** The seventh annual meeting of the Southeastern Industrial-Organizational Psychological Association (SEIOPA) will be held at the Atlanta Hilton on March 25, 1981. SEIOPA is an informal organization of I/O psychologists who meet annually for a one-day program to discuss issues of mutual interest. SEIOPA meets on the first day of meetings of the Southeastern Psychological Association (SEPA). Persons interested in receiving a program announcement or being added to the mailing list should contact: **Ron Johnson, 1155 Observatory Drive, University of Wisconsin-Madison, WI 53706.**

(3) The Department of Psychology at Virginia Tech is pleased to announce the **Fourth Annual Symposium on Applied Behavioral Science** to be held May 21 and 22, 1981. The theme of the symposium will be "Women in the Workforce" and the speakers will be **Marv Dunnette, Ginny O'Leary, Ben Rosen, Martha Mednick, Kay Deaux, Jim Terborg, Max Wortman** and the winner of First Annual *B. von Haller Gilmer Award*. For further information on the symposium or the *Gilmer Award*, write **John Bernardin, Department of Psychology, VPI & SU, Blacksburg, VA 24061.**

(4) The **Second Organization Development World Congress** on "Conflict Resolution Technology," originally scheduled for Cambridge University in England, has been moved to Nashua, New Hampshire, October 13-16, 1981.

(5) The **19th Annual Meeting of the Southern Management Association** will be held November 11-14, 1981 in Atlanta, Georgia. The theme of the

meeting will be "The Relationship between Theory, Research, and Practice: An Assessment of Fundamental Problems and their Possible Resolution." For additional information write to **Arthur G. Bedeian, Department of Management, School of Business, Auburn University, Alabama 36849.**

(6) The **Second Annual Scientist-Practitioner Conference in Industrial-Organizational Psychology**, sponsored by the Department of Psychology of Old Dominion University will be held in Virginia Beach on April 23-24, 1981. The theme will be: "The Changing Composition of the Work Force: Implications for Future Research and its Application." There will be four half-day sessions: (1) The 1990 Age Mix, (2) The 1990 Gender Mix, (3) Organization, Management and Labor of the '90s, (4) Higher Education for the '90s. Each session will focus on presentations by: a "practitioner" who will project a "statement of condition" within the 1990-1999 time frame, and problems and policy implications foreseen; a "researcher" who will address the question of the "research readiness" of behavioral and social scientists in meeting the needs of the '90s; and a "discussant" who will integrate the practice, policy and science issues, highlighting research action potentials. Sociologists, economists, managers and labor leaders, as well as psychologists, are among the panelists. Those who are interested in participating in this invitational conference should contact the general chairman, **Albert S. Glickman, Performance Assessment Laboratory, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, 23508 (Telephone: (804) 440-4227).**

(7) All graduate students in I/O and OB programs are invited to submit papers and to attend the **Second Annual National I/O Psychology and Organizational Behavior Graduate Student Convention** which will be held at Michigan State University, April 24-26, 1981. The research of I/O and OB graduate students from across the nation will be featured. Graduate students interested in presenting should submit a 300 word abstract to the I/O-OB Convention/Steering Committee.

Convention highlights will be: (1) *Keynote addresses* from two I/O-OB researcher/consultants: **Richard M. Steers**, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Management, University of Oregon and **Virginia E. Schein**, Organizational Consultant (Former Associate Professor of Management, The Wharton School). (2) *Workshops*: Arthur Young and Company, an accounting and management consultant firm, is scheduled to present a Professional Development Workshop. American Telephone and Telegraph is also planning a workshop on Assessment Centers which will include a demonstration of their assessment techniques. (3) *Special Event*: **John E. Hunter**, Professor of Psychology, Michigan State University, will participate in a DEBATE/PANEL DISCUSSION covering some of the more controversial issues in SELECTION, TEST VALIDATION and compliance with EEOC GUIDELINES. Dr. Hunter has testified in several important court cases, and, for the second speaker, we expect to have someone who has presented opposing testimony. The debate promises to an important event.

For further information contact: **Steering Committee, 135 Snyder Hall, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, (517) 353-5006.**

EEO ISSUES

Guardians: Good News and Bad News
Guardians Assn. of NY City Police Dept. v.
Civil Service Comm. of City of NY

JAMES C. SHARP

As reported in the November issue of *TIP* (18[1]), the Second Circuit in July, 1980, accepted the City of New York's validity study for entry-level police recruits thus reversing the trial court which had decided: (1) the test measured abilities that recruits would be trained to acquire, (2) the test was measuring constructs, and (3) since content validity as the only validation strategy attempted, the defendants had failed to demonstrate validity. While *Guardians* is a landmark as a balanced, informed decision, the precedent is not nearly as encouraging for the public sector as it is for the private sector employer. The good news is that the Court of Appeals rejected the literal interpretation sought by both plaintiffs and the Department of Justice (DOJ) as *amicus curiae* and commented favorably on the "...deference, not obedience" to be given the Uniform Guidelines. The bad news for both public sector employers who rank candidates and users of content validity in general is that the court disallowed ranking even though they found the test to be content valid. In effect, the court bought the plaintiffs' and the DOJ's arguments that content validity required additional empirical evidence to justify ranking. Excerpts from the decision and DOJ *amicus* brief follow.

DOJ amicus brief on job analysis requirements

"Defendants' job analysis does not satisfy professional standards. The Exam suffered from the following deficiencies, which are described in more detail below. The job analysis failed to identify with precision the important work behaviors necessary for successful performance on the job. Uniform Guidelines, PP 14C(2). The process by which the 'abilities' were chosen was not sufficiently controlled; they were not 'operationally defined' in terms of 'observable' aspects of work behavior of the job; id., PP 14C(4)...and the 'abilities' were only quantitatively linked to the job tasks. The resulting test plan gave wide latitude to the question writers. Finally, Exam #8155 actually tried to measure mental processes, particularly verbal aptitude and reasoning, rather than the content of the job or operationally defined knowledge, skills and abilities which are required at entry on the job. Exam #8155 cannot, therefore, be demonstrated to be content valid. Uniform Guidelines, PP 14C(1), 14C(4), 15C..."

"A related deficiency in defendants' job analysis was their failure fully to analyze the tasks performed on the job. The 42 vague task statements were rated by police officers who responded to the questionnaires. The ratings were on scales concerning 'frequency,' 'time spent,' and 'importance'...The questionnaire, however, did not seek information about whether performance of the task was required at entry on the job. This is an important omission since the majority of the tasks performed by police officers are learned during training after an applicant is hired. Nor did the questionnaire seek information about the level of difficulty of each task. APA Standards, E12.4; Uniform Guidelines, PP 15C(3).

"The observers who were used to corroborate the accuracy of the responses to the questionnaire focused their attention only on how frequently the officers they observed performed different tasks and how much time the officers spent performing each task. As a result, the content (the actual work behaviors) of the job of police officer was inadequately analyzed by defendants. Uniform Guidelines, 15C(3)."

Court of Appeals rejection of DOJ position excluding "knowledge learned during training" from content validity

"The United States as *amicus* argues that the requirement that the content of the exam be representative means that all the knowledges, skills, or abilities required for the job be tested for, each in its proper proportion. This is not even theoretically possible, since some of the required capacities cannot be tested for in any valid manner. Even if they could be, the task of identifying every capacity and determining its appropriate proportion is a practical impossibility."

"More reasonable interpretations of the representativeness requirement are appropriate in light of Title VII's basic purposes. The reason for a requirement that the *content* of the exam be representative is to prevent either the use of some minor aspect of the job as the basis for the selection procedure or the needless elimination of some significant part of the job's requirements from the selection process entirely; this adds a quantitative element to the qualitative requirement—that the content of the test be related to the content of the job. Thus, it is reasonable to insist that the test measure important aspects of the job, at least those for which appropriate measurement is feasible, but not that it measure all aspects, regardless of significance, in their exact proportions. The reason for a requirement that the test's *procedure* be representative is to prevent distorting effects that go beyond the inherent distortions present in any measuring instrument."

"In specifying how the selection of validation techniques is to be made, the Guidelines adopt too rigid an approach, one that is inconsistent with Title VII's endorsement of professionally developed tests. Taken literally, the Guidelines would mean that any test for a job that included a training period is almost inevitably doomed: if the attributes the test attempts to measure are too general, they are likely to be regarded as constructs, in which event validation is usually too difficult to be successful; if the attributes are fairly specific, they are likely to be appropriate for content validation, but this too will prove unsuccessful because the specific attributes will usually be learned in a training program or on the job. The origin of this dilemma is not any inherent defect in testing, but rather the Guidelines' definition of 'content.' This definition makes too sharp a distinction between 'content' and 'construct,' while at the same time blurring the distinction between the two components of 'content': knowledge and ability. The knowledge covered by the concept of 'content' generally means factual information. The abilities refer to a person's capacity to carry out a particular function, once the necessary information is supplied. Unless the ability requires virtually no thinking, the 'ability' aspect of 'content' is not closely related to the 'knowledge' aspect of 'content'; instead it bears a closer relationship to a 'construct...' But as long as the abilities that the test attempts to measure are no more abstract than necessary, that is, as long as they are the most observable abilities of significance to the particular job in question, content validation should be available. To lessen the risks of perpetuating cultural disadvantages, the degree to which content validation must be demonstrated should increase as the abilities tested for become more abstract... Unlike knowledge, some abilities are appropriate for testing confirmed by content validation despite their overlap with post-selection training. A valid measurement of some abilities can select applicants who will ultimately use their training to perform their tasks more effectively or who will more effectively perform similar tasks for which they have not been specifically trained. On the other hand, content validation remains inappropriate for tests that measure knowledge of factual information if that knowledge will be fully acquired in a training program. Approval of such tests, without predictive validation, risks favoring applicants with prior exposure to the information, a course likely to discriminate against a disadvantaged minority."

Court of Appeals rejection of literal interpretation of Uniform Guidelines

"Closely related to the question of the proper weight to be given to technical conclusions of testing theory is the question of the proper weight to be given to the EEOC Uniform Guidelines, which are largely based on these technical conclusions... The Supreme Court... has not ruled that every deviation from any of the Guidelines automatically results in a violation of Title VII. The Court appears to have applied the Guidelines only to the extent that they are useful, in the particular setting of the case under consideration, for advancing the basic purpose of Title VII... To the extent that the Guidelines reflect expert, but non-judicial opinion, they must be applied by courts with the same combination of deference and wariness that characterizes the proper use of expert opinion in general. See *Albermarle*... (Guidelines 'have never been subjected to the test of adversary comment. Nor are the theories on which the Guidelines are based beyond dispute.') Thus the Guidelines should always be considered, but they should not be regarded as conclusive unless reason and statutory interpretation support their conclusions. As this Court has previously stated: 'If the EEOC's interpretations go beyond congressional intent, the Guidelines must give way.'"

"In addition to their force as the expression of expert opinion, the Guidelines also possess legal force. But here too, it is necessary to keep their limit in mind. The primary purpose of the Guidelines is to indicate the standards that various Federal agencies... are to use in enforcing Title VII and related statutes. But the fact that an agency or group of agencies has announced the standards they will use does not convert those standards into mandatory legal rules."

"A second legal basis for following the Guidelines is that they represent the 'administrative interpretation of the Act by the enforcing agency,' and are 'entitled to great deference' on that basis. *Griggs*... However, the Court has also recognized that the Guidelines 'are not administrative regulations promulgated pursuant to formal procedures established by Congress.' They are entitled to deference, not obedience... it is not at all clear that *Griggs* requires observance of all the intricate details of the Guidelines. It might be desirable for all employers to follow the more careful practices required of the Federal Government, but there is no reason to think that Congress intended to impose such practices, in their full rigor, when it enacted Title VII."

DOJ successful amicus argument against ranking of a content valid test

"Because the district court properly held that Exam #8155 was not shown to be content valid, it is unnecessary to reach the question of the propriety of using the results of the Exam on a rank-order basis. Uniform Guidelines, PP 14C(9). In any event, defendants failed under accepted psychological standards to meet the burden of justifying the use of the scores on Exam #8155 to rank candidates. See Q&A #62. Use of scores for ranking assumes that the results on the Exam are associated with and predictive of different levels of job performance. See Uniform Guidelines, PP 14C(9). Nothing in the record demonstrates that the scores on the Exam are in any way correlated to levels of performance on the job. Indeed, plaintiffs; experts, Dr. Barrett and Dr. Kirkpatrick, supported this view."

PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

JERRY NIVEN

APA's Public Information Office has recently published a Media Guide which contains helpful information regarding the preparation of news releases, dealing with the press, making radio and television appearances and other topics concerned with psychology and the media. Copies can be obtained from **Kathleen Holmay, Public Information Officer, APA, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036**. The words "Media Guide" should also be included on the envelope. Division 14 members desiring assistance in the preparation and/or dissemination of news releases can call on Ms. Holmay for assistance.

In response to a request to the Committee, **Barry Friedman** has been identified as a resource to assist the Psychology Department of Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y. in the organization of an I/O specialization at that school. Seaton Hill College, Greensburg, Penn. is hosting a Business Management Workshop in the spring of 1981 and has requested a keynote speaker through the committee. **Mary Tenopir** will be filling this role.

John Bernardin, Department of Psychology, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061 is responding to requests to Division 14 speakers for Psi Chi Chapters and I/O graduate student groups. In the event speakers for student groups are desired, please drop a line to John.

Mark Lifter has been in contact with ASPA regarding speakers for that organization. He would also appreciate any member inputs regarding appropriate industrial, governmental or professional groups who would be interested in Division 14 member presentations. Mark's address is: Arthur Young and Company, 100 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243.

SPSSI SPOT

The following request was noted as *TIP* perused its vast collection of newsletters. Those of you who like wild assumptions should attend to topic #1 below and write to: **Robert D. Caplan, SPSSI Newsletter, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106**.

"The SPSSI Newsletter would like to feature two (or more) points of view on a controversy linking social science and society. Below are two topics. If you have a definite viewpoint on *one* of the following topics, submit it in a statement of 250 words *or less*. The editor will select the most representative points of view and publish them in this "corner." Label your statement either "PRO" or "CON" and list the topic you selected as the title. All statements must be typed, and must include your name, address and signature.

(1) *TOPIC*: Assuming we had personality tests with sound predictive validity, should test scores of candidates for public office be obtained and made public by an independent organization?

(2) *TOPIC*: Is it unethical to accept federal money for social research when the average citizen, in practice, has no say in how it is spent?"

GOVERNMENT RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

LAUREL W. OLIVER

Dave Mangelsdorff of the Academy of Health Sciences (located at Fort Sam Houston, Texas) is conducting a study to determine what types of organizational effectiveness (OE) interventions/strategies have been employed in health care settings. He will survey Army Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officers (OESOs), asking about the OESO's consulting experiences, the strategies employed for different problems, and why these strategies were employed. A list of possible OE interventions will be assessed for: the problem/situation(s) addressed in health care settings, where the strategies were employed, and how the OESO perceived the effectiveness of the intervention. Also assessed will be the effectiveness of the intervention as perceived by others—e.g., the requester (who might be the medical commander who perceives communication difficulties among the staff members of the Emergency Room, say), the target group/team (the staff members of the Emergency Room, in this example) and the total organization. OESOs will be asked to describe the factors unique to consulting as an OESO in a health care setting and to describe what OE interventions are unique to patient care needs.

The survey results will be summarized and returned to all OESO's as soon as possible. An additional survey will be conducted to determine which stages of the four-step OE process (assessment, action planning, implementation, and evaluation) were implemented for the varying OE interventions. How evaluation was documented will also be investigated.

Any OD researchers who have consulted in health care settings and who would be interested in sharing their experiences are encouraged to contact **Dr. David Mangelsdorff, Health Care Studies Division, Academy of Health Sciences (ATTN: HSA-CHC), Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78234. Telephone: (512) 221-4541-3331**.

Steve Norton informs us that he is receiving "a steady stream of requests" for the paper on an upward mobility assessment center which we described in the August issue of *TIP*. Steve is now with the Department of Defense, so please direct inquiries to: **Dr. Steven D. Norton, DoD Centralized Referral Activity, ATTN: RE, 1507 Wilmington Pike, Dayton, OH 45444. Phone: (513) 296-5091 or AUTOVON 850-5091**. We also omitted the names of Steve's co-authors on the assessment center paper. They are: **LTC Edward J. Dunne, Jr.**, Air Force Institute of Technology, and **H. Edward Thornton**, Aeronautical Systems Division (AFSC). Ed is working on other assessment centers and can be reached at ASD/DPCH, WPAFB, OH 45433. Phone: (513) 255-3504 or AUTOVON 785-3504.

NOTICE: U.S. Office of Personnel Management Offers Two Research Programs. Applications for two research programs on public management issues are currently being accepted by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. One is the *Pre-Doctoral Program* which will support doctoral students pursuing dissertation research. Students will conduct public management research on a full-time basis for a period not to exceed 15 months. The program stipend is \$1,000 per month. The second program is the *Post-Doctoral Program* which will support researchers for up to one year to study

public personnel management issues of concern to OPM. Participants in this program must hold an earned doctor's degree and a faculty appointment with an accredited U.S. institution of higher education. Applicants should have taught at least three academic years full-time at the baccalaureate or higher level.

The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) solicits applications for either of the research programs from any social science discipline or field. Interested parties should contact OPM to obtain information concerning the types of research questions currently of interest to OPM and for application forms. Write or call the **U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Public Management Research Program, 1900 E Street, NW., Room 7H15, Washington, D.C. 20008. Phone: (202) 632-5496.** Application deadline for both programs is February 15, 1981.

APA DIVISION 13 MELTZER AWARD 1981

Division 13 is pleased to announce an annual award for the most fruitful, completed research concerned with problems of special interest to the consulting psychology division. This invitation is directed to all psychologists, whether members of Division 13 or not, who are involved in research of a consulting nature which contributes toward discovery of knowledge or improvement of method. Included will be studies of planned change or program development, the systematic use of case material for investigating interpersonal relations, consultation roles and processes, and the selection and training of consultants. Manuscripts should be limited to 200 pages, and a 300-500 word abstract must be included with each complete report. Four copies of each manuscript and abstract should be submitted to the Division 13 Research Awards Chairman, no later than March 1, 1981, **Ray A. Craddick, Research Awards Chairman, APA Division 13, Department of Psychology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.**

The winner will receive \$500 plus an appropriate certificate. The runner-up will receive \$250 and an appropriate certificate. Both winner and runner-up will be invited to present their studies at the September 1981 APA meeting in a program sponsored by the Consulting Division and chaired by the Director of the Research Awards Committee of Division 13.

The Committee welcomes studies that promise to lead to publicly observable change. The winning contribution may be that of any behavioral science, and doctoral dissertations have been among the winners in previous years. Research published prior to this announcement may not be entered into this competition, and studies previously presented will not be accepted for resubmission. The report must be sufficiently comprehensive to cover the problem investigated, the methodology, the findings, and implications of the findings.

MORE EEO ISSUES

(Editor's Note: The following appeared in *The Washington Post* on Saturday, December 6, 1980. The full text of the draft consent decree was reprinted in the *Daily Labor Report* 236, December 5, 1980).

U.S. Lawyers Seek Historic Agreement On Minority Hiring

By Spencer Rich
Washington Post Staff Writer

Government attorneys are pressing to conclude before the Reagan administration takes power a historic affirmative action agreement, guaranteeing minorities a larger share of better-paying federal jobs.

Under the proposed agreement, which would be in the form of a consent decree in federal court here, the government would junk the PACE exam. The most important civil service career examination, it has been charged with favoring whites over blacks and Hispanics in determining who gets some of the better federal professional and administrative jobs. The exam would be phased out over a five-year period.

Instead of PACE (Professional and Administrative Career Examination), federal agencies would be required to construct new tests guaranteeing that a much higher proportion of black and Hispanic candidates would end up passing the tests and getting the jobs.

The exams would seek to assure that the number of blacks and Hispanics getting jobs would be proportional to the number who took the tests. For example, if half the people taking an exam for a specific job were blacks and Hispanics, then about half (but no less than 40 percent) of all persons ending up with job appointments would have to be blacks and Hispanics.

If the exams did not produce these results, they would be further revised until they did or until it could be shown that the number of blacks and Hispanics already holding jobs in the category was at least 20 percent.

One government lawyer involved in the case said, "There is no question

some of the government attorneys working on this case want to get the consent agreement settled before the Carter administration leaves," for fear that Reagan appointees would refuse to sanction it.

"People realize there is a transition going on," said another.

In recent weeks, there has been a flurry of activity in the case, resulting in the drafting of new consent decree proposals, which were reviewed by the Justice Department and attorneys for major federal agencies two weeks after the election.

The case has broad implications for federal employment policies and selection procedures. The PACE exam for a number of years has been the chief test by which people who have completed college and are selected for federal jobs at the GS 5, GS 7 and sometimes GS 9 entry level. It was designed as an objective method of finding people qualified to handle professional and career jobs, such as customs inspector, geographer, immigration agent, revenue officer, tax auditor.

In 1979, a total of 137,725 took the test and 6,283 were selected for jobs.

On Jan. 29, 1979, a group of blacks and Hispanics who had failed to pass the April 1978 PACE sued the Office of Personnel Management. Critics of the test alleged it contains hidden biases against blacks and Hispanics and asks for general types of knowledge not required for the jobs. They said the test did not really measure the capacity of people to do the 118 categories of jobs for which it was used.

They said the test, whose passing grade is 70, has the effect of precluding

blacks and Hispanics from federal jobs for which they are actually well qualified. Statistics in the proposed consent decree indicate that 42 percent of the whites who took the test early in 1978 got 70 or more, but only 5 percent of the blacks and 13 percent of the Hispanics.

So far the case, before Judge Joyce Hens Green, has never come to trial. Instead, government lawyers and attorneys for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, which represents Angel Luevano and other plaintiffs, have been trying to negotiate a consent decree. Lawyers for the plaintiffs could not be reached for comment yesterday, but if no agreement is reached the case may go to trial.

If all parties okay the consent decree and send it to Judge Green before Ronald Reagan takes office, she could conceivably make it effective even if Reagan objects. The terms of the decree reportedly would allow the new administration time to comment, but once it is in the judge's hands, she would not be required to heed such comment.

Not all federal agencies are happy with the agreement. One attorney on the case said, "Essentially this is going to establish quotas."

Treasury and Internal Revenue Service, in a secret memorandum last summer, said the PACE exam has been a good test for picking good revenue officers, who are successful at getting money out of taxpayers.

B. von Haller Gilmer Award

The Department of Psychology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University announces the *B. von Haller Gilmer Award* for the outstanding research paper in an area commensurate with the theme of their annual symposium on Applied Behavioral Science. This year's theme is "Women in the Work Force."

A \$300 award and expenses (continental U.S.) will be given to the winner who will present the paper at the annual symposium in Blacksburg, VA, May 21 and 22, 1981. The paper will also be published in the Proceedings. Two previous symposia on Applied Behavioral Science will be published by Lexington Books in February, 1981.

The competition for the Gilmer Award is open to all. Submissions should be no longer than 30 pages and should be made in quadruplicate. Send papers and all correspondence to **John Bernardin, Department of Psychology, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061**. The deadline for receipt of all papers is March 1, 1981. A winner will be announced on April 1, 1981.

JOURNAL REVIEW SERVICE

R. F. BOLDT

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

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AND LEGAL ISSUES

Block, H. R., & Pennington, R. L. Labor market analysis as a test of discrimination. *Personnel Journal*, 1980, 59, 649-652. Provides a case study indicating that mere geographical proximity of potential employees cannot establish a prima facie case of discrimination. (RR)

Brown, C. A note on the determination of "acceptable" performance in Thorndike's standard of fair selection. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1980, 17, 203-209. Contends that, since almost any selection ratio could be "justified" as consistent with Thorndike's "acceptable performance," acceptability ought to be defined so that the fraction of all applicants who would perform acceptably if chosen, equals the fraction of applicants who can be chosen. (PJO)

Buss, W. G., & Novich, M. R. The detection of cheating on standardized tests: Statistical and legal analysis. *Journal of Law and Education*, 1980, 9, 1-64. Lengthy, detailed, and well referenced discussion of the subject. (RFB)

Connolly, N. B., Jr., & Peterson, D. W. Use of statistics in equal employment opportunity litigation. *Law Journal Seminars-Press, Inc.*, New York, 1980. Suggested for use by labor attorneys, courts, personnel managers, academicians, complaint officers, etc. in evaluating data collection and evaluation systems in the context of EEO litigation. (RFB)

Fisher, T. H. The courts and your minimum competency testing program—a guide to survival. *Measurement in Education*, 1980, 11 (1). Describes what to expect when critics bring suit against a testing program—how to gather evidence, what defense strategies to use, how a trial is conducted, and what the legal terms mean. (PJO)

Fox, J. A., & Tracy, P. E. The randomized response approach: applicability to criminal justice research and evaluation. *Evaluation Review*, 1980, 4, 601-622. Good introduction to the randomized response technique for obtaining sensitive data, which preserves anonymity even in one-on-one situations. (RFB)

Kaye, D. The laws of probability and the law of the land. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 1979, 47, 34-56. Bayes oriented discussion of the role of probability theory in legal fact-finding. (RFB)

Robertson, Dario F. Examining the examiners: The trend toward truth in testing. *Journal of Law and Education*, 1980, 9, 167-199. Extended discussion, with many references, which concludes that the subjects legislation affords gains to the country that are worth the cost to the testing industry. (RFB)

Rossel, C. H. Social science research in educational equity cases: A critical review. *Review of Research in Education*, 1980, 8, 237-295. Discusses the courts' use and lack of use of social science research evidence in reaching decisions, with illustrations from a variety of court cases. (LBP)

Symposium on the employment rights of the handicapped. *De Paul Law Review*, 1979, 27, 943-1133. This proceeding includes a paper on protecting the handicapped from employment discrimination, which deals with job relatedness and BFOQs. (RFB)

MEASUREMENT

Bobko, P., & Rieck, A. Large sample estimators for standard errors of functions of correlation coefficients. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1980, 4, 385-398.

Develops standard errors for correlations corrected for attenuation and for restriction of range, as well as for indirect effects in path analysis. Demonstrates that standard errors for these functions of correlations can be considerably higher than for the original (uncorrected) r , and suggests the appropriate hypothesis tests to use when dealing with corrected correlation coefficients. (ARB)

Gross, A. L., & Shulman, V. The applicability of the Beta binomial model for criterion referenced testing. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1980, 17, 195-201. Although the assumptions are not realistic and the adequacy of the model for the ability distribution is not clear, the beta model may be sufficiently robust for criterion referenced testing programs, where the assumptions do not hold. (PJO)

Hartnett, R. T., & Willingham, W. W. The criterion problem: What measure of success in graduate education. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1980, 4, 281-292. Presents a general discussion of a number of different criterion measures that have been used for measuring success of graduate students and evaluates them in terms of their use both for validating selection measures and providing evaluations of graduate student progress. (ARB)

Köffler, S. L. A comparison of approaches for setting proficiency standards. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1980, 17, 167-178. Compares proficiency standards determined from judgments about groups (Contrasting Groups method) and from an inspection of test content (Nedelsky method) and concludes that, since there was little agreement in the results, multiple procedures should be used to set cut-off scores. (PJO)

Nevo, Baruch. Item analysis with small samples. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1980, 4, 323-330. Demonstrates empirically that relatively small sample sizes (e.g., $n=100$) are satisfactory for item analyses if one is interested primarily in the relative difficulty levels and/or item-total correlations rather than in estimating the absolute magnitudes of these item parameters. (ARB)

Popham, W. J., & Lindheim, E. The practical side of criterion-referenced test development. *Measurement in Education*, Spring, 1980, 10, (4). In an attempt to close the quality gap between traditional norm-referenced tests and new criterion-referenced tests, the authors provide step-by-step procedures for constructing criterion-referenced tests. (PJO)

Skakun, E. N., & Kling, S. Comparability of methods for setting standards. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1980, 17, 229-235. A comparison of the passing scores and failure rates of three failure rates of three criterion-referenced procedures (Nedelsky plus two modified Ebel procedures) versus the traditional norm-referenced approach indicated that, although there was only a 5% difference between the lowest and highest passing scores, the failure rate would double if the higher cutting score were used. (PJO)

Serlin, R. C., & Levin, J. R. Identifying regions of significance in aptitude-by-treatment interaction research. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1980, 17, 3, 389-399.

Shepard, L. Technical issues in minimum competency testing. *Review of Research in Education*, 8, 30-82. Issues discussed include item selection, setting cutoff scores, and validation. (LBP)

Sternberg, R. J. Factor theories of intelligence are all right almost; Carroll, J. B. Remarks on Sternberg's "Factor theories of intelligence are all right almost." *Educational Researcher*, 1980, 9, No. 8, 6-18. The authors discuss and compare factor analysis and component analysis approaches to the study of intelligence. (LBP)

STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Blair, R. C., & Higgins, J. J. The power of t and Wilcoxon statistics. *Evaluation Review*, 1980, 4, 645-656. Monte Carlo study shows a power advantage for Wilcoxon's rank-sum test. (RFB)

Dyer, F. J. Application of power analysis concepts to test reliability research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1980, 40, 301-306. Provides tables for determining the probability of an observed reliability coefficient assuming a given true reliability. (LBP)

Harter, H. L. Modified asymptotic formulas for critical values of the Kolmogorov test statistic. *The American Statistician*, May 1980, 34, No. 2, 110-111. Provides formulas for computer use for determining the significance, accurate to 2 decimal places, of the single sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov for sample sizes as small as 6 (LBP)

Snyder, R. A. Cross-lagged correlation analysis and the Zeitgeist: A potentially unfortunate blend. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 1980, 53, 27-29. Warns against misapplication of cross-lagged correlation analysis (CLCA) and specifies information which should be reported in paper on CLCA studies as a means of increasing their usefulness. (LBP)

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Corporate Approaches to the Quality of Work Life. *Personnel Journal*, 1980, 59, 632-638. Provides a brief discussion of designing and implementing such programs at two major corporations.

Ronen, S., & Primps, S. B. The impact of flextime on performance and attitudes in 25 public agencies. *Public Personnel Management*, 1980, 9, 201-206. Reports on results in twenty-five public organizations indicate improved productivity, performance, and work attitudes; supervisors and managers tend to be less positive.

ERRATUM (TIP, Nov. 1980, p. 60)

Measurement

Rindler, S. E. Pitfalls in assessing test speededness. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1979, 16, 261-270. In response to claims that test time limits cause culture bias, the author reviews test speededness indexes and concludes that indexes based on multiple test administrations are adequate but impractical while indexes based on single test administrations are inadequate." (PJO)

A NEW SPSSI-SPONSORED SERIES

THE APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY ANNUAL (Leonard Bickman, Editor) is an annual series of collected original articles examining issues, methods, and topics of current concerns in the field of applied social psychology—that broad region where research in social psychology concerns itself with social problems. Volume I, now available, presents a perspective that has virtually been lost to social psychology for over three decades. It provides examples and models on how social psychology can be utilized to deal with real world problems. It focuses on social psychology in the natural setting—a social psychology which, while maintaining its scientific heritage, provides information which is useful in solving problems.

Please order from: Sage Publications, Inc., 275 South Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90212.

Ed Fleishman, who had testified last year on the Division's behalf against the proposed "truth-in-testing" legislation before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, sends *TIP* the following editorial from the October 13, 1980, *Washington Post*.

News From the Students

A little over a year ago New York became the first state to enact a so-called truth-in-testing law. It requires people who give standardized tests to disclose the questions, answer sheets and correct answers after a test each time one is given. This means that the testing companies must design and calibrate a great many more versions of each test, causing costs to go up.

One immediate result of the law's passage in New York was that 20 of the 26 testing organizations that had been giving tests in the state withdrew, leaving students to travel to neighboring states. The Association of American Medical Colleges challenged the constitutionality of the law and was granted an injunction. This past summer the legislature backed off, passing several amendments that exempt most of the smaller testing enterprises from the law's requirements.

However, by far the most important of the tests—the pre-college Scholastic Aptitude Test—has been operating under the new rules. The College Board has now released early results that give some idea of whether the law in fact accomplishes the purposes for which it was intended. The figures cover the 118,000 students who took the SAT in New York last spring. Though students were informed of their new rights, as of mid-September fewer than 5 percent had requested copies of the tests and answers. The number was way below expectations, but the real irony lies in who these students were.

They were not the marginal students whose educational future was pictured as hanging on the thread of a single uncertain test score. Nor were they minority and disadvantaged students. Those who requested copies of the tests were, according to information voluntarily supplied by the students, twice as likely to be in the top tenth of their class as those who didn't ask. Their scores on the SAT were 60 to 80 points higher than the non-requesters. Their median family incomes were \$32,000, compared with \$24,000 for all students. In short, they were the highly motivated, higher scoring, high achievers.

A great many interesting questions remain. What use do students who request copies of the tests make of them? Do they merely check to make sure they were given the correct score or do they work through the questions they got wrong? Since most of the students in this group were juniors, will those who requested the tests do better this fall when they take the SAT as seniors than those who did not request their tests?

The evidence is not all in, but so far it points to a negligible educational effect of the law's disclosure requirements. If anything, its social impact appears to be the opposite of what was intended—widening rather than narrowing the gap between the most and least successful students. The only indisputable effect so far has been to raise the costs of testing for everyone.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE de PSYCHOLOGIE APPLIQUEE

Dear Division 14 Member:

The goal of the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP) is to increase communication among psychologists around the world regarding scientific and professional matters of common concern.

IAAP's Division of Organizational Psychology includes many Division 14 members as well as colleagues in other countries with mutual interests. The Division has its own newsletter and participates actively in the development of its own Congress program. We are hopeful that more Division 14 members will join.

Congresses of the IAAP are held every four years in a different country. Recent congresses have been held in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia; Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Liege, Belgium; Montreal, Canada; and the XIXth International Congress of Applied Psychology was held in Munich, Federal Republic of Germany, in 1978.

The XIXth Congress attracted more than 2,000 participants from 67 countries, and had a full scientific and social program. A brief report of this Congress, along with a few invited papers and Fleishman's Presidential Address entitled "The New Applied Psychology: An International Perspective," which provides a detailed description of the work of various groups and an overview of the role being played by our Association, appeared in the January 1980 issue of the *International Review of Applied Psychology*.

The *Review*, previously published two or three times a year, became quarterly beginning in 1980 under Sage Publications. All members of IAAP receive the *Review* as part of their membership dues.

Over the past few years, IAAP has been developing a divisional structure. The first of these was the Division of Organizational Psychology. Other recently formed divisions are Psychological Assessment, Psychology and National Development, and Environmental Psychology. Other areas in which interest has been expressed are clinical, educational research, and applied gerontology.

Other IAAP activities include maintaining relationships with other international organizations. For example, at the 1980 Congress of the Interamerican Society of Psychology in Peru, IAAP hosted a Coffee Hour to introduce our Latin American colleagues to the Association; also the IAAP Executive Committee met in July 1980 during the International Congress of Psychology in Leipzig, GDR, held by the International Union of Psychological Science.

IAAP membership dues are based on the Swiss franc, as recommended by our Finance Committee. Dues in 1981 are SF28 (for Associates) and SF30 (for Members), converted to \$16.25 and \$17.50, respectively. The assessment charged by divisions is \$2.00 each. All members of IAAP are eligible for reduced Congress registration fees, as well as the subscription to the *Review*.

We hope additional members of Division 14 will decide to join, using the Membership Application on the reverse side.

Best wishes,

Edwin A. Fleishman
President

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE de PSYCHOLOGIE APPLIQUEE

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

Criteria for Full Membership include membership in the American Psychological Association. (Requirement may be waived for special cases.)

Criteria for Associate Membership include a graduate degree in psychology and employment in psychological work. (Vita must accompany application.)

Annual Dues: Full Members - \$17.50 Associate Members - \$16.25

Dues include subscription to the International Review of Applied Psychology.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PRESENT PROFESSIONAL POSITION: _____

HIGHEST DEGREE: _____ FIELD: _____

INSTITUTION: _____ YEAR: _____

Check class of membership for which application is made: ☐ Full
☐ Associate

Please indicate if application is also made for one or more of the following IAAP Divisions:

- () Organizational Psychology () Psychological Assessment
() Psychology & National Development () Environmental Psychology

Attach check made out to IAAP for annual dues; include \$2.00 additional for each division indicated above.

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

RETURN completed application with check to:

Dr. Edwin P. Hollander
U.S. Treasurer--IAAP
P. O. Box 30378
Washington, D. C. 20014
Telephone: (202) 652-6033



APA Committee on Women in Psychology Reports of
Sex Differences in the Employment Activities
of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists

LORRAINE D. EYDE*

The Committee on Women in Psychology (CWP) works within the APA structure to improve the status of women in psychology. One of the interests of CWP has dealt with the role of women psychologists in specialties labeled Very Male Intensive, i.e., those in which 90% or more are men. There are four such groups in APA: Div. 14 (90.9%); Div. 19 (Military Psychology, 94.2%); Div. 21 (Society of Engineering Psychologists, 94.2%); and Div. 23 (Consumer Psychology, 92.4%).

Inquiries about employment opportunities for women consultants led CWP to turn to existing data about industrial and organizational psychologists. One such source is a 1962 membership survey of Division 14 carried out by the Committee of Special Interest Activities, which was chaired by **Philip Ash**. This survey, which drew responses from 67% of its 775 members, showed that 27% of the psychologists worked in an academic setting, 26% were self employed (including consulting) and 47% classified themselves in a category labeled "other." A total of 96% of the academic and self-employed psychologists held doctorates, but only 76% of these employed in the "other" employment setting did. Sex differences were not reported; however, National Research Council data show that in the 1960's women comprised only 4% of the psychologists granted Ph.D's in industrial psychology (Table 1), whereas 21% of all psychologists granted doctorates were women.

Table 1

Distribution of Women Among Ph.D's Granted in Industrial Psychology and All Ph.D's Granted in Psychology, 1920-1979

Field	Percentage of Field Who Are Women					
	1920-74	1960-69	1972	1974	1976	1979
Industrial	6	4	7	8	14	23
All Ph.D. Psychologists	23	21	27	31	33	41

Source: National Research Council, 1978.

Note: Individuals may or may not belong to APA.

In 31 years the membership of Division 14 has expanded enormously, up by 1,672 members from 281 in 1949. And as I/O psychology has expanded, so has the proportion of women receiving doctorates in the field. For example, the proportion of I/O doctorates granted to women went up from 4% in the 1960's to 23% in 1979. This growth rate has been even greater than for the proportion of doctorates granted to women in all fields of psychology which increased from 21% in the 1960's to 41% in 1979.

CWP is concerned with how women I/O psychologists are faring in the

*CWP expresses its appreciation to APA's Human Resources Research Office for providing data on I/O psychologists.

marketplace. One revealing statistic indicates that women earned only 76% of what men I/O psychologists earned. (The differential is 59% for full-time, year-round workers in the U.S.A.). The 1979 Division 14 Income Survey, based on 883 respondents of whom 87 were women, showed that the median income for women was \$27,000, while that for men was \$35,361. These men and women also differed in educational level, age, employment setting and major job activities.

More information about sex differences in the employment activities of I/O psychologists can be obtained by examining the results of the 1976 APA Human Resources Survey, in which 1,973 psychologists including 180 women listed their major specialty as industrial and organizational. (Note, however, that *not* all I/O psychologists who belong to APA are also affiliated with Division 14.)

Table 2
Degree Level of Men and Women Psychologists

Degree Level	Men (N = 1793)	Women (N = 180)
No. Post—baccalaureate	3%	0 %
Master's	23%	38 %
Doctorate	72%	61 %
Other	2%	0.6%
Total	100%	99.6%

Source: 1976 APA Human Resources Survey.

Table 3
Employment Setting of Men and Women
I/O Psychologists with Doctorates

Setting	Men (N = 1297)	Women (N = 110)
Academic	28%	46 %
Human Service	2%	0.9%
Other	62%	49 %
No report	8%	4 %
Total	100%	99.9%

Source: 1976 APA Human Resources Survey.

The 1976 APA Survey shows the women I/O respondents were less likely to hold a doctorate (61%) than were the men (72%). The men holding doctorates reported that 28% worked in an academic setting, a proportion similar to that found in the 1962 Div. 14 Survey. On the other hand, the 1976 Survey indicates that nearly 46% of the women worked in an academic setting. Men holding doctorates were more likely to report working in a setting other than an academic or human service setting than were the women (62% and 49%, respectively).

What kinds of work were the men and women who were employed in the "other" or the chiefly nonacademic settings doing? The men were more

Table 4
Employment Settings of Men and Women I/O Psychologists
Psychologists with Doctorates in Other Than
Academic and Human Service Settings

Employment Setting	Men (N = 806)	Women (N = 54)
Consulting firm	35 %	30%
Industrial/management psychology practice	22 %	7%
Independent research organization or laboratory	9 %	0%
Business or industry (other than above settings)	25 %	35%
Military service (other than above settings)	0.1%	0%
Government civil service (other than above settings)	9 %	28%
Total	100.1%	100%

Source: 1976 APA Human Resources Survey.

Note: This table presents data on "Other Employment Setting" in the same order as the question is listed in the survey instrument.

likely to report working in an industrial/management psychology practice than were the women (22% vs. 7%, respectively), and women were more likely than the men to be working in a government civil service setting (28% vs. 9%, respectively).

To what extent did I/O psychologists participate in APA and State and regional psychological associations? Data from the 1976 Human Resources Survey show that 12% of the men and only 3% of women have served a national APA board, task force, committee or subcommittee. However, men and women I/O psychologists participated in psychological associations at the State and regional levels at a similar rate (15% and 13%, respectively).

Some sex differences appear in the professional and scientific activities of I/O psychologists (Table 6). Men (61%) were more likely to have published an article in a refereed journal than were women (42%), but women (79%)

Table 5
Experience on APA, State, and Regional Associations by Sex

Experience	Men (N = 1793)			Women (N = 180)		
	Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No	No Response
Served on an APA board, task force, committee, or sub-committee	12%	77%	10%	3%	91%	7%
Been elected to a State or regional office	15%	75%	10%	13%	81%	7%

Source: 1976 APA Human Resources Survey.

Table 6
Experiences as Psychologist by Sex

Experiences	Men (N = 1793)			Women (N = 180)		
	Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No	No Response
Published article in refereed journal	61%	34%	5%	42%	51%	7%
Been an editorial consultant or manuscript reviewer	67%	22%	11%	79%	15%	7%
Been a researcher in a city, State, Federal agency other than University	32%	56%	11%	24%	70%	6%
Been the principal investigator on a research grant or contract over \$6,000 (direct costs)	33%	59%	8%	32%	62%	6%
Been an administrator in a city, State or Federal agency other than University	14%	75%	11%	24%	70%	6%
Been an unpaid consultant on a research project	56%	36%	8%	55%	38%	7%
Performed any free services or consulting for a local, State, or Government agency	45%	49%	6%	39%	56%	5%
Performed any free services or consulting for a community group	60%	36%	4%	55%	41%	4%
Formed a consulting firm	34%	59%	7%	8%	84%	7%
Published a test currently available from a commercial test publisher	6%	83%	11%	3%	88%	9%

Source: 1976 APA Human Resources Survey.

were more likely to have been an editorial consultant or manuscript reviewer than men (67%). Even though women were more likely to have worked in a government civil service setting, men were more likely to have been a researcher in a city, State, or Federal agency (32% vs. 24%, respectively). On the other hand, women were more likely to have been a public administrator than the men (24% vs. 14%, respectively). Though nonacademically employed men and women I/O psychologists were equally likely to work in a consulting firm (Table 4), men were much more likely (34%) to have formed a consulting firm than the women (8%).

In 1976, there were numerous differences in the work activities of men and women I/O psychologists. The most notable differences related to their work histories. Perhaps these differences have already been reduced among new I/O Ph.D.'s. For example, the Division 14 Income Survey reported that the smallest sex differential in median income was for men (\$27,000) and women (\$25,000) who received their Ph.D.'s in the last two to four years.

Much of the data reported from the 1976 Human Resources Survey are not routinely gathered by APA. I/O psychologists may wish to propose questions to be included in future APA surveys so that relevant information (including data collected over a period of time) on employment activities may be collected. This information should be useful in better understanding the changing role of women I/O psychologists and may provide insight into factors contributing to the earnings gap.

Recommendations

Women I/O psychologists need to be encouraged to enlarge the scope of their professional and scientific endeavors. Women I/O psychologists holding doctorates can provide role models by serving as visiting scientists and practitioners in graduate school programs. Also these programs should arrange internships in organizations which emphasize research and encourage women to apply. Women need to be provided with research support so that they will be more likely to publish articles in refereed journals. Knowledgeable persons should provide technical assistance to women wishing to start their own consulting company. Women I/O psychologists need to volunteer for and be nominated to serve on APA committees. There already is an available pool of such persons with experience in State and regional psychological associations. These steps may encourage women I/O psychologists to: (1) complete their doctorates; (2) seek employment in nonacademic settings; (3) prepare themselves for possible entry into industrial/management psychology practice; (4) enable them to establish consulting companies; (5) make themselves part of the research network; and (6) improve their status within the APA governance structure.

ANNOUNCEMENT: CALL FOR MEMBERS APA's RESEARCH SUPPORT NETWORK

APA is organizing a research support network designed to increase federal support of psychological research. Our goals are to distribute to members information concerning current federal funding and science policy and to provide members opportunities to make a strong case to policy makers for the value of research in psychology. All research psychologists are encouraged to become members of the network. Membership is free and will include a quarterly bulletin on network activities, containing updates on federal policies affecting psychologists. For further information and membership forms, please contact **Alan Kraut** or **Virginia Holt**, Scientific Affairs Office, at **American Psychological Association, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, Scientific Affairs Office, Telephone: (202) 833-7596.**

CASES AND OTHER MATERIALS OF FEDERAL LAW ON PUBLIC SECTOR TESTING AND OTHER SELECTION PROCEDURES

September, 1980
Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

I. Statutory Provisions

Sec. 703 (h) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2000e-2(h)

II. Supreme Court Decisions

Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 401 U.S. 424 (1971)
Albemarle Paper Co. v. Moody, 422 U.S. 405 (1975)
Washington v. Davis, 427 U.S. 229 (1976)
Dothard v. Rawlinson, 433 U.S. 321 (1977)

See also:

Hazelwood v. United States, 433 U.S. 299 (June 1977);
Furnco v. Waters, 438 U.S. 567 (1978)
New York Transit Authority v. Beazer, 440 U.S. 568 (1979)

III. Other Significant Decisions

United States v. Chicago (Police Dept.), 549 F.2d 415 (7th Cir., 1977), c.d. 434 U.S. 975 (1977).
United States v. Chicago (Fire Dept.) 573 F.2d 416 (7th Cir., 1978)
Firefighters Inst. & U.S. v. City of St. Louis, 549 F.2d 506 (8th Cir., 1977) c.d. 434 U.S. 819 (1977); 616 F.2d 350 (8th Cir., Jan 17, 1980) modified reh. den. April 1980), pet. for cert. pending (No. 80-29)
United States v. Jacksonville Terminal Co., 451 F.2d 418 (5th Cir., 1971), c.d. 406 U.S. 906
United States v. Georgia Power Co., 474 F.2d 906 (5th Cir., 1973)
Bridgeport Guardians v. Civil Service Commission, 482 F.2d 1333 (2nd Cir., 1973)
Vulcan Society of New York v. Civil Service Commission, 490 F.2d 387 (2nd Cir., 1973)
Boston Chapter of NAACP v. Beecher, 504 F.2d 1017 (1st Cir., 1974), c.d. 421 U.S. 910
Rogers v. Int'l Paper Co., 510 F.2d 1340 (8th Cir., 1975), vacated on other [back pay] issue 423 U.S. 809; decision on remand 526 F.2d 732 (8th Cir., 1976)
Kirkland v. New York State Department of Corrections, 520 F.2d 420 (2nd Cir., 1975), affirming in part 374 F.2d 1361 (S.D. N.Y.)
Dendy v. Washington Hospital Center, 581 F.2d 990 (D.C. Cir., 1978)
Blake v. City of Los Angeles, 595 F.2d 1367, 1382 (9th Cir., 1979), c.d. No. 79-59, 4/28/80
Ensley Branch of NAACP & U.S. v. Jefferson County, et al., 616 F.2d 812 (5th Cir., 1980) affirming in rel. part 13 EPD ¶11,504 (N.D. Ala., 1977)
Friend v. Leidinger, 588 F.2d 61 (4th Cir., 1978)
EEOC v. Navajo Refining Co., 593 F.2d 988 (10th Cir., 1979)
Guardians Ass'n of NYC Police v. CSC of City of NYC (Guardians IV), ___ F.2d ___ 23 EPD ¶31,154 (2d Cir., No. 80-7027, July 31, 1980)
Moore v. Southwestern Bell, 593 F.2d 607 (5th Cir., 1979)
Allen v. City of Mobile, 464 F. Supp. 433 (S.D. Ala., 1978)

Brown v. New Haven, 474 F. Supp. 1265, 20 FEP Case ¶1277 (D. Conn., 1979)
Vanguard & Justice Society v. Hughes, 471 F. Supp. 670 (D. Md., 1979)
U.S. v. City of Montgomery, 19 EPD ¶9239 (M.D., Ala., 1979)
U.S. v. New York (State Police), 475 F. Supp. 1103 (introduction), 21 EPD ¶30,313 (full findings) (N.D. N.Y., 1979)
U.S. v. San Diego, 20 EPD ¶30,159 (S.D. Cal., 1979)

IV. Guidelines, Regulations, Instructions

Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 43 Fed. Reg. 38290 (Dec. 30, 1977)
Questions & Answers to Clarify and Provide a Common Interpretation of Uniform Guidelines, 44 Fed. Reg. 11996 (Mar. 2, 1979)
Additional Questions & Answers to Clarify and Provide a Common Interpretation of the Uniform Guidelines, 45 Fed. Reg. 25930 (May 2, 1980)
Dept. of Justice, Labor, & CSC, "Federal Executive Agency Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures," 41 Fed. Reg. 51734, 28 C.F.R. §50.14; Dept. of Justice, Labor and CSC (November 23, 1976).
Questions and Answers on the Fed. Ex. Agency Guidelines, 42 Fed. Reg. 4052 (Jan 21, 1977)
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Guidelines on Affirmative Action, 44 Fed. Reg. 4422 (1972)
"Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures," 28 C.F.R. Part 1607, 35 Fed. Reg. 12333 (Aug. 1, 1970).
Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs
Order on "Employee Testing and Other Selection Procedures" 41 C.F.R. Part 60-3 36 Fed. Reg. 19307 (Oct. 2, 1971).
Guidelines for Reporting Criterion Related and Content Validity, 41 C.F.R. 60-3.6, 39 Fed. Reg. 2094 (Jan. 17, 1974)
Questions and Answers on the OFCC Testing and Selection Order (January, 1974)
Civil Service Commission—Instructions on "Examining, Testing, Standards and Employment Practices," 37 Fed. Reg. 29016

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

A 1980 Addendum to the Survey of Graduate Programs in Industrial/Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior is now available to supplement the 1978 Survey. New information is available pertaining to 22 programs in I/O and OB. For those who want a copy of this addendum, please write to:

Lewis E. Albright
Director, Training and Development
Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation
300 Lakeside Drive, Room KB 2140
Oakland, CA 94643

GENERIC APPLIED RESEARCH

(Editor's Note: **Kurt Salzinger** has sent the following notice to *TIP*. The program is a potential source of support for research for Division 14 members. In fact, several have already benefited. **Terry Mitchell** has a grant for "Improving Performance: Causal Attributions and Leadership"; **Sandra Kirmeyer** for "Employee Reactions to Job Demands in Service Settings"; **Rabi Bhagat** for "Effect of Personal Life Stress Upon Individual Performance Effectiveness and Work Adjustment Processes Within Organizational Settings." For additional information, contact **Kurt Salzinger, Ph.D., Program Manager, Applied Experimental Psychology & Industrial Organization Division of Applied Research, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20550.**)

There is an area of research lying somewhere between basic research (in which the goal is the collection of data to integrate findings into coherent systems, and the creation, extension, and validation of theory) and mission-oriented research (whose primary aim is the determination of whether a particular idea or technique works to solve a specific problem at a particular time and place). The middle area to which applied experimental psychology is addressed resembles, and comes directly from, basic work in that the techniques are objective and well-designed, reliable and systematically considered, and variables are well-controlled. But this generic applied research does not stem from an urge to answer fundamental theoretical questions. Rather, its ultimate reason for being is to determine whether subsequent applied research and development will pay off in solving a particular problem. If the results of the generic applied research are positive, then a particular application can be investigated by a mission oriented agency to determine whether that application follows the generic findings, or is an exception. Generic applied research indicates how mission oriented research will be done in the future, and includes within its work an example of how this application will actually work.

Our interest in applied experimental psychology is not restricted to any subfield of psychology; on the contrary, the approach is to encourage researchers in all areas including sensation and perception, memory and cognition, language behavior, social psychology, organizational psychology, learning and conditioning, comparative and physiological psychology, environmental psychology, developmental psychology, and testing. Research in abnormal psychology is not supported insofar as it constitutes clinical research.

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 **Richard M. Steers, Graduate School of Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 94703.**

A Key to Scientific Research Literature

(Author Unknown; Reprinted from the Military Psychology Newsletter, December, 1979)

What was said...	What was meant...
It has long been known that...	I haven't bothered to look up the original reference but...
Of great theoretical and practical importance...	Interesting to me...
While it has not been possible to provide definite answers to these questions...	The experiment didn't work out, but I figured I could at least get a publication out of it.
The operant conditioning technique was chosen to study the problem.	The fellow in the next lab already had the equipment set up.
Three of the Ss were chosen for detailed study...	The results on the others didn't make sense.
Typical results are shown...	The best results are shown...
Agreement with the predicted curve is: excellent good satisfactory	fair poor imaginary
It is suggested that... It is believed that... It may be that...	I think...
It is generally believed that...	A couple of other people think so too.
It is clear that much additional work will be required before a complete understanding...	I don't understand it.
Unfortunately, a quantitative theory to account for these results has not been formulated.	I can't think of one and neither has anyone else.
Correct within an order of magnitude...	Wrong.
Thanks are due to Sam Zebeard for assistance with the experiments, and to Jane Glotz for valuable discussion...	Zebeard did the work; and Glotz explained what it meant.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Postdoctoral Research Associateships in the Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory, Groton, CT offer temporary civil service appointments (GS-11) to candidates approved by the Laboratory and recommended by the National Research Council. Opportunities exist in the Human Factors Department for study of proposals relevant to: environmental influences on behavior; information processing, problem solving and decision making; and computer-based biomedical/diagnostic systems. Write to: **Associateship Office (JH608), National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20418.**

POSITIONS AVAILABLE

LARRY FOGLI

- (1) Organizational Psychologist, Ph.D.: Anticipated opening for tenure-track faculty member in an established program in industrial/organizational psychology. Rank and salary negotiable. Teach undergraduate and graduate courses in organizational psychology, teach related and general courses, advise students, supervise masters and doctoral theses, and participate in program development. Candidates must have teaching and research competence in some area of organizational psychology. Our preference is to hire at the entry level, but active and highly competent senior persons will be considered and are encouraged to apply. Appointment date: August, 1981. Applicants should send curriculum vitae, letters from at least three references, and a statement of research and teaching interests (new graduates should also send graduate transcript) to **Terry L. Dickinson, Chairman, Industrial/Organizational Psychology Section, Department of Psychology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523**. By: **March 15, 1981**. Colorado State University is EEO/Title IX employer. Equal Opportunity Office: 314 Student Services Building.
- (2) The School of Business Administration, Dalhousie University, has 2 positions, open rank. One position is in Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory; the second position is in Personnel. Visiting appointment considered; PhD preferred, ABD considered. Competitive salary; available September 1981. Contact **Dr. Ronald Storey, School of Business Administration, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3H 4H8, Canada (902-424-7084)**.
- (3) Industrial Organizational Psychologist: The Ohio State University has an opening for a Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor for the 1981-82 academic year. We are looking for a person with demonstrated interest and achievement in the areas of personnel selection, theory and practice, job and task analysis and performance assessment. Duties include teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Position begins October 1, 1981. Salary range: \$17,040-20,040. Send curriculum vita and 3 letters of recommendation to **Dr. Richard Klimoski, The Ohio State University, Department of Psychology, 404C West 17th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210**. To assure consideration, applications must be received by **February 15, 1981**. Ohio State is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity employer.
- (4) Saint Mary's University, Department of Psychology, Assistant Professor. The Department of Psychology is seeking to fill a tenure-track position in the general area of Applied Psychology. The Department offers M.Sc. programs in *Clinical and Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. The ideal candidate is one who can contribute through teaching and research, to both of these areas. Experimental psychologists with strong applied interest should also feel welcome to apply. Duties include teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels, research and professional activity, and research supervision. The 1980-81 salary floor for the assistant professor rank is \$19,908. Starting date for position is September 1, 1981. Preference is given to applicants who are eligible for employment in Canada at the time of application. Applicants should send a letter of application stating their teaching, research and professional interests along with a vita and the names of three references to: **Dr. Victor M. Catano, Chairperson, Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 3C3**.

- (7) Knight-Ridder Newspapers, Inc. seeks an industrial psychologist for its corporate staff. The incumbent will prepare management evaluations, conduct management training programs and assist in Attitude and Opinion surveys, Assessment Centers, personnel planning and other ongoing personnel programs. Ph.D. plus three years experience preferred. Salary based on experience and qualifications. Please send resume to **Dr. Douglas C. Harris, VP/Personnel Knight-Ridder Newspapers, One Herald Plaza, Miami, Florida 33101**. An affirmative action, equal opportunity employer.
- (8) Medina & Thompson, Inc., a firm of management consulting psychologists, is seeking psychologists for consulting with middle and upper management in the U.S. and abroad. Responsibilities include evaluation, counseling, group work and conducting workshop/seminars. Ph.D. required. Contact **Dr. Robert F. Medina at Medina & Thompson, Inc., 100 South Wacker Drive, Chicago, 60606. Telephone: 312-372-1804**.
- (5) Texas Tech University, College of Business Administration, Management Area Coordinator. The College of Business Administration invites applications and nominations for the position of Coordinator of the Area of Management at the rank of Associate or Full Professor. The Coordinator should be capable of providing leadership for the future growth and continued development of the Management Area, be willing to work with junior faculty, and have an established research record. In addition to the Coordinator's position, the Management Area has faculty openings in Organizational Behavior, Business Policy, and Personnel/Industrial Relations. These positions may be either at the junior or senior level.

Applications with the names of three references and other supportive information should be sent to: **Barry A. Macy, Chairperson, Management Area Search Committee, College of Business Administration, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409**. An equal opportunity employer.
- (6) Manager, Corporate Personnel Research: Control Data Corporation, an international computer manufacturer based in Bloomington, Minnesota, is looking for a candidate to reflect the industrial psychologist scientist-practitioner model in planning, organizing, and directing the varied personnel research projects and programs. These may include selection and validation, program evaluation, survey research, performance appraisal, job analysis, etc. This position will also assist in coordinating the R&D and quantitative analysis resource needs of the department, act as a consultant to others and conduct research projects/programs. This position normally requires a Doctoral Degree in Industrial-Organizational Psychology or a closely related field with a minimum of four years directly related experience. Supervision and project management experience desirable, as well as excellent communications and organizational skills. Control Data offers excellent compensation, professional growth opportunities and employee benefits. Send resume to **K. A. Adams, Headquarters Personnel, Control Data Corporation, P.O. Box O, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440**. An equal opportunity employer.

PRINCIPLES FOR THE VALIDATION AND USE OF PERSONNEL SELECTION PROCEDURES: SECOND EDITION

Division 14's Executive Committee has adopted the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures (second edition)* as the official statement of the Division concerning procedures for validation research and personnel selection. **Bill Owens** and **Mary Tenopyr** were co-chairs responsible for this edition; an advisory panel of 24 experts participated in the revising and updating of the 1975 Principles. The purpose of this new edition is to specify principles of good practice in the choice, development, and evaluation of personnel selection procedures.

Each member of Division 14 has received a copy of the *Principles*. Additional copies can be obtained from **Lew Albright, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation, 300 Lakeside Drive, Room KB 2140, Oakland, CA 94643**. The price schedule is: \$4.00 each for 1-9 copies, \$2.50 each for 10-49 copies, and \$2.00 each for 50 copies and up.

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
		7½"	4½"
	One Page	3½"	4½"
	Half Page		
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!

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.**