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 Subscription Section, 1400 N. Uhle St., Arlington, VA 22201. Subscriptions are included with membership in the Division. **TIP** circulation is approximately 3000 which includes the membership of the Division, all APA officers and board members, presidents of other APA Divisions, graduate students in industrial-organizational psychology and organizational behavior programs, Editors of APA newsletters, and to subscribers. Opinions expressed are those of the writers and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology unless so stated.

Sheldon Zedeck Editor
Larry Fogli Business Manager

Editorial Board

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

President
Arthur C. MacKinney
Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Missouri-St. Louis
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Secretary-Treasurer
Virginia R. Boehm
SOHIO
1521 Midland
Cleveland, OH 44115

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Message From Your President

ART MacKINNEY

The big issue in Division 14 at the moment revolves around BPA's proposal for "recognition," as well as annual re-recognition, of specialties in psychology, including the I/O specialty. **Jack Bartlett,** acting as a subcommittee of one, has done his usual thorough analysis of the proposal and found it ridiculous. Subsequently, the Executive Committee carried out a lengthy discussion of the proposal which included a meeting with APA Central Office Staff member, **Dick Kilburg.** Based on Jack's analysis and the subsequent discussions, I have written a long and quite negative letter to BPA's **Bonnie Strickland** attempting to dissuade them (BPA) from imposing another process on us that we think is onerous, expensive, and unnecessary. As I think on it, using the word "ridiculous" above is probably overly kind.

As a result of a request from the Equal Employment Advisory Council, relayed by **Mary Tenopyr,** that we issue a statement that their draft employee selection guidelines are basically consistent with our *Principles,* the Executive Committee has formed an ad hoc committee to study and prepare a comparison between the *Principles* and the government's *Uniform Guidelines.* Since that is a very complex sentence, let me restate it this way: we are undertaking a point-by-point comparison of the *Uniform Guidelines* and our *Principles.* Thus we are not responding directly to the request for a statement about the EEAC proposal, but looking first at the points of congruence and dissimilarity between the *Uniform Guidelines* and the *Principles.* **Jack Bartlett, Don Grant,** and **Milt Hakel** have agreed to serve on the subcommittee and will report by the time of the next Executive Committee meeting in May.

The proposed exchange of visits with our counterparts in the People's Republic of China seems to be inching forward. We have received a very warm response to the overture letter I told you about in the last issue of *TIP* which proposed that a Division 14 delegation visit the P.R.C. this coming fall. Their response proposes we visit three cities: Beijing, Shanghai, and Hanzhou (We are told, ". . . that the University (Hanzhou University) is the center of industrial psychology in China. The Professional Division of Industrial Psychology of the Chinese Psychological Association is headquartered here at this University, of which the Chairman is my University President Chen Li, the most senior scholar in the field (Ph.D. from London in the 1940's).") Thus let me repeat my invitation from the last *TIP:* I would like to hear from any Division member who thinks there is a possibility that he or she would like to join such a delegation. I would also need to know under what conditions you would be able to do so.

I'm sure you know from elsewhere in this *TIP* that all five of the proposed bylaws changes passed the vote of the membership by overwhelming majorities. We will be working immediately on their implementation. Incorporation is the major one of these, of course, and you will hear a great deal more on this matter in the next few months. A special task group has been formed to implement the incorporation decision consisting of myself, **Gini Boehm, Dick Campbell, Irv Goldstein,** and **Jack Bartlett.**

14 TIPBITS

SHELDON ZEDECK

This issue contains a comprehensive summary of licensing and its relationship to I/O psychology, prepared by **Ann Howard** and **Rodney Lowman** and the Professional Affairs Committee of Division 14. The general sense is that there is ambiguity as to the who, what and why of licensing. APA Council is looking into the issues and will be discussing them at future meetings. After reading the Howard and Lowman summary, if you need more detail, write to Ann for the complete report. You should then have all the information you would want and be sufficiently knowledgable on the topic to partake in the discussions in APA and in your state organizations.

Another topic summarized in this issue is that of ability testing—its uses, consequences, and controversies. **Jim Sharf** presents a brief summary of a recently released National Academy of Sciences report (two volumes) on testing. See Jim's column for the address from which you can get the two detailed volumes.

While you're waiting for the above mentioned complete reports, fill out the Workshop Registration form that is found in this issue. It may be that only licensed psychologists who have a number of continuing education credits will be permitted to practice I/O psychology. One state introduced legislation several years ago that restricted validation "studies" to only licensed psychologists—it didn't get too far but will probably be introduced again, and again, until...

NEWS AND NOTES...

Bob Perloff, well known as the first editor of *TIP,* made it to the final five. Bob is one of the candidates for APA President-Elect. You should be getting your ballot some time in the middle of May...**John Campbell,** whose term on APA Council was to begin after the January meeting, is unfortunately unable to serve. Accordingly, **Don Grant** (who had received the largest number of votes among the candidates not elected in the last election) was declared elected for a two year term by the Executive Committee at its Winter meeting. Also, **Mary Tenopyr,** who had originally been designated for a two year term, will now serve a three year term...**Milton Blood** is the Division's appointee to a new APA Task Force on the employability of experimental psychologists in industry...The American Association of State Psychology Boards requested a nominee for their examining committee. The Division's Executive Committee has submitted **Jack Bartlett's** name...**Paul Thayer** has been elected a Fellow of AAAS "for theoretical and practical contributions to industrial/organizational psychology."

Eugene Stone was inadvertently left off the 1981-1982 Education and Training Committee list that appeared in the February issue of *TIP.* He was also left off the 1980-1981 list. All that I can promise Gene is that this *TIP* editor won't make that mistake three years running. Not that it takes me three trials, but rather effective with volume 20, November 1982, **Ann Howard** will be the new *TIP* editor. Congratulations to Ann. All items, bits of information, etc. that you have as of July 1, 1982 should be sent to Ann at **AT&T, 1776 On The Green, Room 48-2B47, Morristown, New Jersey 07960.**

Lew Albright has assumed a new position, that of consultant for outplacement and training and development programs for deRecat and Associates, Inc. in San Francisco...**Dennis Sweeney** has joined the staff of Psychological Consultants to Industry, Inc., of Pittsburgh, PA...**Olga E. Engelhardt** has joined the faculty of Northeastern Illinois University as Director of the Division of Business and Management...**Judi Komaki** will be joining the Psychology Faculty at Purdue University, effective Fall 1982...**Valerie Simmons,** who is finishing up her doctoral work at the University of Maryland, will join the Applied Social Psychology group at the University of California, Santa Cruz... **Mike Beer** has been appointed to the post of Professor of Business Administration at the Harvard Business School.

Joel Lefkowitz informs *TIP* that the Baruch College of CUNY has formed a new Ph.D. program in I/O psychology. Information can be obtained from Joel at **Psychology Department, Baruch College, CUNY, 17 Lexington Ave., NY, NY 10010.**

Abraham Luchins will be retiring in two years from SUNY at Albany and is, therefore planning to distribute copies of Wertheimer's seminars on problem solving, perception, character, personality and the social order. If you're interested, write to him at **Dept. of Psychology, SUNY, 1400 Washington Ave., Albany, NY 12222**...**Stan Seashore** will become emeritus this October and is now declaring his availability for limited-term engagements in interesting places; anyone needing a highly experienced I/O psychologist who is trying out the "two day work week" can contact him at the **Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106**...**Rich Cherry** took a year's leave (last September) from General Motors as Director of International QWL to live on a lake and try out the role of associate professor at Stetson University's School of Business in DeLand, Florida. The QWL (we never heard of DeLand either) is so good that he's thinking of extending his leave.

This issue of *TIP* has a summary of a paper by **Kenneth De Meuse** and **Carl Greenberg** that looks at the reputation of I/O graduate programs. It's time that we look at *undergraduate* programs. *TIP* is pleased to report that **Doug Bray** has been recognized as Alumnus of the Year by his undergraduate alma mater, American International College (Springfield, MASS)...**Ann Howard** has also been recognized by her undergraduate college; Ann received the Award for Outstanding Achievements in the Sciences from Goucher College (Towson, MD).

Finally, *TIP* is pleased to acknowledge the following recent contributors to the Ghiselli Award: **Jack Bartlett, Richard Blackburn** and **Michele Mitchell, Marv Dunnette, Milton Hakel, Douglas A. Johnson, Eugene Ketchum, Karlene Roberts,** and the firm of **Landy, Farr, & Jacobs.**

THE DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF ITEMS
FOR THE AUGUST ISSUE OF *TIP* IS
JUNE 15, 1982

BALLOT RESULTS!!!

619 members voted in the November ballot on incorporation and bylaws changes. The results were:

Change in Bylaws	*Percent in Favor*
1. Incorporation and related Bylaws changes	87.4
2. Merger of Publications & PPSI Committees	95.6
3. Rewording of E&T Committee duties	97.9
4. Merger of Continuing Education and Workshop Committees	97.4
5. Sunsetting of Committees	96.0

All changes passed by very wide margins and the necessary steps for incorporation will be carried out in time for incorporation to officially take place the day after the Annual Meeting at the 1982 Convention.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT:

Edwin E. Ghiselli Award

The **Edwin E. Ghiselli Award** will replace the James McKeen Cattell Award as the designation for the best proposal for research in I/O Psychology. Named after one of the chief proponents of a broad approach to research in I/O Psychology, the Ghiselli Award will become a symbol of excellence for those who earn it.

The Ghiselli Award needs to be funded by I/O Psychologists and their organizations. Each I/O Psychologist should feel the necessity to contribute at least $10.00 for the establishment of the Ghiselli Fund and organizations which employ I/O types need to be asked for contributions. The Ghiselli Award is as important as anything else we support because it looks to the future; the award is for proposals, not accomplishment.

Send contributions or make pledges to the Secretary-Treasurer, **Virginia R. Boehm, Standard Oil Company, Midland Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115,** today. All contributions should be made out to "Ghiselli Fund." All contributions are tax deductible. Let's make this happen by showing our commitment to research.

The Legacy of Robert J. Wherry, Sr. 1904-1981

C. J. BARTLETT

The year 1904 was a very good year for I/O Psychology. Charles Spearman published the first paper on factor analysis (Spearman, 1904) and Bob Wherry was born. Both of these events were to have a lasting impact on the research methodology of I/O Psychology. This coincidence was particularly appropriate since Bob was to make major contributions toward methodology emphasizing the retention of the general factor concept in the interpretation of factor structure.

Bob Wherry grew up and received all of his formal education in Ohio, receiving his B.S., M.A. and Ph.D. degress from Ohio State University. He was the second of a long line of illustrious scholars who received their doctorates under the direction of Herbert A. Toops.

Bob Wherry began his long career in higher education in 1929 at Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tennessee, where in the depths of the depression faculty received their salary in hogs, chickens and produce given by students in lieu of tuition. In 1937 he went to the University of North Carolina where he remained until 1948 with the exception of several leaves of absence to serve the government during World War II.

In 1948 he returned to his alma mater, Ohio State University as Professor of Psychology. He served as Professor and Chairman of the Department of Psychology from 1960-1970. Returning to full time faculty status, he became Professor Emeritus in 1974, but continued an active role in research and helping students with their research problems until his death in 1981.

Much of Bob Wherry's legacy to psychology, and I/O psychology in particular, is his contribution to the literature in statistical methodology. The development of the theory of shrinkage in multiple regression began with his doctoral dissertation in 1929 and in the publication of his famous shrinkage formula in 1931 (Wherry, 1931). His work continued in this area throughout his career and was summarized in his invited address at the Division 14 meetings in 1974 (Wherry, 1975). In addition to his contributions to regression methodology, Wherry's works in factor analysis are also widely recognized. He made it possible to factor analyze large numbers of variables before the advent of modern data processing systems (e.g., Wherry and Winer, 1953). The use of these techniques made factorial investigations such as the Ohio State Leadership Studies possible.

A large part of the Wherry legacy is in material which he did not publish. Bob thought that the application of his shrinkage formula to the selection of tests by multiple regression was so obvious that publication of the specific

technique was unnecessary. Fortunately for those of us whose insight was not up to Bob's level, the Wherry-Doolittle Test Selection Method was published by others (Stead and Shartle, 1940). In addition, Bob Wherry invented the forced-choice method for self description and rating. He modestly attributed the method to an idea he got from Paul Horst, and it didn't matter to him that he didn't publish it because others have discussed it and everyone knew about it. Another of his unpublished works is in the area of the control of bias in rating. Fortunately, the theory of rating he developed 30 years ago will be published in a book (Landy and Farr, 1982) as well as in *Personnel Psychology*. The research stimulated by this theory should provide a living memorial to Bob's work in this area.

The greatest legacy of Bob Wherry may not be from his published or unpublished research and writing but from his teaching. The thousands of students who struggled their way through "Wherry's Mystery Hour" gained an insight into the importance of the proper use and interpretation of statistical analysis that has had an impact on the entire field of psychology. I/O psychology has reaped the greatest benefit. He not only directed the doctoral dissertations of 81 students but many of these have gone on to instruction of others, assuring that this Wherry legacy will continue for generations.

I would like to close this tribute to Bob Wherry by expressing appreciation to those who meant so much to him and provided so much support for his work, his loving wife Carrie and his family. We thank them for sharing Bob with I/O psychology. We are a better profession because he was with us.

References

Landy, F. J. and Farr, J. L. *The measurement of work performance: Methods, theory, and applications.* New York: Academic Press, In press.

Spearman, C. General intelligence objectively determined and measured. *American Journal of Psychology,* 1904, *15,* 201-292.

Stead, W. H. and Shartle, C. L. *Occupational counseling techniques.* New York: American Book Company, 1940.

Wherry, R. J., Sr. A new formula for predicting the shrinkage of the multiple correlation coefficient. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics,* 1931, *39,* 493-496.

Wherry, R. J., Sr. Underprediction from overfitting: 45 years of shrinkage. *Personnel Psychology,* 1975, *28,* 1-18.

Wherry, R. J., Sr. and Winer, B. J. A method for factoring large numbers of items. *Psychometrika, 18,* 161-179.

The following poem was found on Bob Wherry's desk by his family who came to clean out his office after his death. Below is Bob's final legacy to us:

A Professor At Pasture

Despite the fact I get no pay,
I like to go to work each day.
The work itself to me brings glee;
I seize each opportunity
To give a wanted helping hand
To know that I am in demand,
That someone rates my talents high,
To know that life's not passed me by.
In boredom I thus put a dent,
That's my reward for time well spent.

And if perchance no one shows up,
I just fill up my coffee cup,
Pull out some data from the file
And plan research I think worthwhile;
Work on a chapter for my book,
And give it one more careful look.
And as the time so quickly passes
I'm glad that I teach no more classes,
Have no committees to attend;
Those boring chores are at an end.

I come when I like and leave when I please,

I live indeed a life of ease;
No deadlines to meet, no reports to file,
No chairman or dean must I beguile.
I sit and read and contemplate
Each act performed at leisured rate.
So, I do not retirement rue,
I can eat my cake and have it, too.
That's why I go to work each day
Despite the fact I get no pay.

Author: Robert James Wherry, Sr.
Year: 1981

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Robert J. Wherry Award

The **Robert J. Wherry** award will be given annually to the best research paper by a graduate student in I/O Psychology. The award will be presented at the annual business meeting of Division 14 for the best I/O paper presented at the I/O-O-B Graduate Student Convention or by other procedures to be established. An endowment has already been received to assure an annual cash award of $100.

Bob Wherry spent his life supervising graduate student research and teaching them statistical methods. That special Wherry touch has helped improve the quality of research in our field and the Wherry Award will continue to be an inspiration to young aspiring psychologists.

APA COUNCIL REPORT

MILT HAKEL

APA passed an important milestone in January with the first try-out of a reorganized Council of Representatives. In accordance with a plan adopted at the Los Angeles convention, the Council divided itself into two forums which met for a half day each to consider business of mutual interest. Forum 1 reviewed and made recommendations to the full Council about several issues concerning the provision of psychological health care services. Forum A considered several science oriented issues. When the full Council met it was clear that the forums had expedited much of its business. For the January try-out, we allocated four of our five votes to Forum A (the more academically oriented forum), and our fifth vote to Forum 1 (the more professionally oriented forum). The try-out will continue for another two and a half years and its success marks the first fruit from the recommendations made by the Commission on Organization. Other changes to be expected in the next few years concern changes in the convention, governance of APA boards and committees and the dues structure.

When it got down to business the Council quickly passed a $15.5 million budget for 1982 and also authorized the Board of Directors to negotiate for the purchase of an additional building in Arlington, Virginia (adroit asset management will permit APA to occupy its office space in the Washington area at a net cost of $4.57/square foot during 1982—Washington downtown rental is now $25/square foot). The Council approved a procedure for reinstatement of former members, affirmed the continuation of current policy with respect to associate members and streamlined the procedures for election to membership. It placed a three-year moratorium on the formation of new divisions, changed the name of the *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology* to *Psychological Documents,* passed funding authorizations for APA membership in the Consortium of Social Science Associations and the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, and debated and then passed a revised resolution on hand gun control.

On the horizon are two issues that will arouse considerable interest and controversy in the next several years: the creation of procedures for APA designation of specialties in psychology, and the creation of a procedure for systematizing graduate education in professional psychology (this latter item may lead to a process somewhat like the process followed in 1915 by the Flexner Commission, which resulted in the standardization of medical education in the United States). **Milton Blood, Dick Campbell** and **Paul Thayer** retired from the Council at the end of the January meeting. **Don Grant, Bob Guion,** and **Mary Tenopyr** will succeed to their seats, joining **Milt Hakel** and **Lyman Porter.** We continue to have five seats on the Council but last time around we passed the cutting point by only one-tenth of one percent! We need your continuing support, and when the apportionment ballot arrives next autumn, please give Division 14 all ten of your votes.

(Editor's Note: The following is reprinted, with permission, from *The Pennsylvania Psychologist* January/February 1982 issue. All those who want to audition for the roles of Harry, voice, and sound should contact *TIP*'s office for appointments.)

Psychologists Work in Industry and Organizations Too!

Read the following script for a Public Service Announcement and look for it on TV within four months. It is the result of brainstorming, disposed of drafts, and more brainstorming by Jackie Sallade and Gil Aberg. It was written by Gil Aberg and production and distribution will be financed by PPA and the I & O Division.

GIL ABERG ASSOCIATES

Old, obviously long-retired worker visiting his former workplace, a factory, at night. Huge shop. High ceiling. Many machines...Nobody around.

(MUSIC: In far background, something like a polka, lively but nostalgic)

Walks slowly down aisle between machines, face showing he is reliving his former work situation.

(SOUND EFFECTS, off mike: We hear sounds of the same factory running full time: machines running; metal clanging; drills, etc. Some voices.)

Man stops and "fondles" machine; it was obviously his when he was working.

(VOICE, on mike: "Hey, Harry, we need three more of these before quitting. Can do?")

Man's face shows determination; he nods his head as though answering: "Sure, of course. Can do..."

Low angle, through his machine, as he reaches over and presses a button. Nothing happens. He shrugs.

High angle; wide shot; whole shop, as he walks on, through another aisle.

(SOUND, off mike; factory noises, A quitting bell is heard, followed by sounds of machines being turned off. VOICE, on mike, same as above: "Hey, great job, Harry. Great job!")

CLOSEUP as camera trucks ahead of worker. Face shows pleasure as he remembers being complimented.

(SOUND: factory noises cut out. Only his footsteps are heard.)

PAN with him in long shot as he goes to door. Pauses; looks back fondly, remembering.

NARRATOR: "You spend a third of your life at work. Don't wait til it's over to enjoy it."

OLD MAN turns out lights, exits.

SUPER: THE PENNSYLVANIA PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
Industrial and Organizational Division

Dr. Jackie Sallade, Chair,
Communications Board, Pennsylvania Psychological Association

Licensing and Industrial/Organizational Psychology: A Summary of Background and Issues

ANN HOWARD and RODNEY L. LOWMAN

When the Incoming Division 14 met in the summer of 1980, the Professional Affairs Committee was asked to take yet another look at the issue of licensing as it pertains to I/O psychologists. The authors undertook this task, and after extensive revisions of the first draft, completed with the assistance of **Martin Greller,** a lengthy document was approved for circulation by the Executive Committee at its January, 1982 meeting. This article is a summary of that document.

BACKGROUND

Licensing and certification are legal forms of credentialing which regulate the use of a title and/or define the activities that constitute the practice of a particular profession. The notion began not very successfully in the 13th century, when Frederick II, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, tried to restrict the practice of medicine to university-trained physicians and eliminate the activities of "witches." America's effort at licensing also began unsuccessfully, with a flood of legislation before 1800, followed by disillusionment and massive deregulation prior to the Civil War. A renewed effort began in the 1870's tying competence to licensing and culminating in the present system.

Early Efforts in Psychology

For psychology, the story began in 1945, when Connecticut passed the first state certification law for psychologists. A primary motivation for licensing psychologists was that psychiatrists' objections threatened the independent practice of clinical psychology. APA responded by establishing a Committee on Legislation (later renamed the Committee on State Legislation, or COSL), whose first major task was to develop model guidelines for state legislation. The first set of guidelines, approved by APA in 1955, laid down four major principles: 1) nonrestrictive legislation by title or title and general function, 2) requiring a doctorate and one year of supervised experience for independent practice, 3) generic licensure that did not differentiate psychological specialties, and 4) reference to the APA code of ethics in the law.

Problems began to multiply as different regulations and criteria emerged in various states. Consequently, in 1961 the state boards were organized into the American Association of State Psychology Boards (AASPB) to promote cooperative efforts. This group initially took on the task of developing a national licensing examination.

The EPP Examination

The AASPB contracted with the Professional Examination Service (PES) to develop a national examination for licensure. The first edition of the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPP) was released late in 1964, and by 1980 virtually every state had used or planned to use it in their licensing or certification process. The goal of the examination is to screen out those incompetent in the basic knowledge expected of all professional psychologists; thus its items span a broad range of specialties.

The EPPP exam has been subjected to many criticisms, not infrequently by I/O psychologists. Complaints have suggested it favors one specialty over another and contains items that represent arcane knowledge or lack content validity. The most recent objection from the Division 14 Executive Committee, expressed in a letter to the Board of Professional Affairs (BPA), included the recommendation of a more appropriate criterion-related validity strategy that began with a needs assessment or job analysis. This resulted in a 1980 BPA conference on Professional Assessment, which in turn led to an agreement to undertake a job analysis for the position of practicing psychologist. AASPB doubled the licensing fee from $30 to $60 to support a contract with the Educational Testing Service to conduct the job analysis, which is now in progress.

Several studies have been completed to date which found high scores on the EPPP related negatively to amount of professional experience, years since highest degree, and age, but positively to number of psychology courses taken. Also, Ph.D. degree holders do significantly better on the exam than those with Ed.D. degrees. Thus the EPPP exam appears to relate to academic exposure to psychology but has not yet been demonstrated to correspond with competent practice.

The EPPP has also been attacked for the variable standards used across the states (some states pass those who score 25% right; others require as much as 75%). The exam ranges so widely that many score rather poorly, in spite of the fact that it has a reputation as a "Psych. 101" exam. The most recent blow was a charge in California that the exam discriminates unfairly against minority candidates. An added complaint was that the exam measures psychological knowledge related to academic training, without establishing that this knowledge is essential to protection of the public health, safety, and welfare.

1967 Model Licensing Guidelines

Following the establishment of AASPB and guided by it, COSL went to work on a more complete set of model licensing guidelines, and some 28 recommendations were approved and issued in 1967. The introductory statements to these guidelines clearly included I/O psychology within its regulatory purview. The definition of psychological practice included such activities as personnel selection and management, evaluation and planning for effective work and learning situations, advertising and market research, and resolution of interpersonal and social conflicts.

Another section of the guidelines established some exemptions by place of employment, including academicians as well as those who worked for industry and government. These exclusions meant in effect that most I/O psychologists would not be subject to licensing by these guidelines, with consultants offering I/O services to the public the primary exceptions.

Education and Credentialing Conferences

One problem with the criteria for licensing and certification adopted by the different states was the lack of a national standard for the definition of a doctorate in psychology. Most laws used the phrase "primarily psychological in nature" to prescribe the required education and training for licensure applicants, but that phrase was inconsistently defined. With the advent of the new Psy.D. degree as well as programs training psychologists outside of psychology departments, the question of whether these educational experiences produced comparable practitioners led to new calls for systemization.

In 1976 and again in 1977 conferences were convened on Education and Credentialing. The outcome was a recommendation for a national review commission and national minimum educational standards for licensing and credentialing in psychology. A psychology program was defined as administratively housed anywhere, as long as it was identified and labeled a psychology program. Thus graduates from programs in business schools or other departments, taught by I/O psychologists but labeled Organizational Behavior or the like, would not be eligible for licensure. Although this would not be inappropriate for some OB programs, there are no doubts where the education of graduates differes little from those in I/O programs. Another recommendation put forth by the Education and Credentialing conferences that could cause difficulties for I/O psychologists was the requirement for courses in four core areas defined as biological bases of behavior, cognitive-affective bases, social bases, and individual differences.

The establishment of a designation process for psychology programs was also viewed with disfavor by some I/O psychologists because of the annual expense to universities and other institutions wishing to be recognized. Moreover, it put potential restraints on academic curricula in the absence of data indicating these educational requirements contribute to more competent practice.

The last conference led APA to establish a Task Force on Education and Credentialing, charged with conducting and evaluating an experimental national system to designate programs that prepare individuals for the practice of psychology. Division 14 representatives convinced the APA Council to exclude I/O psychology from the purview of this task force, although it was no doubt accepted grudgingly in light of generic licensing. The recommendations of the task force have recently met with some opposition, since APA's Policy and Planning Board felt they might result in legal challenges and limit academic freedom. Their alternative, of designating individuals rather than programs, is still under consideration.

Meanwhile, the recommendations of the 1977 Conference, never approved by APA Council, have found their way into the regulations of many states. A recent count indicated the criteria for defining a psychology program have been adopted by 22 states.

Guidelines for Delivery of Psychological Services

The generic approach to credentialing was also used for the development of standards for the delivery of services by psychologists (adopted in 1974, with revisions in 1977). These standards, which differ from licensing requirements, were designed to address the quality of psychological activities undertaken by practitioners in any given setting rather than the initial qualifications of the individual psychologist. They describe services to potential users, spell out evaluation and accountability procedures, and state obligations of the service providers to the service users.

Division 14's original reaction to the revised version of these guidelines was to request in Council that I/O psychology be eliminated from their scope, since I/O practice is so different from clinically-oriented practice. This resolution was defeated, but the recognized specialties (Clinical, Counseling, School, and I/O) were asked to create additional specialty standards. Division 14 protested that such specialty guidelines were unnecessary, but this did not alter APA policy. Thus a draft acceptable to the Executive Committee was produced, primarily through the efforts of **Tom Tice** and **Jack Bartlett.** Still the Division 14 Representatives to Council voted against the adoption of these guidelines since, though written acceptably, they were still considered unnecessary. The guidelines were passed by Council nevertheless and published in the *American Psychologist* in April, 1981.

The Third Attempt at Model Licensing Guidelines

In the late 1970's COSL began again to revise the model guidelines for state legislation. This time they attempted to cover all psychological services, whether offered for a fee or in an institutional setting, and expanded the definition of psychology, affecting thousands of psychologists not previously licensed.

Early drafts drew fire from the Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA), until a compromise draft was produced in 1978 that clearly exempted teaching and research from licensure requirements. **John Campbell,** then President of Division 14 and speaking for it, presented a strong case for the inappropriateness of many provisions for I/O psychology. Among them were definitions of psychological practice that included almost all personnel management activities performed by laypersons, requirement of a new license for those practicing out of state more than 20 days, and the stipulation of supervised experience after the Ph.D. The Division 14 Executive Committee also developed their own definition of licensable activities, which COSL initially rejected as going too far in restricting the need for licensure to clinical functions. A final compromise draft of the guidelines, released in 1979, defined psychological practice as providing "direct ameliorative psychological services to the public" and retained most of the Division 14 definitions of licensable work. Most activities of I/O psychologists were deemed *not* licensable, such as administering group tests, opinion surveys, and teaching and research not involving ameliorative services. Requiring licensure were such things as individual assessment or counseling, interpretation of individual test scores, and sensitivity training. The thrust of this distinction was also included in the Specialty Guidelines for the Delivery of I/O Psychological Services.

Although the 1979 revision of the proposed licensing guidelines was reasonably palatable to I/O and other non-health-care providers, it met with new resistance by the original licensing proponents. Of primary concern was the differentiation of those providing ameliorative services and the use of the title "psychologist" by both licensed and unlicensed psychologists. Some also felt it unwise to try to change the licensing laws while sunsetting posed a threat in several states. As a result, the APA Council voted "no action" on the 1979 revision, leaving the 1967 guidelines in force.

At present there is a large gap between the 1967 guidelines and their implementation. The exemptions were creating some problems, since unlicensed psychologists were found in public institutions, where the poor receive services, but not in private facilities, suggesting a discriminatory situation. As a consequence the states have been disallowing the institutional exemptions. A recent review by **Martin Greller** of a compendium of state psychology laws indicated that only 9 states permit the exemption of I/O psychologists in business while retaining use of the title "psychologist." An additional 16 exempt licensure for such persons but do not permit use of the title, and the remaining 26 laws have no business exemption.

And so in 1982 the licensing procedures confronting I/O psychologists seem to be in disarray. The 1967 APA guidelines are unsatisfactory, but there is no agreement within the profession of psychology about how to change them. Licensing still applies to all practicing psychologists, but the education and credentialing standards (the first step in the licensing process) have been restricted within APA to health care providers. Meanwhile the increasing idiosyncracies of individual state laws, including three that do not license I/O psychologists at all (Michigan, South Dakota, and Hawaii), spread confusion and generate new barriers to interstate practice. If no steps are taken, it appears likely that the future will see Division 14 members increasingly subjected to regulations many consider antithetical to their interests.

THE RATIONALE FOR LICENSURE

Whether or not licensure is even appropriate for I/O psychologists can be better understood by examining the arguments that have been put forth favoring and opposing it.

Protection of the Public

Advocates of licensure or certification suggest that it is necessary to protect the public by assuring at least a minimal standard of competency among those who are permitted by law to practice psychology. Otherwise, persons with no training at all could proclaim themselves psychologists and provide a type and level of service inconsistent with the quality expected from one in the field. Opposing this argument is the view that, while licensure or certification may be well intended, it does more to protect the members of the profession than the public, who are rarely considered in any meaningful way. Moreover, the assertion that the public is protected by licensing seems to rest on unsubstantiated opinion.

Some argue that while states have the responsibility of protecting their constituencies against coercion and fraud, they should not assume responsibility for protecting people against their own ignorance and irrationality. By doing so with licensing, they deny individuals the right to choose the practitioner or career of their choice. But accustomed to the analogy of licensing of physicians, most fail to question whether the state has a right to issue such licenses. Licensing advocates also note that licensure affords to the psychologist a measure of confidentiality in state courts he or she would not otherwise enjoy, which further protects clients.

Opponents fault licensing procedures for creating a false illusion of public protection. Critics of the EPPP exam point to its already cited inadequacies and note the lack of empirical evidence that it relates to client outcomes in psychology. Proponents would protest that the exam should not be viewed in isolation, but as part of a broader assessment procedure. They might also appeal to I/O psychologists to use their research and development skills to improve it. The general lack of enforcement for licensing

laws and the paucity of procedures for licensure renewal in spite of the rapidity of obsolescence also raise questions about the efficacy of licensure for public protection. None of these arguments necessarily means licensing per se is inappropriate, rather that there has often been a failure of implementation. An important overall question is whether the inadequacies of the existing procedures can be addressed and improved.

Protection of the Field

Some argue that without legally controlling the use of the title "psychologist" or the services to be provided only by those who hold the title, more and more people may claim to be qualified until bad psychology drives out good and the profession as a whole suffers. But this protection may be more illusory than real, since individuals can legally perform the same types of activities merely by labeling themselves differently. Opponents also complain that licensure unduly restricts the numbers of individuals considered part of the profession.

Licensure proponents claim the process helps to develop and maintain the identity of the profession by defining roles, boundaries, and guidelines for the appropriate practice of the discipline. Status and credibility may also be enhanced by licensure, especially for court testimony as an expert witness. Others feel that legal recognition is not necessary for defining roles and boundaries, and technical adherence can be monitored by such mechanisms as the ethical committees of the APA and state psychological associations. But proponents feel that if I/O psychologists do not pursue and maintain licensure, they will lose their "territory" to those who do, particularly if lack of licensure prevents use of the title "psychologist."

Other Arguments, Pro and Con

Aside from protection of the public or the profession, there are practical concerns that enter into arguments about the appropriateness of licensure. Practicing I/O psychologists often work in many different states, sometimes for weeks at a time, and the requirement for obtaining interim temporary licenses is both expensive and impractical. An extreme example of inconvenience is Oregon's requirement of 60 days prior notice for any out-of-state licensee to practice there. This could act in restraint of interstate trade in I/O consulting services, since most clients would be ill-inclined to wait that long for service.

Yet licensing is an advantage for another practical matter. In most states only licensed psychologists are allowed to form professional corporations, which offer many tax benefits. Similar benefits may be available in closely held or "Subchapter S" business corporations, although some states do not allow professionals to form them.

Another objection to licensing arises from an anticipated threat to academic freedom. Narrow definitions of the practice of psychology could freeze existing theory and practice; if this were the case, the procedure could be somewhat at odds with the scientist-practitioner model Division 14 advocates.

The arguments favoring and opposing licensing speak to a need for assuring competence in services that are provided to consumers. But the present method of licensing is not the only way to approach this goal, and various alternatives should be examined for a proper perspective on the licensing issue.

CREDENTIALING ALTERNATIVES

Methods for establishing competence can be divided into those associated with governmental regulation and those that make use of non- or partially statutory methods. Each has different implications for the profession.

Statutory Methods

Generic licensure or certification, used for psychologists in most states, legally recognizes psychologists as members of the profession of psychology, rather than as professionals in a sub-discipline of specialization. Possible advantages of this approach include movement of psychology as a field toward integration; cost control, since states must maintain only one examining board rather than several; and usefulness for weeding out persons not meeting minimal standards. Opponents of generic licensing

argue that the field of psychology has become too specialized for a generic license to work, and the public could be misled into believing there is more similarity among psychological specialties than there really is. Generic licensing also leads to examination problems, since evaluation procedures may have to be so general as to be meaningless.

An alternative, *specialty licensure,* licenses or certifies only in the area of specialization. An advantage of this approach is that competence may be more thoroughly assessed within narrower areas, without insistence upon a level of expertise in all of psychology. For this reason it has been supported from time to time by Division 14 members as preferable to general licensing. But specialty licensing reinforces differences rather than similarities within psychology, and generic licensing proponents fear this might diminish its public impact as an integrated discipline and reduce it to no more than a collection of occupations. Another result of specialty licensing could be practice limitations between the specialties, so that, for example, only health care providers may be permitted to do sensitivity training or personal counseling.

Another problem with specialty licensing is that as knowledge in presently defined areas increases, there will likely be more and more specialization. This could create an impossible tangle of regulations that would make interstate practice all but impossible to carry out legitimately. Perhaps most crippling to the specialty licensing argument is that multiple licensing boards might make the costs of this approach unfeasible, with the greatest burden on those coming from a smaller base, such as I/O psychology.

Another proposal is a *two-step licensing model,* requiring passage of both a generic licensing procedure and a separate examination in the area of specialization. This method could provide a meaningful rigorous assessment, aiming toward the goals of both generic and specialty licensing. But it would also carry most of the disadvantages of both approaches, and the costs involved might be prohibitive.

Another statutory approach is to *license only selected activities.* This method cuts across disciplinary lines by licensing an activity rather than a specialty. By excluding some activities from licensure, it also acknowledges that not all activities of professionals require special protection of the relevant public. On the other side, this model does little to enhance or maintain the profession's identity, may require far too many licensing boards, and requires the controversial task of determining who should be licensed and for what purpose.

Non-Statutory Methods

The least restrictive approach to credentialing is that of *laissez faire, caveat emptor,* where consumers of psychological services rely on their own judgments of the efficacy of practitioners and seek redress for malpractice through the civil court system. This method incurs no direct expense but also offers little public protection. If all professions worked under the same system it could have appeal, but a profession standing alone without standards could not only lose credibility in the eyes of consumers but attract persons marginally trained or incompetent.

In the method of *self disclosure* persons are expected to accurately convey their qualifications and training experiences to their clients, but there is no attempt to define what constitutes appropriate credentials for practitioners of a given profession. This method is economical and requires no elaborate bureaucracy for administration, but it assumes that consumers are capable of evaluating professional qualifications, which may not be a valid assumption. It also requires an adequate monitoring system to be sure professionals are not misrepresenting their qualifications, but there is no clear mechanism for handling allegations of unethical behavior.

The *voluntary certification* method relies on professional groups, such as the APA or Division 14, to certify competence. This method addresses the issue of qualifications, but has the advantages of removing statutory involvement and allowing voluntary participation. On the negative side, its only enforcement power for offenders is removal from the organization, not practice. Also, its voluntary nature may result in too small participation, and the organization responsible may have difficulty financing the certification process.

Competency evaluation could be used as an adjunct to voluntary certification. Rather than a review of paper credentials, it requires a demonstration of the ability to perform in a manner acceptable to the profession, usually by focusing on the performance of specific tasks. The evaluation is carried out by the profession itself on a voluntary basis and should cover both knowledge of the field and the ability or skill to apply that knowledge to practical problems. An advantage is that the requirements and procedures to measure competence are completely under the control of the professional specialty. Credentialing of educational programs may be unnecessary, and those with different training who wish to move into a new professional area have the means to demonstrate their competence.

The advantages of competency evaluation rest on the quality of the examinations, however, and an appropriate method, such as the assessment center, can be very expensive to develop, validate, and keep current. A second BPA conference held in April, 1981, resulted in planned activities to explore the use of competency assessment within psychological specialties at the journeyperson level. Division 14 was invited to participate in this development, but the Executive Committee declined, finding it unnecessary.

Combined Statutory and Non-Statutory Methods

The statutory and non-statutory methods may also be combined, as in the medical model whereby physicians are licensed generically by the states to practice medicine, but boarded by a private association in a specialty, such as ophthalmology. Applied to psychology, practitioners would be licensed or certified by a state government at the generic level and given certification at the specialty level by a procedure like the journeyperson exam administered by a professional group such as ABPP. Thus the licensing procedure would testify to one's meeting the minimal standards of a psychologist, while the boarding process would certify competence in a specialty.

This method does not prohibit from practice those who have not received specialty certification as long as they passed the licensing qualifications. Another advantage is that the profession remains integrated at the basic level but specialties are also recognized. The negative side includes some of the problems with licensing alone, such as its questionable validity, and the total costs, which are borne by the states, the profession, and the applicants. Also, some may object that this is simply too much credentialing, although the government would be involved only in the first step.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

The present situation for licensing of I/O psychologists is somewhat of a paradox. It appears that licensing will probably begin to affect more and more I/O psychologists who presently don't feel they need or want it, especially those in government and industry. At the same time disparate regulations in some states may make it difficult for those who feel they do need it from obtaining a license; e.g., consultants or those who testify in court on test validation and related issues. The time appears ripe to try to bring some consistency to the situation, especially in light of the prevalence of interstate practice. But first a look at how I/O psychologists are coping with the present regulatory situation.

Present Licensing Activity Among I/O Psychologists

According to a recent analysis of survey data used to prepare the 1981 APA Directory (see article elsewhere in this issue of *TIP*), 45.1% of those who claimed I/O as their major field of psychology were licensed. Yet this is probably an overstatement of licensing activity among those engaged in what are usually considered I/O activities. About ¾ of the I/O psychologists with degrees in Clinical, Counseling, or Community Psychology and an equivalent proportion of the I/O psychologists now providing traditional mental health services were licensed, thus inflating the figures. Only 38.5% of the I/O psychologists in academia, 29.4% of those in government and 42.7% of those in business were licensed, probably reflecting the exemptions in many states for those employment settings, but 65.2% of those currently consulting in non-mental-health related practice were licensed.

There is other evidence that licensing among I/O psychologists is less frequent in recent years. Licensure was most prevalent among the graduates of the 1950's (64.8% were licensed). This was a time when grandfathering was prevalent and before the enactment of the EPPP exam and more restrictive procedures. Among those graduating since 1970 only 30% were licensed, suggesting that newer I/O psychologists may have decided it just isn't worth the trouble if they don't believe their activities pose a significant risk to themselves or the public.

The Need for Licensure

The most fundamental question here is whether licensing *should* apply to psychologists and I/O psychologists in particular. If the provision of health care services was not and never had been in the province of psychology, it is unlikely that there would be a cry for the licensing of I/O or other psychologists in a scientifically-oriented APA. I/O appears to have been pulled into licensing by analogy, as if what is good for the health care providers should be good for all providers of psychological services. But the motivations for regulation do not similarly apply: there is no other occupation whose scope of practice statement restricts I/O psychologists from rendering services and no third party payments are involved. Most importantly, it is not clear that I/O activities necessarily put the naive or helpless in jeopardy so that there is a compelling need to protect the public.

Although protection of the field may be a concern within the profession, the principle upon which legislators promote licensing is protection of the public. Whether the activities I/O psychologists perform pose significant risks which are reduced by licensing is the critical question. The answer should be sought by examining the criteria for what is a licensable activity; some guidelines for this have been developed by the Council of State Governments.

A first question is whether unlicensed practice would pose a serious risk to consumers' life, health, safety, or economic well-being. The work of human factors psychologists might affect safety, feeding back test or assessment results could affect psychological health, and employment policies could affect economic well-being unfairly, but the issue is how much of a risk is actually involved in the performance of an activity. Employee or vocational counseling are often thought to pose a significant risk, but the Directory data indicated that only about 6% of I/O psychologists identify clinical or counseling type activities as first or second subspecialties. Yet others may perform such functions without necessarily naming them as first or second subspecialties on the Directory questionnaire.

Another criterion in evaluating the need for relicensure is the relative vulnerability of users. Some have argued that I/O psychologists serve corporations or other organizations who need no protection, although one might question the assumption that many are really sophisticated consumers. If employees and applicants are also considered users, they may lack the knowledge to evaluate the qualifications of the practitioners and thus need protection.

Whether or not there are existing laws or standards that can solve any suspected problem without licensing is another criterion. Within personnel psychology there are indeed a number of laws that regulate testing and selection, pay, freedom of information, and privacy, but it is not clear if this is protection enough.

Assuming I/O psychology's public requires protection, a final consideration is to what extent licensing would eliminate the charlatans and incompetents. Generic licensing, unless modified in practice, provides no protection against "field switchers" in psychology who might attempt to perform I/O functions with almost no relevant training or experience. Here specialty licensing or nonstatutory competency evaluation would be needed for adequate protection. But to the extent that the incompetents are non-psychologists posing as professionals, licensing may indeed do some good.

There may be various means for determining whether the practice of I/O psychology falls under the jurisdiction of activities deemed licensable. For example, functions described in the recent I/O psychologists' job analysis could be evaluated on the above

criteria by panels of legislators, consumers, or practitioners. But the determination rests finally in the realm of judgment.

Feasibility of Delicensure for I/O Psychologists

Even if there were unanimous agreement that many or most I/O activities should not be licensed, there are still practical considerations in attempting to effect delicensure for I/O psychologists. The prevailing mood of the times may support such an effort, for legislators have begun to question the need for so much regulation in general, sunset reviews have posed challenges to psychology licensing in several states, and minority groups may increasingly charge the licensing exam with race discrimination. Moreover, it is not unprecedented to have groups exempted from psychology licensing, such as social psychologists (under an agreement with the American Sociological Association and stated in the 1967 APA guidelines for state legislation).

Many practical factors work against delicensure efforts. Effecting statutory changes can involve great time and effort, including learning the issues in each state, preparing a position paper and replies to legislators, writing a draft bill, educating the membership and others, raising money, hiring a professional lobbyist, getting sponsors, providing testimony, etc. In many states there are probably too few practicing I/O psychologists to wage an effective campaign. The APA Directory study showed that 19 states have less than 10 I/O psychologists and another 11 states have only 10 to 25 people.

Even if it could be accomplished, exemption from licensing might carry its share of risks, since it could lead to disenfranchisement from the rest of professional psychology and a loss of prestige to other licensed groups. But if there is no need to be licensed, the process seems wasteful of both the psychologists' and the state's time and efforts.

An Official Division 14 Position

The Executive Committee of Division 14 decided at its incoming meeting in August, 1981 to establish and act on an official position on licensing on behalf of the Division. The position reaffirmed that taken in connection with the proposed 1979 guidelines for state legislation, later reflected in the Specialty Guidelines for I/O Services; namely, that most I/O activities should *not* require licensure. The decision was made to send a letter over President **Art MacKinney**'s signature to the 51 state or territorial psychology boards (see Nov., 1981 *TIP*). The letter stated that most I/O psychologists should not be required to get a license, although the minority who perform health care services should not be precluded from the option of relicensure when their activities so require. The letter asked for advice on whether each board's regulations were in accord with the APA policy set in the Specialty Guidelines, and if not, if any plans were under way for revising them or if Division 14 could assist in this process. The responses received to date have not encouraged the hope of quick statutory changes, although they may point to states where local action might result in the enactment of the Division 14 position.

The latest word on the issue from APA indicates they may once again open their chambers to a dialogue on the need for licensing. At the January, 1982 meeting of APA Council, a proposal by a subcommittee of the Board of Directors was approved to look into a re-evaluation of education and credentialing for licensed psychologists. Included with the recommendation was an instruction to look into who should be licensed, although an amendment restricted the work of the task force to Clinical, Counseling, and School Psychology. Perhaps this reopening of the issue will provide I/O and other psychologists the opportunity to work toward a mutually acceptable solution to a serious joint problem.

It is hoped that the analysis presented here of licensing as it pertains to I/O Psychology will stimulate communication among I/O psychologists, psychologists in other specialties, and representatives on all the legislative and policy making bodies affecting the profession of psychology. A copy of the complete report can be obtained by writing to **Ann Howard, AT&T, 1776 On The Green, Room 2B47, Morristown, New Jersey 07960.**

State Affairs

WILLIAM C. HOWELL

Notes in previous issues of *TIP* have probably alerted you to the existence of a Div. 14 network which is attempting to keep abreast of activities in the states that may affect I/O psychologists. Management is afforded by the Ad Hoc State Affairs Committee whose members (the national and regional coordinators) were listed in the February issue. Through the state contacts and other sources, we try to stay current on legal and professional matters, to respond to requests for advice on individual problems, to promote awareness and cooperation among I/O psychologists within the states, and to serve as a point of contact with the Division.

If communication is to be effective and bi-directional, it is important that you become acquainted with your state contact or regional coordinator. The complete list is as follows:

Northeast Region **J. Marshall Brown,** Easton, PA

Me., **John D. Drake** (Kennebunkport)
N.H., **R. Stephen Jenks** (Durham)
Vt., **C. Wesley Cannom** (Norwich)
R.I., **Hollis B. Farnum** (Providence)
N.Y., **Andrew J. DuBrin** (Rochester)
N.J., **Paul Ross** (Basking Ridge)
Conn., **James O. Mitchell** (Hartford)
Mass., **Don Tear** (Worcester)
Pa., **J. Marshall Brown** (Easton)
Del., **Harry Loveless** (Dover)

Southeast Region **John M. Larsen, Jr.,** Knoxville, Tenn.

Ala., **John J. Hopkins** (Birmingham)
D.C., **Charles Allen** (Washington)
Fla., **Herb Meyer** (Tampa)
Ga., **Edward H. Loveland** (Atlanta)
Ky., **Glenn B. Williams** (Ashland)
Miss., **Ernest B. Guman** (Hattiesburg)
Md., **Irwin Goldstein** (College Park)
Andy Crosby (Chevy Chase)
N.C., **William McGehee** (Eden)
Tenn., **John M. Larsen, Jr.** (Knoxville)
Va., **Daniel L. Johnson** (Radford)
W. Va., **Robert L. Decker** (Morgantown)

Midwest Region **Milton D. Hakel,** Columbus, O.

Minn., **Ronald C. Page** (Minneapolis)
Mich., **Frederic R. Wickert** (East Lansing)
Ill., **Michael W. Nees** (Evanston)
Ohio, **Milton D. Hakel** (Columbus)
Ind., **Robert Vecchio,** (South Bend)
Iowa, **Jack Menne** (Ames)
Wisc., **Paul Williams** (Milwaukee)

Southwest Region **Charles G. Martin,** Houston, Tx.

Ark., **Louise M. Miller** (Little Rock)
La., **Lawrence Siegel** (Baton Rouge)
Kansas, **Donald L. Hardesty** (Topeka)
Mo., **Frederick J. Thumin** (St. Louis)
Tx., **Blake A. Frank** (Dallas)
Neb., **Carl I. Greenberg** (Omaha)
Okla., **William E. Jaynes** (Stillwater)

Rocky Mountain Region **Lynette B. Plumlee,** Cedar Crest, N.M.

Utah, **Gloria Wheeler** (Provo)
Colorado, **Jack E. Hautaluoma** (Ft. Collins)
Ariz., **Clay L. Moore** (Flagstaff)
Idaho, **Howard J. Kinslinger** (Boise)
Wyo., **Timothy J. Keaveny** (Laramie)
N.M., **Lynette B. Plumlee** (Cedar Crest)

Far West Region **Frank Ofsanko,** Rosemead, Ca.

Hawaii, **Mary Hopkins** (Honolulu)
Wash., **Peter Scontrino** (Issaquah)
Nev., **Harrie Hesse** (Las Vegas)
Ore., **David Myers** (Portland)
Ca., **Frank Ofsanko** (Rosemead)
Alaska, **Cheryl Friar** (Anchorage)

A major activity of this committee over the past months has been preparation of a report on state rules concerning temporary practice in one state by those licensed in another. Summarizing its contents, there seem to be three general ways in which state laws handle this case:

1. Granting of a *temporary license or permit,* usually for a fee, by the "host" state
2. Provision of an *exemption* from the licensing law by the "host" state, usually not involving a fee
3. *Reciprocity,* which involves a simplified route to licensure in the "host" state, usually for the regular fee.

States vary considerably both in which of these approaches are used and how they are implemented. Some use a combination (e.g., a *temporary permit* for longer periods; and *exemption* for shorter periods). The duration and requirements also vary, although most specify some number of days (or *business* days) per year, and require the individual to have been approved (licensed, certified, etc.) by his home state or country if its criteria are equivalent to those of the host state (as judged by the Board). Many require the individual to apply or report to the Board, indicating the extent and nature of the activity and verifying out-of-state credentials.

Anyone contemplating operating in the out-of-state mode should contact the Board in the host state to be sure he/she has the most current information. Both laws and operating rules have been changing rapidly. A listing of those states that *at this writing* permit some form of temporary practice is given below. A more complete report is included as an appendix to the document, *Licensing and Industrial/Organizational Psychology by* **Ann Howard** and **Rodney Lowman.** Copies may be obtained from Ann (see *Professional Affairs* report in this issue).

Limited-duration exemption

Arizona	Louisiana	N.C.
California	Maine	N.D.
Delaware	Massachusetts	Ohio
D.C.	Missouri	Oklahoma
Illinois	Montana	Pennsylvania
Indiana	Nebraska	Vermont
Iowa	Nevada	W. Virginia
Kansas	N.J.	Wisconsin

Temporary license or certification

Colorado	Massachusetts	Oklahoma
Georgia	Michigan	Oregon
Hawaii	Mississippi	Virginia
Kansas	N.H.	W. Virginia
Kentucky	New Mexico	Wyoming
Maine	N. Carolina	

Note: In many of the above, license or certificate is granted only on an interim basis while seeking permanent licensure.

GOVERNMENT RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

LAUREL W. OLIVER

Some months ago, we told you about some productivity research being conducted by the Productivity Research Division at the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). As that research group has been eliminated by budget cuts, almost all of their research has to be abandoned.

Some of the productivity research being carried out by military research groups is described below. **Tony Mento** tells about the quality circle work at the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFB) in Ohio. **Laurie Broedling** reports on the Productivity Research Program at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) in San Diego. Some of these NPRDC projects have been completed; others are ongoing.

AFIT Quality Circle Research

Quality circles are a popular human resources development technique with potential for enhancing both product quality and work group productivity in private and public sectors. There is within the Department of Defense (DOD) great interest in applying quality circle techniques to work problems confronting various DOD organizations. The Department of Defense has recently designated AFIT at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio as the principal center for conducting education, consultation, and research on Department of Defense quality circle efforts.

Presently, there are approximately 500 quality circles in operation at various DOD facilities around the country. A recent thrust of the Organizational Sciences Department at AFIT was to institute a rigorous program of research and evaluation of quality circle efforts in the DOD. Initial research sites have been a DOD Civil Engineering organization and a Medical Center in the DOD. A five day Quality Circles Facilitator training course, team-taught by AFIT faculty, is offered approximately 12 times a year at Wright-Patterson for federal sector personnel (primarily DOD). For more information about these quality circle efforts, contact **Tony Mento, Quality Circle Program Director, AUTOVON 785-4549** or **commercial (513) 255-4549.**

NPRDC Productivity Research Program

NPRDC does research and development (R&D) on ways to enhance productivity in the Navy through improving the ability and motivation of management and the work force. The research has thus far been done with the Navy's civilian shore establishment in maintenance and supply types of organizations. Long-term plans include extending this R&D to the Navy's military population. While the emphasis is in finding ways to improve workers' contribution to productivity, the influence of technology and equipment on productivity is not disregarded. People's ability and motivation determine the extent to which technology or equipment is introduced and is a main area of research focus.

Following are brief descriptions of NPRDC productivity projects. Some have been completed, and others are currently underway.

Increasing Productivity with Data Transcribers in Six Navy Shipyards (completed). A monetary incentive program designed to improve individual productivity was developed and implemented in the data entry section of a data processing center at a

Naval shipyard. A Performance Contingent Reward System (PCRS) was designed such that a monetary bonus was awarded for high individual productivity. The amount of the reward was directly proportional to the amount of work exceeding a production standard. Production for the 12-month period improved substantially. Excessive overtime and a heretofore perpetual backlog were virtually eliminated. The work force decreased in size but not in productivity as a few employees left the organization through natural attrition and were not replaced. The success of this project led to the implementation of PCRS at five other shipyards with an approximate average increase of 22% in productivity.

Productivity Improvement Program for Small Purchase Buyers in a Supply Department of a Naval Shipyard (completed). A productivity improvement program (PIP) was developed and implemented in the Small Purchase Branch of the Supply Department at a Naval shipyard. The PIP was designed to improve individual performance by improving work motivation among small purchase buyers and associated clerks through a monetary incentive program. Employees earned bonus money by performing at levels that exceeded performance standards both in terms of the quantity and quality of work produced. An evaluation showed a productivity improvement of over 17% during the tryout period and projected savings in excess of $500,000 over five years.

Identification of Impediments to Productivity in Navy Industrial Facilities (completed). A project directed at identifying impediments to productivity within the Navy's industrial community was completed in September 1980. Five field activities, representing the major types of industrial organizations, participated in the study. Impediments were identified using a combination of interviews and questionnaires. Impediments to productivity found to be common to more than one activity were in the following areas: (1) supply support, (2) automated data processing equipment, (3) erratic workloads, (4) micromanagement, (5) military rotation, (6) equipment, (7) coordination of instructions, (8) buying authority, (9) budget process, (10) pay/position management, (11) staffing, (12) training, and (13) employment restrictions.

Organizational Effectiveness of Program Management Offices (in process). The Deputy Secretary of Defense has established several objectives in weapons systems acquisition which include reducing costs, making the acquisition process more efficient, increasing program stability, and decreasing acquisition time. Improvement in the effectiveness of program management offices can contribute significantly to the achievement of these objectives. This study will examine several areas of program management in the Naval Material Command (NAVMAT) such as the structure of program managment offices, the styles and variety of management found in these offices, and the roles of key program management officials. Data obtained from a literature review, interviews with program management officials, and an examination of various organization and management theories will be used to develop a descriptive model. The goal of the model will be to describe elements of program management and their interactions to a sufficient level of detail to determine the appropriateness of the tasks and duties within the roles of program managers and their supporting personnel. The current effort is expected to be completed in the fall of 1982.

Productivity Enhancement Program for Production Workers at a Naval Shipyard (in progress). This project is concerned with implementing and evaluating the effects of a group-level Performance Contingent Reward System (PCRS) monetary incentive program for Federal industrial workers. A group-level performance measurement package has been developed and will be used to determine cash award for teams performing above standard on tasks requiring cooperative efforts among members.

Development of a Model Productivty Enhancement Program at a Naval Air Rework Facility (NARF) (in progress). A productivity improvement study is being conducted with wage grade production workers at a NARF. The research design involves two major motivational interventions of individual goal setting and performance feedback. A work reporting system that allows foremen to track both shop and individual performance has been developed and implemented. Foremen were trained in how to

use the reports to provide feedback to employees and to set individual performance goals. Results over the six month tryout period have shown a 10% to 18% increase in productivity. In FY82, these interventions will be coupled with a monetary wage incentive program and then evaluated. The same work measurement and reporting system is being implemented at another NARF for purposes of developing an integrated performance appraisal system. Baseline data will be gathered in FY82 at this NARF.

Assessing Quality Control Circles (in progress). Following questionnaire results indicating some 23 activities within NAVMAT had already begun a quality circle (QC) program and an additional 60 were interested in implementing them, a research effort was initiated to determine the effectiveness and utility of QCs in the Navy. The approach calls for the comparison of "white" and "blue" collar workers at four NAVMAT activities concerning the influence of QCs on various measures such as sick leave, attitude changes, number and scope of issues addressed, etc. Baseline measures have been collected and periodic data collection and interviews will continue throughout FY82. A post intervention questionnaire will be administered in early FY83.

Research on Civilian Personnel Management Issues (in progress). The productivity and efficiency of the Navy's 300,000 civilian workforce has a direct impact on how well the Navy is able to perform its mission. A research program comprised of studies which identify and test a variety of ways to improve civilian personnel management efficiency and productivity was established at NPRDC. Possible areas to be investigated include the following: staffing, classification/compensation, supervisory effectiveness, military/civilian relationships, manpower, EEO, training, labor relations, personnel management evaluations, personnel profession, and centralization of decision-making. The first study to be conducted will be of ways to enhance the effectiveness of first line supervisors.

Factors Affecting the Acceptance of Technological Change (in progress). This project investigates the impact of newly introduced office technology systems. In one federal agency, results of interviews showed that while most personnel had a positive overall attitude toward a new system, "Inadequate training and training materials" were cited as the most frequent potential problems. Research is continuing to determine (1) the level of use of the new technology, (2) the characteristics (e.g., level of support, expertise, and commitment of potential users) of the adopting unit to implementation, (3) the management strategies used to effect the implementation, and (4) the effect of the new system on productivity. A parallel research effort has begun at a Navy laboratory examining a newly implemented office technology system designed to enhance productivity.

Points of contact for this productivity research program are **Robert Penn, Laurie Broedling,** and **Steven Dockstader. AUTOVON 933-6935,** or **commercial (714) 225-6935.**

NOTE: I would very much like to hear about Government research which is *not* military-related research. Is there any going on out there??? Contact **Laurel Oliver** at the **Army Research Institute, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA. AUTOVON 284-8293,** or **commercial (202) 274-8293.**

Education and Training Committee: New Training Guidelines

RICHARD KLIMOSKI

Over the last 18 months the Education and Training Committee of the Division has been working on a revision of the guidelines for doctoral level training in I/O Psychology. A Draft of this revision is now available. It is the intent of the Committee to solicit input from all interested parties. Therefore, copies are being sent to programs throughout the country. If your program is represented in the Division's booklet *"Survey of Graduate Programs in I/O Psychology and Organizational Behavior,"* or if your school was included in the survey of programs conducted by **Carl Greenberg** and associates (recently published in *Professional Psychologist,* October 1981, and summarized in this issue, see pp. 42-43), you will be receiving a copy. Others who wish to review the draft should contact: **Richard Klimoski, Psychology Department, Ohio State University, 404C West 17th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210.**

Committee members will also be available at the APA Annual Conference in Washington in August. Time will be made available for discussion of the guidelines. Look for the time and place in future announcements.

IPMAAC Sourcebook Available

The IPMA Assessment Council (IPMAAC) recently completed development of a valuable, 52-page guide to information sources and services in public personnel assessment. Prepared by the IPMAAC Cooperative Research Committee, this "Sourcebook" contains information of interest to both personnel generalists and assessment specialists including such sources of information as professional associations; consortia and regional organizations; abstract and computerized literature search services; professional journals, newsletters and other publications; information services; and information sharing facilities. In addition, the "Sourcebook" provides a section on selecting and evaluating consultant services and products as well as a listing of consultants including areas of expertise and products and services offered.

The "Sourcebook" is provided in a looseleaf, three-hole punched format which allows for supplementary and updated material to be incorporated. IPMAAC will periodically provide updated information for inclusion in the publication.

Copies of the "Sourcebook" are available to IPMA members at a cost of $12.75 each. To obtain a copy of this publication, please enclose a check payable to the **International Personnel Management Association,** and Send to: **"Sourcebook," IPMA Assessment Council, 1850 K Street N.W., Suite 870, Washington, D.C. 20006.**

THE 30th ANNUAL INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY WORKSHOPS

Presented as part of the annual convention of
The American Psychological Association
Sunday, August 22, 1982
Sheraton Washington Hotel
Washington, D.C.

WORKSHOP COMMITTEE

Tove Helland Hammer, Chair
Stanley B. Silverman, Treasurer
Richard D. Arvey
Richard S. Barrett
William J. Bigoness
Larry L. Cummings
M. A. Fischl
Morgan McCall, Jr.
Robert A. Ramos
Richard J. Ritchie

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

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Sunday, August 22, 1982

Sheraton Washington Hotel — Washington, D.C.

8:15 a.m.	9:00 a.m.	Registration
9:00 a.m.	12:30 p.m.	Morning Sessions
12:30 p.m.	1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m.	5:00 p.m.	Afternoon Sessions
5:30 p.m.	7:30 p.m.	Reception

Section I	Leadership and Decision-Making: The Vroom-Yetton Model **Victor H. Vroom**
Section II	The Use of Confirmatory Analysis in Research and Practice **Lawrence R. James, Stanley A. Mulaik,** and **Jeanne M. Brett**
Section III	Designing Research with Implementation in Mind **Melvin Sorcher, Michael Beer,** and **Joseph L. Moses**
Section IV	EEO in the Courtroom **William C. Burns, Barry L. Goldstein,** and **N. Thompson Powers**
Section V	Performance Assessment and Feedback: Substance and Style **Frank J. Landy** and **Daniel R. Ilgen**
Section VI	Validity Generalization and Situational Sepcificity: Results from Two Industry-Wide Studies **Marvin D. Dunnette** and **Norman G. Peterson**
Section VII	Consulting with Industry **Daniel E. Lupton** and **John R. Hinrichs**
Section VIII	Current Practices and Issues in Compensation **Daniel M. Glasner**
Section IX	Opinion Survey Feedback **Allen I. Kraut**
Section X	EEO/Fair Employment Update **Edward E. Potter** and **James Campbell Sharf**

SECTION I (Full Day)
Leadership and Decision-Making: The Vroom-Yetton Model

Victor H. Vroom
Yale University

This one-day workshop will provide participants with a working knowledge of the Vroom-Yetton model and related approaches to the investigation of leadership styles in organizations. The morning will focus on the model itself, its relationship with other approaches to leadership, and on evidence concerning its validity. The afternoon will deal with current applications of the model, most particularly to research on organizations and to management and organizational development. The topical outline will include: 1) the Vroom-Yetton model; 2) applications of research on the model to management and organizational development; and, 3) new frontiers.

The workshop will be experiential. Participants will practice applying the model to cases and will receive computer-based feedback on their leadership style based on cases completed prior to the workshop.

The methods of presentation will include lecture discussion and small group work. The recommended audience includes managers involved in management and organizational research in corporate setting.

Victor H. Vroom is the John G. Searle Professor of Administrative Sciences and Professor of Psychology, Yale University. He is the past president of Division 14.

Coordinator: **Larry L. Cummings,** Northwestern University.

SECTION II (Full Day)
The Use of Confirmatory Analysis in Research and Practice

Lawrence R. James
Georgia Institute of Technology

Stanley A. Mulaik
Georgia Institute of Technology

Jeanne M. Brett
Northwestern University

This workshop was developed for APA's Conference on Innovations in Methodology for Organizational Research, which was sponsored by Division 14, and held at the Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina, in March 1981. It was called *"Innovative Uses of Quantitative Techniques in Organizational Research."*

Confirmatory analysis is a family of empirical procedures designed to evaluate the utility of causal hypotheses and to support inferences regarding causality among naturally occuring events. The objectives of the workshop are (1) to familiarize the participant with a logical framework and associated quantitative methods for making causal inferences from research data, (2) to increase the participant's skill at developing theoretical models and confirming/disconfirming these models with empirical data, and (3) to illustrate how to generate interesting research by contrasting alternative, a priori, theoretical perspectives.

The workshop will cover the following topics: Causality, conditions for making causal inference, causal modeling with latent variables, and causal inference. There will be a mixture of lecture presentations and group discussions, in which participants will be given problem sets to practice applying the principles covered in the lectures.

The workshop is recommended for both practitioners and researchers who wish to improve their theoretical skills, and their confirmatory analysis skills. Participants should have a working knowledge of regression analysis and participants who are theoretically, not quantitatively oriented, will learn a great deal about the structure of good (i.e., testable) theories.

Lawrence R. James and **Stanley A. Mulaik** are both Professors of Psychology at Georgia Institute of Technology. **Jeanne M. Brett** is Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior, Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University. They have a forthcoming book with Sage Publishers which provides an in-depth coverage of the topics to be presented in the workshop.

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

SECTION III (Half Day)

Designing Research with Implementation in Mind

Melvin Sorcher
Richardson-Vicks Inc.

Michael Beer
Harvard University

Joseph L. Moses
AT&T

I/O psychologists have been trained in research methodology but many of us have found it difficult to implement our research ideas in organizational settings. The objective of this workshop is to broaden the effectiveness of an applied researcher.

The workshop will start with a case study to illustrate the issues which must be understood and the steps that need to be taken when proposing and conducting research in organizational settings. The first part of the workshop will probe the perceptual, organizing, and analytical skills which are the basic tools of research with implementation in mind. The second part of the workshop will give instruction and practice in the communication and analytic skills needed to gain encouragement and support from operating personnel in a research context.

Melvin Sorcher is Director of Management Development at Richardson-Vicks Inc. His research interests in recent years have focused on the development of "behavior modeling"—a now widely-used strategy for training managers how to deal more competently with their associates and subordinates.

Michael Beer is Lecturer on Business Administration at the Harvard Business School. He recently has completed a book on organizational development that integrates scholarly knowledge about change processes with the techniques required for carrying out those changes in complex organizations.

Joseph L. Moses is Manager of Research at AT&T, where he is involved in management selection and staffing research. Much of his work has centered around designing research with implementation in mind, including assessment centers, behavior modeling, career planning, and coping with ambiguity.

Coordinator: **Morgan McCall, Jr.,** Center for Creative Leadership.

SECTION IV (Half Day)

EEO in the Courtroom

William C. Burns
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Barry L. Goldstein
NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Inc.

N. Thompson Powers
Steptoe and Johnson, Chartered

The preparation of a case under Title VII will be discussed from the point of view of the plaintiff's attorney, the defendant's attorney and the expert witness. Emphasis will be placed on the preparation for trial from the points of view of the three different kinds of participants.

A mock trial will be presented at the end of the session with ample time for discussion of the preparation and of the trial itself.

Participants in the workshop session are invited to bring with them questions about the preparation and conduct of a litigation.

William C. Burns has been Director of Personnel Research for Pacific Gas and Electric since 1972. He was Chairman of the committee which drafted the 1972 California Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures which introduced the 80% rule and the bottom line concept. He has served as an expert witness in several fair employment cases, including **Officers for Justice,** and served as consultant to the plaintiffs in **Luevano** (the PACE case).

Barry L. Goldstein is a staff attorney in charge of the Washington Office of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. He has been an attorney in significant fair employment

cases, including *James v. Stockham Valve and Fittings, Inc., Detroit Police Officers Association* v. *Young,* and *Albemarle Paper Company* v. *Moody.*

N. Thompson Powers is a member of Steptoe and Johnson, Chartered. He was Executive Director of the EEOC in 1965 and Special Counsel to the President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity 1962-1965.

Coordinator: **Richard S. Barrett,** Organizational Sciences Associates

SECTION V (Half Day)

Performance Assessment and Feedback: Substance and Style

Frank J. Landy
The Pennsylvania State University

Daniel R. Ilgen
Purdue University

Over the past several decades, there has been extensive discussion about the mechanics of performance evaluation. This has included such issues as the type of information to be gathered, the person(s) most suitable for providing the information, the physical characteristics of the information gathering device/system, and the metric of the information. Some of this discussion has been useful and some has been trivial. It is important to separate the two and this workshop will place research and administration in perspective. In addition, there have been some major advances recently in understanding the subtle interplay between the substance of feedback and the feedback process. The workshop will integrate the concepts of performance definition and performance feedback. Finally, there will be some discussion of the value systems which support various systems of performance measurement and feedback in the hope that such clarification may be helpful in determining which of many approaches may be most suitable in a given organizational environment.

Frank J. Landy, Ph.D., is currently Professor of Psychology at The Pennsylvania State University. He is also a partner in the consulting firm of Landy, Farr and Jacobs. He has authored numerous papers. He is co-editor, with **Sheldon Zedeck** and **Jan Cleveland,** of a collection of papers on performance appraisals, and co-author, with **James Farr,** of a new book on performance appraisals.

Daniel R. Ilgen, Ph.D., is currently Professor of Psychology in the Department of Psychological Sciences at Purdue. His major field of interest is organizational psychology. He is co-author, with **E. J. McCormick,** of *Industrial Psychology,* 7th Edition, and also, with **J. C. Naylor** and **R. D. Pritchard,** of *A Theory of Behavior in Organizations.*

Coordinator: **Richard J. Ritchie,** AT&T

SECTION VI (Half Day)

Validity Generalization and Situational Specificity: Results From Two Industry-Wide Studies

Marvin D. Dunnette
University of Minnesota

Norman G. Peterson
Research Institute in Minnesota

Results from two recently completed large-scale industry-wide consortium validation studies will be presented. The first, sponsored by the Life Office Management Association, involved 110 Insurance Companies located throughout the United States and Canada. Predictive validities were evaluated according to differences by company, jobs, sex, and race, and also according to level of job complexity.

A second study, sponsored by the Edison Electric Institute, involved employees working in nearly 250 plants, operated by 70 electric-utility companies. Concurrent validities were evaluated according to differences across companies, job types, race, and sex.

Methods used and results obtained from these two investigations will be described in detail and their implications for future practices in validitation and selection research will be discussed.

Marvin D. Dunnette is a Professor of Psychology at the University of Minnesota and President of Personnel Decisions Research Institute in Minneapolis. Through his teaching and his publications, Dr. Dunnette has influenced I/O psychology on both a national and international level.

Norman G. Peterson is an I/O Psychologist in Minnesota, currently serving as Vice President of Personnel Decisions Research Institute. Dr. Peterson's past work experience includes three years as Director of Personnel Research for the State of Minnesota.

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

SECTION VII (Half Day)

Consulting with Industry

Daniel E. Lupton
Towers, Perrin, Forster & Crosby

John R. Hinrichs
Management Decision Systems

This workshop will cover two aspects of the consulting relationship with client organizations. **John Hinrichs** will discuss, on the basis of his personal experience, the process of setting up a consulting firm from the time that the urge to be on one's own begins to press itself forward into the consciousness to the time that the consulting firm is in operation. The presentation will include the mechanics of getting started, developing the clientele, establishing one's self in a field of specialty, the process of growth and the problems that must be addressed before the consulting firm can be established. Hinrichs will illustrate the material with personal experiences and background from other organizations with which he is familiar. Discussion of the process of establishing a consulting firm will be encouraged from the participants.

Daniel Lupton will discuss the client relationship and illustrate it with a participatory case problem on the development of a performance rating procedure which is carried from the proposal stage on to the development of a completed plan for the development, and assist in the installation and evaluation of the performance rating procedure and maintenance of the program.

Daniel E. Lupton is a Vice President with Towers, Perrin, Forster & Crosby in New York City. He developed and directed a consulting skills workshop for the training of others within the firm. Prior to joining TPF&C he was a consultant with Rohrer, Hibbler & Replogle, and a research psychologist with Science Research Associates and with the University of Illinois Medical Center.

John R. Hinrichs founded Management Decision Systems in 1976. Under his direction, the firm has grown to five professionals who consult in all areas of Human Resources Management. Prior to forming MDS, he was a staff psychologist with International Business Machines.

Coordinator: **Richard S. Barrett,** Organizational Sciences Associates

SECTION VIII (Half Day)

Current Practices and Issues in Compensation

Daniel M. Glasner
Hay Associates

The workshop will cover techniques and tools that are typically used by the Compensation function in major industrial organizations to determine salaries and cash incentives for management and professional positions. There will be brief demonstrations involving application of common techniques for job definition. The demonstrations will provide the basis for discussion of current issues relating compensation practices to psychological principles and social values.

Hay Associates, Philadelphia, is a leading professional consulting organization in relation to all types of employee compensation for all job levels and fuctions, and in relation to broad matters of human resources strategy and management practice. **Daniel M. Glasner** is Director-Technical Studies for the world-wide Reward Management practice emphasis, and has been associated with Hay since 1967. His MS and Ph.D. were from Purdue in Industrial Psychology in 1962 and 1963.

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

SECTION IX (Half Day)

Opinion Survey Feedback

Allen I. Kraut
International Business Machines Corporation

This workshop will focus on the feedback of opinion survey data. Feedback is increasingly recognized as the crucial step in getting the most out of surveys.

This workshop will review:

A. The practical and symbolic reasons for giving feedback on survey results. Problem solving and organization development opportunities are key issues.
B. Different models of feedback currently used, including the "Waterfall" approach, which starts at the top of an organization, and the "Bubble-up" approach, which starts at the bottom. The resources will be discussed, along with the pro's and con's of each method.
C. Research findings on what unit managers can do to make feedback meetings effective.
D. Examples of the guidance managers can be given to help them understand their role in this process.
E. A well-tested training program (with videotape) used to prepare managers to conduct their feedback meetings.

The intended audience for this workshop are practitioners and researchers who have been or are involved in employee opinion surveys. Participants will be encouraged to discuss, and to provide feedback, on the materials presented. Thus, the workshop may improve the state of art in this area of practice.

Allen I. Kraut is Program Manager, Personnel Research, for the International Business Machines Corporation and a Fellow of Division 14. A University of Michigan Ph.D., he is also Research Professor at New York University. He has extensive international experience in conducting employee opinion surveys, and has published several articles on their effective utilization.

Coordinator: **William J. Bigoness,** The University of North Carolina

SECTION X (Half Day)

EEO/Fair Employment Update

Edward E. Potter
McGuiness & Williams

James Campbell Sharf
Richardson, Bellows, Henry & Co.

The objectives of this workshop are to provide an update of current Supreme Court EEO/testing decisions and an examination of the regulatory developments and enforcement policies of the Reagan Administration. The workshop leaders will summarize developing case law which impacts on job evaluation, employee selection, promotion, validity generalization and performance appraisal. The current status of Alternative Guidelines presented to the Bush Regulatory Task Force will also be reviewed.

The material covered in the workshop will be presented in a workbook which participants will work through under the direction of the leaders.

The workshop will be especially beneficial for I/O practitioners with a fundamental knowledge of the landmark Supreme Court decisions concerning employment testing, who have studied the *Professional and Legal Analysis of Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* (1981).

Edward E. Potter is a partner in the law firm of McGuinness & Williams in Washington, D.C., specializing in labor and equal employment opportunity law. He was a member of the Ad Hoc Group on Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures and is currently counsel to the Employee Selection Subcommittee of the Equal Employment Advisory Council, which has drafted a revised set of Guidelines for consideration by the federal enforcement agencies. He holds an M.S. in industrial and labor relations from Cornell University, and a J.D. from American University.

James Campbell Sharf is Vice President of Richardson, Bellows, Henry & Co., in Washington, D.C., a firm specializing in the development, validation and implementation of corporate selection and performance appraisal procedures. Dr. Sharf was a member of the Ad Hoc Group on Uniform Guidelines and worked with the Equal Employment Advisory Council in drafting a set of "alternative guidelines." He received his M.S. and Ph.D. in Organizational Psychology from the University of Tennessee.

Coordinator: **M. A. Fischl,** Army Research Institute

REGISTRATION
30th Annual APA Division 14 Workshops

Sheraton Washington Hotel — Washington, D.C.

Sunday, August 22, 1982

NAME (Please Print) _____

POSITION _____

MAILING ADDRESS _____

_____

_____

PHONE ( ) _____ EXT. _____

APA DIVISION MEMBERSHIP(S) _____

A Note to Registrants:

Two (2) of this year's workshops have been designated as day long workshops. When filling out your registration form, please take this fact into account. If you request a full-day session as one of your options, please do NOT indicate an additional half-day session within that same option. PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU EITHER CHOOSE TWO HALF-DAY SESSIONS OR ONE FULL-DAY SESSION.

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

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

$125 Division 14 Members and Student affiliates — $150 APA Members — $175 Non-APA, Non-Division 14 Members

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

Please make check or money order payable to: **APA Division 14 Workshop Committee**

Mail form and registration fees to:

Stanley B. Silverman, Treasurer
Division 14 Workshop Committee
Organizational Consulting Group
483 Overwood Road
Akron, Ohio 44313

(216) 836-4001 or (216) 864-0409

EEO ISSUES:

National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences Report—
Ability Testing: Uses, Consequences and Controversies

JAMES C. SHARF

This two volume report was issued by the Committee on Ability Testing in February accompanied by a day-long public presentation covered by the national press. The Committee's objective was a "white paper" examining the role of testing in contemporary society. Committee members from diverse disciplines including law, history, anthropology, sociology, economics, experimental psychology, math and education included Division 14's **Mary Tenopyr** and **Mel Novick.**

Volume I is addressed to public policy makers and test users and provides an overview of testing issues and controversies in both educational and employment contexts. The employment chapter identified a "destructive tension" between the compelling societal goals of productivity and EEO and noted that judges are requiring a "degree of technical adequacy that tests and test users apparently cannot provide." Also noted was that "The Committee has seen no evidence of alternatives to testing that are equally informative, equally adequate technically, and also economically and politically viable...and little evidence that well-constructed and competently administered tests are more valid predictors for one population subgroup than for another: individuals with higher scores tend to perform better on the job, regardless of group identity." "Research evidence does not support the notion that tests systematically underpredict the performance of minority group members." The Committee noted "There is some irony in the fact that an agency with no intrinsic interest in tests has come to be the arbiter of what constitutes technical acuracy ...The policy of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is clearly to make the justification of test use as demanding as possible wherever tests result in differential selection." The Committee's recommendations include the following: "The validity of the testing process should not be compromised in the effort to shape the distribution of the workforce."

Volume II is a set of 11 signed papers divided between employment testing, educational testing and psychometric issues. Of significance are the two pschometric issues chapters on "Individual Differences, Prediction and Differential Prediction" and "The Implications of Coaching for Ability Testing" authored by **Bob Linn** and **Nancy Cole** respectively.

Any practitioner who has ever been asked to prepare for litigation will find these volumes both timely and authoritative treatments of testing issues in contemporary society. Volume I ($13.95) and Volume II ($24.95) may be ordered from the **National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.**

(Editor's Note: The following editorial from the *Wall Street Journal,* Feb. 5, 1982, is one early response to the report described by **Jim Sharf** in the previous article.)

Testing the Tests

A panel of the National Academy of Sciences has just released a report on its four-year study of hiring and admissions tests. These standardized tests are used by employers and educational institutions to get some measure of an applicant's abilities. The tests do indeed provide such a measure, the academy's learned panel concluded. This was not exactly a blockbuster of a conclusion. But it has deeply embarrassed the affirmative action advocates who for years have been telling us that the tests are nothing but a form of institutionalized racism.

The affirmative action movement, you'll recall, began by calling for an end to hiring and admissions discrimination against minority groups. The movement soon had to face the fact that many institutions did not practice discrimination but still ended up with few minority group members in their midst. The affirmative action warriors did not retreat. Instead they came up with the ingenious argument that the neutral, color-blind, fair hiring systems weren't really fair after all. For instance, take all those standardized tests we thought were so even-handed. The tests were actually biased against minorities, said the affirmative action folks. And they didn't even predict how well an applicant would actually do in the classroom or on the job.

The challenge was deemed serious enough to prompt the academy to undertake its extensive, expert study. But now the conclusions have gone decisively against the critics. The tests, it turns out, have a limited but real ability to predict how well applicants will perform. And they predict minority group performance as reliably as they tell about future performance by non-minority individuals.

The academy's experts hasten to surround their verdict with warnings and qualifications. Tests should not be used as the sole criteria for admissions and hiring, they say. We may well want to soften the bad social effects of the tests by finding other ways to ensure the inclusion of enough minorities in our schools and desirable workplaces. We should make sure that the particular tests we are using are good and valid.

But the tests are not biased. They may reflect deprivations in the background of minority group members, but the tests themselves are not to blame for differences in performance. We should not mess around with the tests just to make sure we get as many blacks as whites with a passing grade.

This is no more than common sense would have suggested, but it needed to be said. One of the worst excesses of the affirmative action campaign was that it pursued goals by systematically attacking the tests, interviews, and other procedures we have developed to allocate society's prizes. These methods were never perfect but they were at least part of an effort to introduce objectivity and fairness into a process that was once widely used to preserve a social and economic elite. If the affirmative action movement had succeeded in discrediting them, it would have in the name of a "fairness" that fails to fit the definition of that word, destroyed one of the best tools this society has for keeping the door open to social security.

Who Are the I/O Psychologists?
Summary of an Analysis of Data from the 1981 Directory Survey

ANN HOWARD

The survey of psychologists conducted for the preparation of the 1981 APA Directory provided the data base for a recent report to the Division 14 Executive Committee on the characteristics of I/O psychologists. Statistical analyses were conducted on the computer at the Bell Laboratories by AT&T's Basic Human Resources Research staff. Editorial comments and other suggestions were contributed by members of the Professional Affairs Committee **(Laurie Eyde, Dick Reilly, Rod Lowman, Martin Greller, Bill Sauser, Joe Cutcliffe,** and **Bill Grossnickle).**

Of the 52,440 psychologists listed as APA members, 2800 or 5.3% designated I/O Psychology as their major field of practice. Of these:

- 74.9% held a Ph.D., 3.4% an Ed.D., 0.1% a Psy.D., 19.8% a Master's, 0.6% a Bachelor's or less, and 1.2% another type of professional degree
- 51% received their highest degree in I/O Psychology
- 44.6% earned their highest degree since 1970
- 11.2% were women
- 3.4% were minorities
- 32.8% were employed in business, 29.9% in academia, 14.5% in professional settings of a non-mental-health nature, 8.3% in government, 6.5% in mental health services, and 8.1% in other settings.

Faced with choosing two subspecialty areas, I/O psychologists most often selected General Personnel and General Management and Organization. Those who chose one of these as a first subspecialty were most likely to choose the other as a second subspecialty. Management and Organization subspecialties were selected by more of the newer than older graduates and there was a slight decline in the popularity of Selection and Placement. Consumer and Engineering Psychology seemed fairly independent of I/O Psychology in terms of graduate training, selection of subspecialties, and participation in the relevant divisions.

Only 53.2% of those calling themselves I/O psychologists belonged to Division 14, which suggests an opportunity both to recruit new members and to find out what has made them reluctant to join before. Of the 2009 Division 14 members, 1489 called I/O their major field but another 520 (25.9%) designated another field as primary.

When the I/O psychologists joining Division 14 were compared to those who did not join, the joiners were more likely to be I/O majors, have Ph.D.'s be employed in business and academia rather than government, be ABPP Diplomates, have licenses, and belong to state associations. The Division has been joined by a greater proportion of white male I/O psychologists than women or Blacks in the specialty, although the numbers in the latter groups have increased notably in just the last few years, as they have in all of APA.

I/O psychologists appeared to be less involved in licensing and state associations compared to the other recognized groups in professional psychology (Clinical, Counseling and School). Moreover the newer graduates were less involved in these activities than those who received their degrees earlier. Some 20.2% of I/O psychologists had joined state associations, 45.1% were licensed, and 5.3% were ABPP Diplomates. Most likely to be licensed were those with mental health degrees or subspecialties or those who worked in mental health settings. Women and minorities were less likely to be licensed than white males both at the doctorate and master's levels.

The data in the report raise many questions about professionalism but also provide the best available evidence on which to base future policies with respect to such issues as licensing and ABPP credentialing. A copy of the complete report can be obtained by writing to **Ann Howard, AT&T, 1776 On The Green, Room 2B47, Morristown, New Jersey 07960.**

(Editor's Note: The following article is reprinted from the Division of Consulting Psychology's newsletter, Winter 1982, with permission from the author. The data are from 1973; those interested in longitudinal analyses should compare these results with those found in 1981 data mentioned by **Ann Howard,** see p. 36).

The Industrial/Organizational Psychologist as Consultant and Researcher

PAUL J. LLOYD and THOMAS J. KRAMER

Industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology combines aspects of both a scientific discipline and a professional practice. It is traditionally an area which calls for the integration of research and application. As a consultant to business and industry, a psychologist is in an excellent position to understand the phenomenological world of management and also to present new ways for the executive to view a business organization. The problem areas identified jointly by business and psychology can be valuable heuristic guidelines for articulating research hypotheses. Thus the I/O psychologist as a consultant is in an ideal situation to originate research based on sound methodology which is relevant to the business community.

Although the importance of research within the context of I/O consulting is evident, research is at a minimum on the interrelationships between research and consulting. A study by Sutton (1974) included unanalyzed data pertinent to such inquiry. Sutton compared the attitudes of businessmen and I/O psychologists concerning the functions and utilization of I/O psychologists. Data were obtained from questionnaires administered to 227 participants of American Management Association seminars and mailed to the membership of the American Psychological Association Division of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. The demographic data for I/O psychologists obtained as part of this larger data collection were analyzed to determine the association between the amount of time spent in consulting activities and the amount of time spent in research activities. The data were also examined to see the relationship between primary employer and research/consulting activities, teaching and other demographic data collected. One objective was to ascertain if there exists demographic differences between I/O psychologists whose primary place of employment is in a university setting and I/O psychologists working mainly in non-academic situations.

Method

Questionnaires were mailed to 1,225 members of the Division of Industrial/Organizational Psychology (Division 14) of the American Psychological Association. The return rate for useable questionnaires was 40%, or a total of 489 respondents. One page of the questionnaire concerned with personal data requested information in regard to age, sex, highest earned degree, area and year in which the degree was obtained, number of years experience in industrial/organizational psychology, type of organization which was the respondent's primary employer, and time spent in various professional activities (I/O consulting, research, teaching, other consulting, other activities).

The responses were coded numerically by the respondents. These demographic data were analyzed by the linear discriminant analysis method for two groups. Three sets of dichotomized criterion variables were selected for separate analysis. These were (1) primary employer as nonacademic or academic, (2) amount of industrial/organizational consulting as less or more than 20 hours per week, and (3) research activity as less or more than five hours per week.

Results

Tables 1 and 2 present frequency distributions for the demographic measures. One-third of the sample indicated academic institution as primary employer. Most of the

I/O psychologists were male (96%) and had earned doctorate degrees (82%). Seventy-seven percent obtained their degree since 1951. Sixty-four percent have degrees in the area of industrial/organizational psychology. Eighty-two percent were between the ages of 31 and 60. Seventy-three percent had worked in the area of I/O psychology for six to twenty-five years.

I/O consulting was reported as the major professional activity. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents engaged in I/O consulting 26 or more hours per week. Research activity was reported by 46 percent as being five or more hours per week.

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics for a Sample of 489 Industrial/Organizational Psychologists

Primary Employer	*N*	%	*Age*	*N*	%
Business	216	43	20-30	31	6
Academic	161	33	31-40	134	28
Service Org.	72	15	41-50	148	30
Government	40	9	51-60	118	24
			61-65	58	12
Education	*N*	%	*Sex*	*N*	%
Masters	89	18	Male	467	96
Doctorate	400	82	Female	22	4
Years of Degree	*N*	%	*Major Area*	*N*	%
Before 1930	7	1	Clinical	41	8
1930-1940	34	7	Counseling	30	6
1941-1950	72	15	Experimental	46	9
1951-1960	152	31	I/O	310	64
1961-1970	188	39	School	5	1
1971-Present	36	7	Other	57	12
Years Experience	*N*	%	*Years Experience*	*N*	%
1-5	65	13	21-25	88	18
6-10	106	22	26-30	39	8
11-25	75	15	31-35	16	3
16-20	87	18	36-61	13	3

The linear discriminant analyses yielded interrelated predictor variables for the three sets of criterion variables which are presented in Table 3. Multiple correlations for the two strongest predictors for each of the three sets of criterion variables led to significant increases in the accuracy of prediction. The multiple correlations (R) are also presented in Table 3.

The two best predictors of primary employer were amount of time spent teaching and the amount of time spent in I/O consulting activities. Amount of time spent in research was non-significant as a predictor of primary locus of work. However, amount

TABLE 2

Hours Per Week Spent on Various Professional Activities for a Sample of 489 Industrial/Organizational Psychologists

Activity	*Hours per Week*	*N*	%
I/O Consulting	0-5	189	39
	6-10	70	14
	11-15	35	7
	16-20	33	7
	21-25	18	4
	26 or more	144	29
Research	0-5	263	54
	6-10	66	14
	11-15	51	10
	16-20	39	8
	21-25	20	4
	26 or more	50	10
Teaching	0-5	325	66
	6-10	61	13
	11-15	41	8
	16-20	24	5
	21-25	13	3
	26 or more	25	5
Other Consulting	0-5	393	81
	6-10	58	12
	11-15	20	4
	16-20	7	1
	21-25	5	1
	26 or more	7	1
Other Activities	0-5	339	69
	6-10	38	8
	11-15	25	5
	16-20	27	6
	21-25	14	3
	26 or more	46	9

of time spent in research activities was the second most powerful predictor of I/O consulting activities exceeding twenty hours per week. In addition, I/O consulting was the best predictor for research activities of more than five hours per week.

The multiple correlations indicate the best sets of predictors for the criterion variables. The major areas of activity and non-activity for the I/O psychologists are performance indices whose interrelationships are the best demographic predictors for all three sets of criterion variables.

Discussion

The implications of these results are not encouraging. Rather than a dynamic interchange between consulting and research, there is a tendency for those who do

Table 3

Linear Discriminant Analyses for Three Sets of Dichotomized Criterion Variables

Dichotomized Criteria Variables		*Predictor Variables*	*r*	*R*
Primary Employer	academic or non-academic	Teaching	.63	.63
		I/O Consulting	−.44	.70
I/O Consulting	more than 20 h/ less than 21 h	Primary Employer	−.44	.44
		Research	−.35	.55
Research	more than 5 h/ less than 6 h	I/O Consulting	−.35	.35
		Other Activities (e.g., administration)	−.15	.45

research not to be involved in I/O consulting, and vice versa. The amount of time given to research (more than 5 hours per week) was found to be inversely related to the amount of time spent in I/O consulting (more than 20 hours per week), $r = -.35$, $p < .01$.

Whether the primary locus of work was in an academic or non-academic setting was not found to be a significant correlate for amount of time spent in research activities, $r = .06$. Also, the correlation between teaching and research activities was not significant, $r = .04$.

Assuming that research of a relevant nature is desirable, and that I/O psychology is able to make significant contributions to the business community, the implications are that there is a need to be fulfilled. Meltzer (1973) noted that the lack of relevant I/O psychology research is a major contemporary problem. A review of over forty years of the *Psychological Abstracts* revealed that the preponderance of published research in the field of I/O psychology is by psychologists not employed as consultants. Bass (1974) also pointed out the need to "look at real world data for the source of our problems and to bring into our experimental paradigms data that we can solidly connect to the real world."

An emphasis on the importance of research strategies in consulting should be an integral part of the training for an I/O consultant. The I/O psychologist will be able to offer the business community the methodological services that distinguish psychology as a scientific discipline. Dissemination of research originated by consultants through publications such as the *Consulting Psychology Bulletin* and other media will help further the profession of psychology. In this way, psychology will optimally service the needs of business and industry, and be beneficial in bridging the apparent hiatus between research and consulting.

References

Bass, B. M. The substance and the shadow. *American Psychologist*, 1974, *29*, 870-886.

Meltzer, H. The content of industrial psychology in psychological abstracts, 1927-70. *Professional Psychology*, 1973, *4*, 321-328.

Sutton, D. E. *A study of the role and need for industrial-organizational psychologists: Their own views contrasted with the views of organizational managers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Saint Louis University, 1974.

A Survey of I/O Doctoral Programs

KENNETH P. De MEUSE and CARL I. GREENBERG

If asked to name the five top I/O psychology doctoral programs in the country, most likely each of us could possibly identify a handful of schools. Whether this ranking was due to mere familiarity with only a small subset of universities, or whether there actually exists qualitative differences across programs is a good question. It was just such a question that prompted a group of researchers to investigate this issue. The results have been recently published in the October issue of *Professional Psychology*, pp. 548-548 (**Greenberg, Thomas, Dossett, Robinson, De Meuse** & **Pendergrass,** 1981). We will highlight some of our findings.

In the summer of 1978, a questionnaire was mailed to a stratified, random sample of Division 14 members. The questionnaire was composed of two parts. Part I asked respondents to first indicate whether they were familiar with each of the 39 I/O PhD-granting programs that were listed, and then categorize each into one of the following: a) schools that they would recommend to promising graduate students as being among the best; b) schools they would recommend to promising graduate students as having an *adequate* program; or c) schools they would *not recommend* to promising graduate students. Part 2 asked respondents to rate on a seven-point scale to what degree various characteristics described "best" and "adequate" programs, respectively.

In brief, the results showed that the ten highest ranked programs were Purdue, Minnesota, Ohio State, Michigan, Bowling Green, Illinois and Maryland (tied), Michigan State, Penn State and New York University, respectively. The remaining schools rounding out the top 50% (i.e., ranked 11th through 20th) were Carnegie-Mellon, Wayne State, California-Irvine, Houston, Tennessee, Akron, Colorado State, Georgia Institute of Technology, North Carolina State and South Florida. The rank order correlation (rho) between familiarity and recommendation score values of all programs was .98 ($p < .001$). Thus, as expected, there appears to be a very strong relationship between respondents' positive evaluation of an I/O program and its familiarity within the I/O psychology community.

Ten characteristics, of the 22 measured, statistically distinguished "best" from "adequate" programs. The "best" programs were rated significantly higher on the following items:

1) know faculty by reputation;
2) strong quantitative method emphasis;
3) access to research tools (e.g., computers, etc.);
4) know graduates by reputation;
5) faculty has large number of publications;
6) know faculty personally;
7) personnel selection emphasis;
8) know graduates personally;
9) strong experimental orientation; and
10) training emphasis.

The following 12 characteristics did not significantly differ ($p > .05$) between perceived "best" and "adequate" programs: organization behavior emphasis, emphasis on "hands on" experience in field, faculty graduated from respected schools, faculty contacts for industrial job placement, strong practicum emphasis, organization development emphasis, practica and internships are closely monitored, strong internship program, many industries in surrounding community, human factors emphasis, many cultural opportunities in community and pleasant community environment (e.g., low crime rate, etc.).

These findings were discussed in relation to recommendations from the Task Force on the Practice of Psychology in Industry (1971) and to recent trends in organization behavior and organization development. We concluded that "although it is satisfying to see program content distinctions between best and adequate schools, the importance of reputational items is *not* particularly satisfying. To be rated best seems to require a reputation that is hard to develop unless a program is already rated best" (p. 547).

REFERENCES

Greenberg, C. I., Thomas, J. M., Dossett, D. L., Robinson, R., De Meuse, K. P. & Pendergrass, M. Perceptions of industrial/organizational doctoral programs: A survey of APA Division 14 members. *Professional Psychology*, 1981, *12*, 540-548.

Task Force on the Practice of Psychology in Industry. Effective practice of psychology in industry. *American Psychologist*, 1971, *26*, 974-991.

ED FLEISHMAN IN CHINA

Ed Fleishman, past president of Division 14, was invited by the Chinese Academy of Sciences to speak at the 60th anniversary Congress of the Chinese Psychological Society, held in Peking, December 3-9, 1981. While there in his role as President of the International Association of Applied Psychology, he also was one of two official representatives of APA at the Congress. **Wayne Holtzman,** Secretary General of the International Union of Psychological Sciences, was the other invited U.S. representative. It was the first time foreigners were ever invited to meetings of the Society, which was founded in 1921.

More than 300 Chinese psychologists from all provinces of the People's Republic attended. The twelve foreigners received a warm welcome and were treated as guests of honor. In addition to receptions and plenary sessions, with simultaneous translation, there were paper sessions in areas of developmental, educational, industrial/ergonomics, experimental, medical and theoretical psychology.

The title of Ed's address was, "The Measurement of Effort." He also presented a session on industrial psychology in the U.S. and spoke at various ceremonial activities.

While there is a great deal of interest in industrial psychology, only one University, Hangzhow University, currently gives degrees in this field. Nonetheless, industrial/organizational/human factors courses are given in many universities and the Chinese are familiar with many of our basic texts and references. However, they are anxious to know more.

After visits to the Great Wall, Ming Tombs, etc., the three-week visit included a specially arranged tour to Xian, Chunking, and Kunming, a route through the center of China from Northeastern Peking to Southwestern China near the Burmese border. Aside from the fascinating tourist sights, visits were made to schools, Universities, factories, communes, clinics, neighborhood councils, and other institutions with plenty of opportunity for frank discussions.

It is likely that contacts with Chinese psychologists will increase in the near future.

I/O Psychologists at LIMRA

EUGENE MAYFIELD

The listing of psychologists employed in I/O functions at AT&T (*TIP*—May, 1981) was interesting and does indicate the major role that organizations can play in the development and application of I/O psychology. Those individuals employed in I/O functions not only formulate behavioral science research, policy, and applications within a given organization, but also extend an influence far beyond that organization through their professional activities and publications.

The AT&T listing did stimulate a review of those individuals with advanced degrees who have been employed in I/O functions by the Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association (LIMRA). These individuals have, over the years, helped LIMRA to reach its goal of supporting and enhancing the marketing function of its member life insurance companies through research and applied services. It is unlikely that everyone who has ever been involved in I/O activities at LIMRA has been identified. However, we did find the 32 shown in the list that follows.

We, too, hope that this review will stimulate our colleagues in other organizations to share with us, through similar listings, the people who have contributed to our field.

Name	*Institution Granting PhD*	*Tenure with LIMRA*
Rensis Likert	Columbia University, '32	1935-1939
Albert Kurtz	Ohio State University, '30	1936-1946
Stephen Habbe	Columbia University, '36	1943-1947
S. Rains Wallace	University of Virginia, '37	1947-1967
Donald Peterson	University of Chicago, '42	1947-1978
Joseph Weitz	University of Virginia, '40	1951-1958
Raymond Dry	Harvard University, '59	1951-present
Robert Nuckols	Pennsylvania State University, '51	1951-present
John Antoinetti	Yale University, '55	1952-present
Leonard Ferguson	Stanford University, '42	1953-1963
Paul Thayer	Ohio State University, '54	1956-1977
Edward Sweeney	Stanford University, '57	1957-1974
Eugene Mayfield	Purdue University, '60	1960-present
Phil Welsh	University of Maryland, '60	1960-1965
Robert Carlson	University of Minnesota, '65	1965-present
William Graham	Wayne State University, '66	1966-1968
Michael Gordon	University of California—Berkeley, '69	1966-1968
Albert Sheridan	Case Western University, '68	1968-present
Michael Matell	Purdue University, '69	1969-1970
Lawrence James	University of Utah, '70	1971-1972
Michael Raphael	University of Akron, '71	1971-1978
Lee Murdy	Texas Christian University, '72	1972-1974
Joseph Schneider	University of Maryland, '72	1973-present
William Love	University of Illinois—Urbana, '70	1974-present
James Mitchel	Bowling Green State University, '74	1974-present
Thomas Tice	Iowa State University, '73	1975-1978
Steven Brown	University of Minnesota, '77	1977-present
Glenn Ball	Bowling Green State University, '77	1977-1980
Walter Zultowski	University of Tennessee, '78	1978-present
Kent Jamison	Michigan State University, '74	1980-present
Elizabeth Johnston-O'Connor	University of Rochester, '81	1980-present
Robert O'Connor	Stanford University, '74	1981-present

QC = PDM^{-1}

RICH STRAND

While at the Groundhog's Dinner for METRO members here in New York last night, I had the opportunity to meet and talk with some colleagues about Quality Circles. They're a hot topic these days, you know, with all the press exposure about Japanese industries pushing aside American companies by using the humanistic theories of management "invented" in American-academics and never quite used by the American corporate complexes. Well, **Edward Demings** was the guest speaker who is one of the most well-known Americans in Japan today. Dr. Demings is known for helping to turn around the world image of Japanese products from one of junk to that of high quality products.

I don't think we'll ever really know the exact ingredients of the Japanese success story, much less ever reproduce them, but it seems they did it by combining statistical quality control techniques and by applying the concepts of Participative Decision Making (PDM). My belief, though, is that the Japanese read about PDM the wrong way, to be more exact, the reverse way.

Let me explain. When you get underneath the academic jargon, I believe PDM is when management comes up with a problem and they pretty much know what they want to do about it, but they go to the employees and ask them: "what do you people think about this problem and what we can do about it"—all with the hope that having employees "participate" will get them to accept the decision. Not to knock PDM, because it does raise management's consciousness, but management is most likely going to do what they set out to do in the first place. Even in **Vic Vroom**'s most participative style of leadership, referred to as GII, the leader chooses the problem and implements the solutions. Nothing, I believe, is said about employees selecting the problems and implementing the solutions.

Back to the Japanese. Having read PDM backwards, the Japanese started a program in which the lower level *employees* identify and define the problems, analyze the causes, and come up with solutions. The employees then go to management and ask the managers what they think about the problem and the possible solution—all with the hope of getting management to accept the decisions.

Probably the greatest power in organizations exists in the front and back-ends of problem solving—the selecting of problems and the doing of something about them. Maybe, after all, something was lost in the translation of I/O

ideas into Japanese, but I think we have a lot to learn from the Japanese translation of humanistic management and I hope we don't just revert to the original.

(Editor's Note: The following was sent to *TIP* by **John R. Murray, III.** It reminded him of the manager who asked the training department staffer to send his/her people to a Quality Circle in the hopes of increasing their productivity.)

Payoff

After attending a job-enrichment seminar, a supervisor decided that some of the suggested techniques could help combat his company's productivity problem. He invited an employee to his office and told him that he now would be allowed to plan, carry out and control his own job. The wanted "satisfiers" would be introduced into the man's job.

The worker asked if he would get more money. The supervisor replied, "No. Money is not a motivator and you will not be satisfied if I give you more pay."

Once again, the employee asked, "Well, if I do what you want, will I get more pay?"

The supervisor answered, "No. You need to understand the motivation theory. Take this book home and read it. Tomorrow we'll get together and I'll explain once again what will really motivate you."

As the man was leaving, he turned back and asked, "Well, if I read this book, will I get more money?"

—Samuel Feinberg in *Women's Wear Daily*

An I/O Psychologist at the 1981 White House Conference on Aging

VIRGINIA ZACHERT

Having applied to be a delegate from Georgia, I was appointed to the committee of my choice—"Older Americans as a Continuing Resource." This committee dealt with various avenues of employment for older Americans, including full- and part-time, self-employment, volunteer and community service work, training for continuing or future careers, and possible tax and other incentives for all of these activities.

Believe me, this was a committee that needed I/O psychologists. The recommendation from this committee, if implemented by Congress and the President, will call for the best efforts of psychologists working at their peak potential.

Nowhere in the recommendations did the group of approximately 150 delegates and 50 observers ask for anything other than opportunities to be able to participate and be helpful in their older lives. They expressed needs for counseling and training, as well as work situations that were not fraught with impediments.

I was delighted with the excellent suggestions made by the delegates for identifying and solving the problems which keep those who wish to work from working as well as those who wish to volunteer from volunteering.

As an elderly I/O psychologist, I am planning to move into this fascinating area of working to help "older Americans become a useful resource" to themselves and others.

Education and Training Committee: I/O and OB Program Survey

RICHARD KLIMOSKI

One again a survey of programs offering graduate training in I/O Psychology and Organizational Behavior is being carried out by the Division. Results of the survey will be published in the form of a booklet distributed by the Division to those interested in graduate work in the field. The 1978 booklet has been extremely popular and is viewed by many to be an excellent source of information about programs. It is now out of print, though the 1980 addendum is still available.

If you have participated in the 1978 survey you will be receiving the questionnaire. Other programs known to the committee will also be contacted. However, if you wish to be certain that your program will be inlcuded please contact: **Rich Klimoski, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, 404C W. 17th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210.**

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:

Virginia R. Boehm
SOHIO
1521 Midland
Cleveland, OH 44115

MEDIA WATCH

As part of its program to monitor reporting in the media, the APA Public Information Office is requesting the assistance of members in notifying APA of examples of news coverage of Association and other psychology developments. Examples of both good and poor reporting are needed from print and broadcast media. Although APA uses a range of national clipping services, they are unable to spot every relevant story. Members who come across coverage of APA or other psychology issues are asked to notify the Public Information Office and, if possible, to provide copies of clippings. Your assistance will help APA in effectively planning its media relations activities; contact **Virginia O'Leary, Public Affairs, APA, 1200 Seventeenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.**

Meetings: Past and Future

1) The **Personnel Testing Council of Southern California** will sponsor a conference on "The Latent Trait Approach" on May 7, 1982 in Los Angeles. Contact **Dina Kelleher,** President, 213-741-3408 if you want registration information (this assumes you will have received the May issue of *TIP* prior to May 7th).

2) The **International Personnel Management Association Assessment Council** will hold its Sixth Annual Conference on Public Personnel Assessment from June 6-10, 1982, in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The theme of the 1982 Conference is "Professionalism and Productivity." Through a variety of formats such as preconference workshops, paper sessions, symposia and invited addresses, this year's conference will address the social, legal and technical issues affecting public personnel assessment. Industrial psychologists, psychometrists, personnel management consultants, and other assessment professionals who are concerned with such topics as productivity improvement, the development of effective performance appraisals, and professional accountability and ethics will find this conference of particular interest.

Conference highlights include the keynote address, "The Validity of Content Valid Tests and the Basis for Ranking," which will be delivered by **Jack Hunter** of Michigan State University; the luncheon address by **Virginia Boehm** of Standard Oil of Ohio; the invited address sponsored by the Great Lakes Assessment Council, "Selection in the Private Sector," by **Richard Arvey** of the University of Houston; the Presidential Address, "Professionalism and Productivity," by **Glenn G. McClung** of the City and County of Denver; the Open Forum; and a dinner and light comedy play at the Old Log Theater.

The annual Conference on Public Personnel Assessment is sponsored by the IPMA Assessment Council, a professional Section of the International Personnel Management Association-U.S. This Section was established in 1976 to represent the interests of public personnel assessment professionals in federal, state and local governments. IPMAAC's objectives include the development of sound personnel assessment practices; the encouragement and direction of public personnel assessment; the improvement of selection, performance evaluation, training, and organizational effectiveness; the definition of professional standards for public personnel assessment; and the development of sound public policy relating to public personnel assessment practices. Among IPMAAC's recent achievements are the development of cooperative item bank standards and the preparation of a sourcebook of information sources in personnel assessment.

For additional information regarding conference registration procedures, please contact **Marilyn K. Quaintance, Director of Assessment Services, IPMA, Suite 870, 1850 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20006 (202/833-5860).**

3) The **Organization Development Network** and **NTL Institute** are cosponsoring the fifth Ecology of Work Conference in Pittsburgh, June 9-11. The conference will showcase what major corporations are doing to improve productivity and the quality of work life. Major presentations will be made by Motorola Corp., General Foods Topeka plant, Ford and the U.A.W., Digital Equipment Corp., and Xerox and the A.C.T.W.U., among others. **Irving Bluestone,** former U.A.W. Vice President and **Will Clarkson,** President of Graphic Controls will deliver major addresses. For details, contact **Judy Leibowitz, NTL Institute, P.O. Box 9155, Rosslyn Station, Arlington, VA 22209 (703) 527-1500.**

4) The **International Congress of Applied Psychology** will hold its 20th meeting in Edinburgh, July 25-31, 1982. A number of Division 14 members will participate as keynote speakers, symposia members, and workshop leaders. A partial list of participants and topics is as follows: **Chris Argyris, Fred Fielder** (leadership and intellectual abilities), **Bernie Bass** (decision making), **Ron Burke** (work family interface), **Harry Triandis** (organizations and cultures), **Roy Payne** (stress), **Sid Fine** (comparable worth), **Lyle Schoenfeldt** and **Donald Brush** (human resource utilization), **Bill Byham** (productivity enhancement programs), **Dan Ilgen** (information search), **Judi Komaki** (OB and the service sector), **Don Super** (self concepts in career development), **Simi Ronen** (work values) and many, many others. Contact **W. T. Singleton, University of Aston in Birmingham, College House, Gosta Green, Birmingham B4 7ET, England** for a complete program. If you are interested in membership in the International Association of Applied Psychology, write to **IAAP, P.O. Box 30378, Bethesda, MD 20418.**

5) The **American Projective Drawing Institute** offers two Summer Workshops this year in New York City: (a) *Basic,* July 26, 27, 28; (b) *Advanced and Cases Seminar,* July 28, 29, 30. *The Clinical Application of Projective Drawings,* Hammer, E. F. (Ed.), Charles Thomas, Publisher, 301 E. Lawrence Ave., Springfield, Illinois 62703, is suggested as preparation for the Workshops. For information write: **Emanuel Hammer, 381 West End Avenue, New York, New York 10024.**

ANNOUNCEMENT

Volunteers Wanted! The Board of Convention Affairs would like to enlist the assistance of Division members to escort persons with disabilities, particularly blind individuals, to Division Social Hours. We would like to encourage social interaction with these persons and feel that having a member of the Division handling the social niceties would facilitate the process. If you are willing to serve as an escort, would you please send your name, address, and divisional affiliation to **Candy Won, APA Convention Office, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 by August 1, 1982.** Once we have your name, we will send you additional information. Thank you.

STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Blair, R. C. A reaction to "Consequences of failure to meet assumptions underlying the fixed effects analysis of variance and covariance." *Review of Educational Research,* 1981, *51,* 499-507. Provides evidence of superiority of the power of the nonparametric Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney U-test) to that of the t-test for independent samples in many if not most nonnormal situations. In some situations, the Wilcoxon is substantially superior. (LBP)

Fleming, J. S. The use and misuse of factor scores in multiple regression analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 1981, *41,* 1017-1025. Discusses conditions under which factor scores are appropriate and inappropriate. (LBP)

Guttman, L. What is not what in statistics. In Borg, I. (Editor), *Multidimensional Data Representations: When and Why.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Mathesis Press, 1981, 20-46 (reprinted from *The Statistician, 26,* No. 2, 81-107). Describes 6 unsolved problems of statistical inference and 53 misunderstandings regarding statistical inference. (LBP)

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Abdel-Helim, A. A. Personality and task moderators of subordinate responses to perceived leader behavior. *Human Relations,* 1981, *34,* 73-88. Role ambiguity, job complexity and subordinate locus of control are examined for effect on the relationship of leader initiating structure and consideration to subordinate intrinsic satisfaction and job involvement; data from eighty-nine middle-lower level managers are used. (RFB)

Champoux, J. E. The moderating effect of work context satisfactions on the curvilinear relationship between job scope and affective response. *Human Relations,* 1981, *34,* 503-516. Results indicate inconsistency in the moderating effects, both in the study and in the literature (30 references). (RFB)

Curran, J., & Stanworth, J. A new look at job satisfaction in the small firm. *Human Relations,* 1981, *34,* 343-365. Interviews with 118 shopfloor workers in eight small British firms, and 83 workers doing similar jobs for larger firms show that when industry characteristics, age and marital status are taken into account, size of firm is not of itself important in explaining levels of job satisfaction. (RFB)

Gordon, M. E., & Nurick, A. J. Psychological approaches to the study of unions and union-management relations. *Psychological Bulletin,* 1981, *90,* 293-306. Reviews the status of work in this area (92 references) and identifies areas of needed research with examples cited in each. (RFB)

Kelley, J. E., & Nicholson, N. The causation of strikes; a review of theoretical approaches and the potential contribution of social psychology. *Human Relations,* 1981, *34,* 853-883. Four approaches to the study of strikes—organizational environments, industrial relations institutions, collective interests and psychological approaches—are analyzed and found inadequate as to focus on strike process and on the use of social psychological insights; an integrated model is put forth (133 references). (RFB)

Madaus, G. E. The clarification hearing: A personal view of the process; and Popham, W. J., & Belli, M. Beware! *The Educational Researcher.* January 1982, *11,* (No. 1), 4-15. As leaders of pro and con teams in Clarification Hearings on Minimum Competency Testing, the authors describe problems with the "judicial evaluation model" as a procedure for clarifying controversial issues. (LBP)

Pascale, R. T., & Maguire, M. A. Comparison of selected work factors in Japan and the United States. *Human Relations,* 1980, *33,* 433-455. Results of analyses of organizational data on work environment, style of supervision, job satisfaction and attendance supported explanations based on common principles more than they supported explanations based on cultural diversity. (RFB)

Ronen, S., & Kraut, A. I. An experimental examination of work motivation taxonomies. *Human Relations,* 1980, *33,* 505-516. Results of factor and cluster analyses of ratings of importance of fourteen work goals are consistent with Maslow's fivefold need categories. (RFB)

MISCELLANEOUS

Curtis, M. E., & Glaser, R. Changing conceptions of intelligence. *Review of Research in Education,* 1981, *9,* 111-148. Traces theory of intelligence and testing practices from the 19th century to the present, including current focus on development rather than classification of intelligence. Implications for training. (LBP)

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. The psychology of preferences. *Scientific American, 264,* No. 1, 160-173. Examines the influence of risk on decision-making under loss and gain conditions. Considers other factors which affect such influence. (LBP)

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 **Virginia R. Boehm, SOHIO, 1521 Midland, Cleveland, OH 44115.** 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.

POSITIONS AVAILABLE

LARRY FOGLI

(1) Industrial/Organizational Psychologists: The Psychology Department of the Baruch College of the City University of New York anticipates (contingent on funding) one, possibly two, tenure-line openings. The position(s) are effective September 1, 1982, and rank is open. We are interested in all areas of I/O Psychology, but are especially interested in individuals whose areas of specialization are (a) organizational development and group processes; (b) career development, vocational psychology, and adult developmental psychology; (c) quantitative multivariate methods and behavioral decision-making; (d) applied experimental and/or personnel research. Candidates for Assistant Professor should be committed to the development of an active and productive research career. Applicants for Associate Professor or Professor should have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence and considerable teaching experience. Responsibilities will include teaching both undergraduate and graduate level courses, student advisement, and dissertation sponsorship. In addition to several existing graduate programs, the person(s) hired will have a special opportunity to join with the current faculty in the initiation and development of a *new Ph.D. Program in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, effective Fall, 1982.* Applications will be accepted until the position(s) are filled. The City University of New York is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer, and we encourage applications from women and minority group candidates. Individuals wishing to apply should submit a complete *vita,* and have three letters of recommendation forwarded to **Dr. John Bauer, Chairman, Department of Psychology, Box 512, Baruch College, C.U.N.Y., 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10010.**

(2) Personnel, Career, Development Specialist. Our client is a growing electronics company located in an attractive rural central Pennsylvania community. Enjoy a good salary, excellent benefits and relocation assistance along with outstanding career advancement opportunities. They're seeking an experienced personnel specialist to oversee the career development activities of their professional staff. Your responsibilities will include counseling employees, determining training needs and purchasing training service packages. Ideally, you will have a BS degree plus 5 years experience (or an MS degree plus 3 years experience) in career counseling and general personnel administration. In addition, you must be a skilled interviewer with a thorough knowledge of EEO requirements/regulations, and have the ability to assess human factors and career testing. For immediate consideration, please send your resume, including salary history, in confidence to: **Dept. KW, Deutsch, Shea & Evans, 49 East 53rd St., New York, N.Y. 10022.**

(3) Industrial/Organizational Psychologist. Westat, Inc., a social science research organization in Rockville, Maryland is seeking an I/O Psychologist with a Ph.D. specializing in personnel psychology and measurement/psychometrics. The position would be with a research group conducting I/O Research in the public and private sectors. The successful applicant would be expected to work on existing projects, and to develop projects involving selection and performance measurement. One to three years experience with applied research required; experience with contract research and with military services desirable. Excellent fringe benefits. Salary commensurate with experience. Send current resume to: **Westat, Inc., Personnel Department (VN), 1650 Research Blvd., Rockville, Maryland 20850.** EOE/M/F/H

(4) Industrial/Organizational Psychologist (Assoc./Full Professor). The Departments of Psychology and of General Business, Management and Organization of the University of Miami are seeking an established academician for a joint faculty position in industrial-organizational psychology/organizational behavior to teach at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and to direct a joint doctoral program. This new position supports a doctoral concentration in Organizational Psychology offered jointly. The usual teaching load will be two courses per semester, primarily in the Department of Psychology. Applicants should have a Ph.D. in Psychology and a record of organizational research experience, publication, teaching and doctoral student supervision consistent with an Associate or Full Professor appointment. Area of specialization within OP/OB is open. Applications will be accepted until April 1, or until the position is filled. Address correspondence to **Dr. Carroll Truss, Dept. of Psychology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124.** The University of Miami is an Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action Employer.

(5) The Department of Psychology at the University of Nebraska at Omaha has a tenure-track positon at the Assistant Professor level in Industrial/Organizational Psychology starting in August 1982. Applicants for January 1983 will also be considered. Duties include playing a central role in a graduate program in I/O psychology through teaching courses such as Personnel Selection, Criterion Development, Motivation and Morale, or Training. In addition, the position requires personal research productivity and the advising of Master's and Doctoral student research. Consulting and research opportunities are also available through participation in our Center for Applied Psychological Services. Salary dependent upon prior research and experience. Send vita and three letters of recommendation to the **I/O Search Committee, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182,** by **May 15, 1982**

ADVERTISE IN TIP-TARGETED AUDIENCE

The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist is the official newsletter of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association. As such, it is distributed four times a year to the entire membership, now numbering in excess of 2000. This group includes both academics and professional-practitioners in the field. In addition, **TIP** is distributed to foreign affiliates, graduate students, and to the leaders of the American Psychological Association generally. Present distribution is approximately 3000 copies per issue.

Advertising may be purchased in **TIP** in units as small as the half-page and up to double-page spreads. In addition, "position available" ads are available at the charge of $25.00 per position. For information, or for placement of ads or listing of positions, write to **Larry Fogli, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.**

ADVERTISING RATES

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

Pass this information on to an author or publisher!

ANNOUNCEMENT

Having trouble receiving *TIP?* If so, write the APA Subscription Section, 1400 N. Uhle St., Arlington, VA 22201. *TIP* uses mailing labels purchased from APA; **all address changes are handled through the Subscription Section.**