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AN OFFER TO SUPPORT RESEARCH

This invitation is open to colleagues in academia, industry, government, or ?. The aim is to improve measures on productivity and the quality of working life through survey feedback, coaching, and training.

Background
My Survey of Management Practices (SMP) and Survey of Sales Relations (SSR) discriminate between high and low performers when assessed by attainment of administrative goals, factory production, or sales. Survey assessments are by selves, superiors, subordinates, customers, or prospects as appropriate.

We have also shown in the quality of working life measured by the Survey of Group Motivation and Morale, is highly dependent on managerial skills as measured by the Survey of Management Practices. And, we have demonstrated that managers' profiles can be raised significantly in as short a time as five weeks.

The Survey of Management Practices assesses skills such as Clarification of goals, Coaching, Control, etc., and interpersonal relations such as Teambuilding, (fifteen dimensions). The Survey of Group Motivation and Morale assesses attitudes toward the organization, one's workmates, and the work (eight dimensions). Both have been translated into French, German, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish.

The Survey of Sales Relations assesses Professionalism, Identification of needs, Presenting benefits, Asking for the order, etc. (ten dimensions). It is adapted for insurance, financial services, technical service organizations, etc.

I have also developed a six-module management training program based on research with the surveys. It utilizes hands-on drills, role play modeling, and on-the-job exercises.

The Research Objective
The goal is to tie the ends together: to show that not only do the surveys discriminate and help produce perceived change; but that we can improve concrete measures of productivity and the quality of working life through an integrated program of individual and group feedback, coaching, and training.

I will support experiments involving experimental and control groups, with objective measures made before and after treatment. Performance measures may be sales, administrative, production, or other concrete assessments. If sales or service, we can use both the management (SMP) and relations (SSR) instruments to treat the entire system from the customer to top functional management. We have had good results at both levels.

The Offer
I will provide at least partial support in the form of materials, data processing, etc. as needed. If your situation is purely academic, as for a graduate thesis, you can count on full support. If you are in an organization or are a consultant, let's talk. Please call or write for supporting data.

Clark L. Wilson, Ph.D.
Fellow, Division 14
Box 471
New Canaan, CT 06840
Tel. 203-966-3018
THE MANAGEMENT APTITUDE INVENTORY

Content, construct, predictive, and synthetic validity.

Provides measures of:

Leadership
Attitude
Relations with Others
Intellectual Curiosity

Available only to members of APA.

J. C. Denton, Ph.D.
Human Resources, International
24100 Chagrin Blvd., Suite 270
Cleveland, OH 44122
216/464-9410
A Message From Your President

Sheldon Zedeck
February, 1987

Between the writing of my last message and this one (December 1986), your Executive Committee has not met, and thus there is little to report on any formal actions taken. Rest assured, however, that your committees are quite active (see the Committee reports in this and the November issue of TIP). The question that you might have is: What has your President been doing while all of the committees have been working on their specific objectives? The answer is: In general, I have been responding to letters and phone calls from our members, various non-APA groups and agencies, and from particular APA groups.

The letters from our members are most appreciated. They express support as well as concern, question our rationale, provide insight, and, in general, require me to keep on top of events so that I can provide informed responses. Letters from non-APA groups are interesting and sometimes puzzling. For example, a recent letter from a suburban sanitary commission’s engineering department requested my personal opinion on whether the Federal Government was pursuing a more flexible position with regard to Uniform Guidelines interpretation and whether pre-employment testing was making a significant comeback.

It is the letters and calls from and about APA, with particular regard to APA reorganization, to which I want to devote most of this column. The scenario that I will describe makes a good case study in organizational dynamics, power and politics, decision making, and persuasion. Keep in mind, however, that by the time you read this, the issue of reorganization already may be well on its way towards resolution.

We begin with the Bardon Task Force on the Structure of APA. This group, the official APA committee to consider reorganization of APA, met and discussed reorganization over a two-year period, and after much consultation and review with various interest groups, recommended in August 1986 a plan for reorganization. In brief, the plan called for two assemblies: (1) the Assembly for Scientific, Academic and Applied Psychology, and (2) the Assembly for State/Health and Human Service Psychology. There also will be a 15-member Board of Trustees to
manage the corporate affairs and a Joint Assembly Coordinating Committee to facilitate the concurrence of the Assemblies in forming APA policy and to assist in resolving conflict between the assemblies. The plan was discussed at the August APA Council Rep meeting and a decision was made to obtain independent review from a managerial and financial perspective. In general, your Executive Committee supported the plan and I wrote to Bardon indicating our position.

Soon after my return from the APA convention, I received a call from a designate from the APA President’s (Logan Wright) office who requested that we nominate a representative to an ad hoc group, whose purpose was to consider a third assembly to house those who perceive themselves as scientists and practitioners and feel that they belong in both assemblies; these psychologists would have a difficult time choosing when the options are either one or the other. Since we are a well prepared and organized Society, we nominated Milt Hakel, chair of the Society’s ad hoc committee on APA reorganization. This APA group, which in subsequent documents referred to itself as “the group advocating a third assembly in the reorganized APA: The Scientist-Practitioner Assembly,” proposed a third assembly to serve the interests of those psychologists actively involved in both the science and the application of psychology. It prepared a document with a preamble and noted organizational considerations in its communication to the APA Board of Directors. This document indicated that I/O psychologists would be a potential constituent in this assembly. It is important to note that not all of this ad hoc committee’s members supported all that was forwarded to the Board!

Soon after the ad hoc committee completed its deliberations, I received another call requesting that I support a letter which thanked the APA ad hoc committee for its deliberations, but which basically indicated that the creation of the new third assembly would separate the “pure” scientists from those with applied interests; such a situation would accelerate the trend for the academic/scientist psychologists to leave or fail to join APA. Furthermore, the letter noted that with the exception of one member, the ad hoc group was composed of psychologists whose interests are relevant to the health and human services community. I should note here, that this is the essential problem—the health service providers vs. all other psychologists. Are we best served by the current APA structure, or is some mechanism needed so that we can accommodate our Societal Interests and objectives and, when necessary, also speak with one psychology voice?

After consultation with several Executive Committee members and with Milt Hakel, I supported the above letter. It is my personal view that the APA Task Force plan can work and that it should be given an oppor-

tunity; the plan does permit the creation of new assemblies, but not until two years have elapsed after implementation of the proposed plan.

A few days after the above letter was sent to Logan Wright, I received a copy of a letter (dated October 21, 1986) signed by eight psychologists (Drs. Siegel, Cummings, Wright, Sobel, Morley, Stockhamer, Kovač, and Gottsegen) which was directed to the APA Board of Directors. This letter is so very “interesting,” “informative” and “diagnostic,” that rather than giving you my clinical interpretation (and not wanting to practice in a specialty for which I am not licensed), I have asked Jim Farr to reprint the letter elsewhere in this issue of TIP. Needless to say, it points out the basic differences that exist in APA and the clear need for reorganization. I should point out that the above letter has not only triggered reaction from us, but also from members within those divisions that are represented by the signatories.)

After the above letter there was a brief lull in communications, but not in action. There is definite recognition that some form of reorganization is needed. A meeting was called by Logan Wright for early December at which representatives from the three assemblies mentioned above attended. My information indicates that there was agreement that two assemblies are better than three, but if there is to be a third, then it should be composed of scientist/practitioners who are associated with the Health Services communities. In this new model, there will still be a Joint Assembly Coordinating Committee, a Board of Directors, alternating APA Presidencies for the assemblies, and differential dues. The issues that still are to be resolved are those dealing with special interest groups. What is the impact of this latter concern? Another letter, addressed to the APA Board (dated November 2, 1986) from the Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology indicated that this group will actively oppose reorganization of APA unless there is a separate assembly for public interest.

Where does all of this leave us? With another meeting on January 9, 1987. This meeting will attempt to resolve the issues of special interest groups as well as develop a proposal to be presented to the APA Council meeting in February. What do I predict? Well, for someone who predicted in September that the San Francisco 49ers would win the Super Bowl, I expect that a three-assembly model will be presented to the Council, who will in turn recommend that the membership vote on it. I further predict that there will be a reorganization, most likely with three assemblies.

The above scenario is a good example of power and politics, brokering and negotiating, conflict resolution, persuasion and influence processes, decision making, and organizational dynamics. Much of what has occurred can also be predicted by the personalities involved. But aside from
using it as a case study in a course, what does reorganization mean for the Society? Our goal has been to make the Society an association that provides for its membership’s needs. In my view, we have been doing a very good job of meeting this objective. Thus, we have been operating independently for quite a while and will continue to do so—in the current APA, a reorganized APA, or a totally new association of psychologists. However, much of our time currently is taken up with APA issues that are not crucial to us; if we could devote less time to those issues, we could increase our efforts in attaining relevant concerns for the membership. This objective will drive our decisions in the immediate future.

October 21, 1986

To: Board of Directors, American Psychological Association

From: Max Siegel, Ph.D., Past President
Nicholas A. Cummings, Ph.D., Past President
Rogers H. Wright, Ph.D., President Elect, Division 12
Suzanne B. Sobel, Ph.D., President, Division 29
Wilbur E. Morley, Ph.D., Council Representative, Division 31
Nathan N. Stockhamer, Ph.D., Past President, Division 39
Arthur L. Kovacs, Ph.D., President, Division 42
Gloria B. Gottsegen, Ph.D., President, Division 43

Subject: Reorganization impasse

We are writing you this memo with a great charge of frustration, bitterness and outrage. For over a decade, we have watched the state affairs/practitioner constituency within the American Psychological Association move steadily to become the single largest group—clearly a majority—with the membership ranks of the association. Over the same period of time and as the obverse of related demographic phenomena, the research/academic constituency has shrunk to around 30% of the membership. Since power over the affairs of and the destiny of APA has traditionally resided in the hands of the latter (and human nature being what it is), it probably would have been too much to hope that the visionaries in the research/academic community would have made way gracefully for new leadership to be seated in the positions of authority in the association, a leadership more attuned to the needs of APA’s majority. So it is not surprising that an orderly transfer of power has not taken place.

What has happened instead has been an endless series of attempts to “reorganize” the governance structure of APA. And each attempt has had the same thrust as previous ones—the holding on to control by those who feared the consequences of their loss of control. The first of these reorganization schemes was the initial version of the Albee Commission proposals as advanced in the 1970’s. The then power elite of the association, appalled at the growing number of practitioner issues introduced into Council by representatives from state psychological associations, tried with one fell swoop to eliminate all state representatives from the the chamber. It took great energy, lobbying effort, and funds generated by some of the signatories of this memo to defeat the original Albee initiative and to move its final form into one which preserved state representation.

Yet as the proportion of seats held by the states began to approach 30%, as practice-oriented divisions began to proliferate, and as we practitioners learned how to organize to elect ourselves and our colleagues to the Board of Directors and to the very Presidency of APA itself, the clamor for reorganization intensified once again. In the past ten years, we have lived not only through the Blue Ribbon Commission and the forums trials, but now, the past eighteen months, through the workings first of the Task Force on the Organization of APA in August, through the workings of the Arthur D. Little firm evaluating and reevaluating it all yet one more time!

We are incensed beyond words at the stupid expenditure of sorely needed association funds diverted to these purposes. While we have no exact figures, we would estimate that the total combined direct and indirect costs of the latest round of reorganization mania, should it be allowed to run its course all the way to a bylaw ballot being put before the membership, will reach the quarter billion mark, or red into the neighborhood of a half million dollars. That fact alone is anathema to us. The colleagues we represent are in serious trouble. The wasted funds could have been spent much more effectively to advance psychology both as a science and as a profession. Instead, these monies are being used to advance yet one more version of the South African experience, with those traditionally in power proposing to create separate enclaves for the true majority, enclaves which will, of course, be very separate and will not constitute the majority of those who are attempting beyond mad hope to retain power.

Never mind whether the traditional principles of representative democracy, principles of not taxing without representation or one person, one vote, get trampled in the process.

We are not only incensed about the waste of precious organization funds on this idiotic process. We are outraged about how the process itself has been carried out. At every step of the way—from the composition of the Policy and Planning Board through the membership of the Task Force on Organization and now on into the composition of the ad hoc group which is relating to the Little organization—there have been only one or two psychologists in full-time, independent practice placed on the bodies responsible for working on the matter, their voices far outweighed by those of university-based colleagues. And while Chuck Kiesler and Janet Spence—leading the rush towards apartheid—are permitted easy access to the deliberative bodies supposedly shaping the future of the association, we, the under-signed, the elected leaders of the state association/practitioner community, have been kept away from the deliberative chambers. You have chosen instead to deal with what you hoped would be acceptable surrogates, our practitioner friends who were more “reasonable” and less “strident” than we are.

Finally, we resent that important initiatives vital to the needs of our constituents are being bogged down by the attempt of some members of the research/academic community to hold the initiatives hostage to the playing out of the reorganization drama. The introduction of Agenda Item 74G at the last Council meeting is only one of the ways that the needs of health service providers are being mocked and attempts at meeting them through the Interim Advisory Committee are being slowed down and interfered with for no obvious purpose which directly benefits research/academic interests with APA.

The real intent of the reorganization drama, however, has at last been made much too clear and nakedly accessible for all to see after the first two meetings with the Little organization and with their published report which preceded the second meeting. We have come into possession of both the final and the next to final versions of that report, and we will quote from relevant portions, indicating both versions. The final draft of the section in question was indeed toned down a bit, but not enough even in that form to conceal its true purpose:

"... Licensed Psychologists Must Join AS/HHSP**

Issue: Since 64.5 percent of the regular members and 58.3 percent of the total members are licensed or certified, then this assembly will dominate the Board and JACC via proportional votes. But, there are several ways this can be dealt with (Early version) ways this might not occur (Final version).

Analysis: [a] Have a third (Scientist-Practitioner) Assembly, or a provision that a licensed member could sit on an assembly. This would reduce the number of people in the AS/HHSP assembly, perhaps below 50% and dilute its influence (Emphases added)."
Never has there been a more obvious acknowledgement, one which painfully reveals the real purpose of the reorganization drama, namely to subvert the democratic assumption of authority by APA's majority. Members of the Board, this nonsense is going to stop now!

The Board of Directors, the Task Force on Organization, and perhaps even the Council of Representatives have been acting as if in a deluded dream. Please note that not a single version of any of the reorganization proposals put forth since the Task Force was formed will ever be ratified by the membership. Reorganization is simply not possible without our cooperation. We control the required lobbying funds and the trust and good will of the constituents who elected us to represent them—the largest bloc among those who will have to ratify any change in bylaws—such that without our vocal efforts on behalf of reorganization, no reorganization will ever happen. We need you to hear that nothing that has been put on the table to date is remotely acceptable to us, and we are outraged. We are absolutely prepared to do whatever is necessary to end this hemorrhage of the association's resources of time and money in pursuit of a fantasy project which can never be realized and implemented.

For the good of the association, then, and to stop the endless, wasteful expenditure of our members' dues for insane purposes, we say to you that the time has come when you must deal with us directly. We who are the signatories of this memo are prepared to come to Washington for as many days as would be required. We would ask that you invite Chuck Kiesler, Janet Spence, and an additional number of the leaders of the research/academic constituency to constitute a group as large as ours to meet with us. We have a broad mandate. We are prepared to negotiate any of the following: an orderly transition in power; the search for some form of organization which will not ask us to surrender our democratic principles; or, if we fail at either of the first two possibilities, the negotiation of a final divorce and working out in good faith who will leave APA and under what terms. If the Board wants to be present while those who are the only ones who can hammer out a resolution to the impasse do so, well and good. If you choose to duck and to get out of the way, that would be quite fine, too. We want you to know, though, that you must, beginning today, work with and through us as the leaders of the state association/practitioner community—and no longer through our surrogates—or you will risk standing exposed as irresponsible caretakers, lost in daydreams and denials, and not cognizant of your political and fiduciary responsibilities.

Submit All Future TIP Correspondence to:
James L. Farr, Editor
The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist
Department of Psychology
615 Bruce V. Moore Building
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-1734
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Ever wonder . . .

"WHERE ARE WE NOW AS A COMPANY?"
"WHERE DO WE WANT TO BE?"
"HOW ARE WE GOING TO GET THERE?"

Assessing and planning strategic changes in companies requires accurate and objective information from your key decision makers on such areas as:

* Profit Enhancement Opportunities
* Competitive Position
* Strategic Planning Processes
* Short/Long Term Goals
* Management Style & Culture
* Acquisition Processes
* Clarity of Company Direction
* Organization Changes

ODI's MANAGEMENT OPINION SURVEY efficiently and effectively gathers such information to help you plan your company's future.

ODI also offers a diversified set of other management tools:

* Employee Opinion Survey
* Customer/Client Satisfaction Survey
* Company Productivity Survey
* Sales Force Effectiveness Survey
* Products & Services Survey
* Merger/Acquisition Survey

To learn more about how the changing business environment may be affecting the profits of your company, please write or call:

Richard J. Petronio, Ph.D.
President
Organizational Decisions, Inc.
401 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(312) 644-4422
Society For Industrial and Organizational Psychology
2nd Annual Conference

Atlanta
April 2-4, 1987
Stanley B. Silverman, Chair

Our second annual conference is around the corner and things are really starting to get exciting again. The various committees have been working hard to make the conference another significant and innovative event for our society. In this issue of TIP you will find registration materials for the conference itself as well as the workshops.

Susan Jackson and the program committee have put their finishing touches on the program. You can see the program summary put together by Susan in this issue of TIP also. Because of multiple-tracking, I am sure you will find it difficult to decide which session to attend because you will want to be at several at one time.

The workshops, chaired by Phil DeVries, will be conducted on April 2nd and there will be seven half-day workshops and one full-day workshop. The conference program itself is scheduled for April 3-4 and will run from approximately 8:30-6:00 on the 3rd and 8:30-4:30 on the 4th.

All meetings and workshops will be held at the Atlanta Hyatt Regency. Enclosed you will find a registration form for the hotel; cut it out of TIP and send it directly to the hotel. The room rates are as follows:

Single Occupancy: $82
Double Occupancy: $92

Please remember the following when registering:

Conference registration form—send to Ron Johnson
Workshop registration form—send to Ron Johnson
Hotel registration form—send to Hyatt Regency

Once you send your forms in, you will hear back from Ron Johnson regarding the status of your workshop and conference registration and from the hotel regarding your room confirmation.

We are all very excited about our second annual conference. Please help us out and register early! In the meantime, if you have any questions, give me a call at (216) 375-7713.

See you in Atlanta!!
WORKSHOP REGISTRATION
INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL
PSYCHOLOGY WORKSHOPS
Thursday, April 2, 1987
Hyatt Regency Hotel, Peachtree Center—Atlanta, GA

NAME (Please Print) ____________________________________________

POSITION TITLE ____________________________________________

ORGANIZATION ____________________________________________

MAILING ADDRESS ____________________________________________

PHONE ( ) ___________________________ EXT. ____________

APA DIVISION MEMBERSHIP(S) ____________________________

A Note to Registrants:
Section 7 is a day-long workshop. All the other workshops have been
designed as half-day workshops. Based upon your choices, you will be
assigned to one full-day workshop or two half-day workshops.

Section No.

First choice: ____________________________________________

Second choice: ____________________________________________

Third choice: ____________________________________________

Fourth choice: ____________________________________________

Fifth choice: ____________________________________________

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

$150—Members of The Society for Industrial and Organizational
Psychology, Inc. (Division 14 of APA) and Full-Time Students

$195—APA Members

$210—Non-APA, Non-Division 14 Members

• Fee includes: All registration materials, lunch, and social hour. Additional
  tickets for the social hour are $20 per guest.

• Please make check or money order payable in U.S. currency to: The
  Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

• Mail form and registration fees to:

Ron Johnson
SIOP Conference Registration
The R.B. Pamplin College of Business
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061
(703) 961-6152

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE
Thursday, April 2, 1987
Hyatt Regency Hotel,
Peachtree Center—Atlanta, GA

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

Section 1  Implementing Performance Appraisal Systems In Organiza-
  tions
          John Bernardin and Richard W. Beatty

Section 2  Downsizing Organizations: Alternatives to Layoffs for
          Reducing the Workforce
          Leonard Greenhalgh

Section 3  Microcomputer Applications for Industrial/Organizational
          Psychologists
          Raymond H. Johnson and C. David Vale

Section 4  Career Planning and Development Policies and Program
          Manuel London

Section 5  Controversial Testing Techniques and Issues
          Paul R. Sackett and Judy Olian

Section 6  Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection
          Procedures
          Neal W. Schmitt and Marilyn K. Quaintance

Section 7  The Internal Consultant as a More Visible Contributor
          Melvin Sorcher and Joseph T. Bevan

Section 8  Large Scale Behavior Simulations for Management Develop-
          ment
          Stephen A. Stumpf and Stephen J. Wall
AIRLINE INFORMATION

The Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology is pleased to announce that Eastern Airlines has been selected as the official airline for the second annual conference. Special arrangements have been made to provide conference attendees with a 45% discount from normal coach fare. Here are the details on these special airfares:

Reservations may be made only through Eastern Airlines 800 number (800-468-7022 outside Florida or 800-282-0244 within Florida). You may receive assistance at this number from 8:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. (EST) Monday through Friday.

You should reference account number EZ4P49 when calling.

Permitted round trip travel dates to Atlanta are March 27-April 10, 1987.

This special air fare requires NO advance purchase.

Tickets purchased at this fare and subsequently changed or refunded will be assessed no penalty charge.

You may purchase your ticket directly from Eastern. You may also purchase your ticket through an authorized travel agency. If you do so, however, your travel agent must call Eastern's convention desk.

GETTING TO THE HYATT REGENCY

The Hyatt Regency Atlanta is located at 265 Peachtree Street N.E. (where Peachtree Street and West Peachtree Street merge together). The telephone number is (404) 577-1234.

If you are driving north on I75/185, take the International Boulevard Exit. Go west on International Blvd. to Peachtree Street (the fourth intersection) and turn right.

If you are driving south on I75/185, take the Courtland Street exit. Go south on Courtland Street to International Blvd. (the third intersection). Turn and go west on International Blvd. to Peachtree Street, and turn right.

The best way to reach the hotel from the airport is to take the Atlanta Airport Shuttle which is located in the South Terminal, Ground Transportation. The shuttle leaves every half hour and the cost is $6.00.
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Anacapa Sciences, Inc. has been providing professional services in the behavioral sciences since 1969. Our staff of 35 offers expertise in the following areas:

- System, job, and task analysis
- Proficiency evaluation
- Analysis of risks, errors, accidents
- Personnel selection research
- Organizational development
- Training research and design
- Development of decision models
- Behavioral research and analysis
- Human factors engineering
- Ergonomics test and analysis

We have now completed more than 300 projects in these areas for more than 100 companies and agencies, and would welcome the opportunity to be of further service.

For a description of staff qualifications and past projects, please contact Dr. Douglas H. Harris.

ANACAPA SCIENCES, INC.
901 Olive Street
P. O. Drawer Q
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-0519
Telephone: 805-966-6157

SIOP CONFERENCE PROGRAM
April 3-4, 1987

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Susan E. Jackson, Chair
Suzanne M. Bruyere
Lou Buffardi
Michael J. Burke
John L. Cotton
Kenneth P. DeMeuse
Angelo DeNisi
Jim Kevin Ford
Dennis M. Groner
John W. Jones
Jerard F. Kehoe
Robert F. Morrison
Michael D. Mumford
Patricia R. Pedigo
Elaine D. Pulakos
Walter Tornow

All sessions are in the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Peachtree Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

FRIDAY
7:45-8:35

COFFEE HOUR

Start the morning at our informal gathering for coffee and conversation. SIOP officers, the Executive Committee, and many, many Committee representatives (both Chairpersons and Members) will be available to meet with you one-on-one to share information about the activities of their committees, and to describe how you can get involved.

New members and first-time conference attendees are especially welcome! SIOP Member Jane Elizabeth Allen gets the credit for this great idea!

8:45-9:50

OPENING SESSION
Sheldon Zedeck, Chair

“PSYCHOLOGY: AN INTERNATIONAL DISCIPLINE”
Special Guest Speaker: Charles John de Wolff, Professor in the Laboratory of Psychology, University of Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

10:00-10:30

SPONSORED COFFEE BREAK
POSTER SESSION I

Using Regression Analysis to Empirically Verify Catastrophe Models
Paul J. Hanges, University of Maryland
Ralph A. Alexander, University of Akron
Glenn R. Herbert, University of Akron

Group and Organization: Appropriate Unit of Analysis
Gina Hernez-Broome, Colorado State University

The Performance Impact of Coworker Layoffs: Severance Pay and Interpersonal Identification Effects
Steven L. Grover, Columbia University
Joel Brockner, Columbia University
Michael N. O’Malley, Columbia Teachers College

Practicability and Sensitivity of Selection Utility Parameters in Various Scenarios
James R. Terborg, University of Oregon
James S. Russell, University of Oregon

The Factorial Structure of Honesty
Philip Ash, Reid Psychological Systems

Sex Differential Validity: A Psychomotor Predictor of Factory Assembly Performance
Karen Weinberg, Graduate School & University Center, City University of New York
Jerad F. Kehoe, AT&T

Differential Validity by Gender in Employment Settings
Hannah R. Hirsh, Baruch College, City University of New York
Michael A. McDaniel, U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Examining Work Temperaments that Moderate DOT Job Family Validities
James S. Russell, University of Oregon
Jon R. Lucke, University of Oregon

Effects of Cognitive Style on Job Evaluation Accuracy
Douglas Cellar, University of Nebraska at Omaha
Dennis Doverspike, University of Akron
Margaret L. Durr, University of Nebraska at Omaha
Susanne Halsell, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Job Evaluation and Labor Market Effects on Simulated Compensation Decisions
Dennis Doverspike, University of Akron
Bernadette Racicot, University of Akron
Neil Hauenstein, Radford University

Reliability of Job Evaluation Committees and Use of Consensus Ratings
Jeffrey S. Hornsby, Auburn University
Philip G. Benson, Auburn University
William I. Sauser, Jr., Auburn University at Montgomery

Intergroup Variations in Perception of Appropriate Pay-Differentials in Two Different Countries
Geula Lowenberg, University of Wisconsin at Parkside
Benjamin H. Lowenberg
Daniel P. Dowhower, University of Wisconsin at Parkside

Dimensionality and Stability of the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (PSQ)
Ronald A. Ash, University of Kansas
George F. Dreher, University of Kansas
Robert D. Bretz, University of Kansas

Personal Values as Predictors of Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment
Thomas Hill, University of Tulsa
Sharon L. Stanners, University of Tulsa
Elizabeth B. Bizot, University of Tulsa
Catherine A. Blackson-Spencer, University of Tulsa

An Examination of Transitivity of a Work Values Hierarchy
Elizabeth C. Ravlin, University of South Carolina
Bruce M. Meglino, University of South Carolina

The Role of Work Values in Leader Member Exchange
Dirk D. Steiner, Louisiana State University
Gregory H. Dobbins, Louisiana State University

10:30-12:20

PANEL DISCUSSION: USING PHYSIOLOGICAL MEASURES IN JOB SELECTION: ROLE OF THE I/O PSYCHOLOGIST
Ronald G. Downey, Kansas State University
Denise M. Dougherty, U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment
Judy D. Olian, University of Maryland
Theodore Rosen, Drug Awareness Services & Training Group
Paul R. Sackett, University of Illinois at Chicago

10:30-12:20
SYMPOSIUM: APPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL COGNITION:
NEW QUESTIONS, NEW PROBLEMS
Jack M. Feldman, Georgia Institute of Technology
Robert G. Lord, University of Akron
Henry P. Sims, Pennsylvania State University
Lawrence R. James, Georgia Institute of Technology
Thomas K. Srull, University of Illinois

10:30-12:20
SYMPOSIUM: MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS:
ISSUES AND PROGRESS
Gerald R. Ferris, Texas A&M University
Walter W. Tornow, Control Data Corporation
Ann Howard, AT&T
Lyle F. Schoenfeldt, Texas A&M University
Michael M. Lombardo, Center for Creative Leadership
Marvin D. Dunnette, University of Minnesota

10:30-12:20
PANEL DISCUSSION: GRADUATE EDUCATION:
PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENTS VS. BUSINESS SCHOOLS
Hal G. Guetal, State University of New York at Albany
Eugene F. Stone, Bowling Green State University
Gary Yukl, State University of New York at Albany
Michael J. Kavanagh, State University of New York at Albany
John E. Mathieu, Pennsylvania State University
Scott I. Tannenbaum, State University of New York at Albany

10:30-12:20
PANEL DISCUSSION: WHAT LIES AT THE
INTERSECTION OF I/O SCIENCE AND PRACTICE?
Elaine D. Pulakos, Personnel Decisions Research Institute
Irwin L. Goldstein, University of Maryland
Leaetta M. Hough, Personnel Decisions Research Institute
Allen I. Kraut, IBM Corporation

Gary P. Latham, University of Washington
Joseph L. Moses, AT&T
William W. Ruch, Psychological Services, Inc.

10:30-12:20
SYMPOSIUM: PRACTICAL ISSUES IN CONDUCTING AND
USING UTILITY RESEARCH
Jim Ledvinka, University of Georgia
Kevin Hummel, BellSouth Corporation
Jim Frederick, S.D. Johnson & Sons, Inc.
Russell Day, Chicago & Northwestern Transportation Company
Janet Favero, Mountain Bell
John W. Boudreau, Cornell University
Wayne F. Cascio, University of Colorado at Denver

10:30-12:20
SYMPOSIUM: AN ERA OF CHANGE AT AT&T:
CONSEQUENCES FOR PERSONNEL SELECTION
Richard J. Campbell, AT&T
Mary L. Tenopyr, AT&T
Edmond W. Israeli, AT&T
Kenneth Pearlman, AT&T
Jerard F. Kehoe, AT&T
Margaret R. Ingate, AT&T
John P. Campbell, University of Minnesota

11:30-12:30
POSTER SESSION 2
A Multivariate Analysis of a Stress-Support-Satisfaction Model
Deborah A. Olson, Chrysler Corporation
Lois E. Tetrick, Wayne State University

An Improved Look at Job and Life Satisfactions
Dirk D. Steiner, Louisiana State University
Donald M. Truxillo, Louisiana State University

Stress and Medical Malpractice: Organizational
Assessment of Risk and Intervention
John W. Jones, The St. Paul Insurance Companies
Brian D. Steffy, The University of Minnesota
Lisa J. Wuebker, Georgia Institute of Technology
Lisa M. Fay, The St. Paul Insurance Companies
Lisa Kunz, The St. Paul Insurance Companies

Empirical Evaluation of a Profile Measure of Type A Behavior
Douglas N. Jackson, University of Western Ontario
Anna Mavrogiannis, University of Western Ontario

Investigating Behavioral Antecedents of Turnover at Three Job Tenure Levels
Ruth Kanfer, University of Minnesota
John V. Crosby, Crosby & Associates, Inc.
David M. Brandt, Crosby & Associates, Inc.

A New Approach to the Study of Withdrawal
Mark Fichman, Carnegie-Mellon University

Top Management Turnover Following Mergers and Acquisitions
James P. Walsh, Dartmouth College

Employee Attitudes and Civilian Turnover: A Meta-Analytic Investigation
Deirdre J. Knapp, U.S. Army Research Institute
C. J. Crannyy, Bowling Green State University

Implicit Leadership Theories: A Look Inside
Lynn R. Offerman, George Washington University
John K. Kennedy, Jr., New York University

Social Influences on Task Perceptions: Moderating Effects of Source Attributions
S. Richard Park, University of Akron
John F. Binning, Illinois State University
John B. Pryor, Illinois State University

Goal Decision Making by Task Performing Groups and Individuals
Verlin B. Hinsz, North Dakota State University

Task Preview Information and Recipient Self-Efficacy
Samuel B. Pond, III, North Carolina State University
Mary Sue Hay, North Carolina State University

The Relationship of Task-Specific Self-Esteem and Performance: A Path Model
Sandra A. McIntire, Assessment Designs International
Edward L. Levine, University of South Florida

Explaining More Variance in the Job Characteristics-Job Satisfaction Relationship
Stephen J. Zaccaro, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Eugene F. Stone, Bowling Green State University

The Dimensionality of Perceived Job Characteristics
Eugene F. Stone, Bowling Green State University
Thomas M. Ruddy, Bowling Green State University

Impact of Prototypes on Evaluations
John L. Cotton, Purdue University
Dale M. Rayman, Purdue University

12:30-1:20

POSTER SESSION 3

Microcomputer-Based Organizational Survey Assessment: Application to Training
Paul Rosenfeld, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
Linda M. Doherty, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
Larry K. Carroll, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center

Moderators of the Effect of Assertiveness Training on Assertive and Aggressive Behavior
Harry J. Martin, Cleveland State University
June H. Shekut, Cleveland, OH

Accuracy Scores in Performance Appraisal: Methodological and Theoretical Limitations
Lorne Sulsky, Bowling Green State University
William Balzer, Bowling Green State University

Predicting Faculty Salaries: Use of Predicted Rank and Tenure
Ronald G. Downey, Kansas State University
Catherine B. Johnson, Kansas State University
Matt L. Riggs, Kansas State University
Redefining Task Feedback to Enable Empirical Verification
Sonia M. Goltz, Purdue University
Judith L. Komaki, Purdue University

Destructive Criticism as an Elicitor of Organizational Conflict
Robert A. Baron, Purdue University

Predictive Validity of Noncognitive Measures for Army Classification and Attrition
Hilda Wing, The Psychological Corporation
Leaetta M. Hough, Personnel Decisions Research Institute
Norman G. Peterson, Personnel Decisions Research Institute

Executive Performance, Organizational Performance and Intellectual Ability
Jay Rusmore, San Jose State University

The Impact of the Salience of Affective Information on Performance Appraisal
Nora P. Reilly, Colorado State University
James P. Clevenger, Colorado State University

Relationships Between True Halo and Rating Behavior Over Time
Douglas H. Reynolds, Colorado State University

Illusory Halo and Accuracy in Performance Ratings
Dennis L. Dossett, University of Missouri at St. Louis
Robert D. Costigan, University of Missouri at St. Louis

Correlates of Sports Team Success
Andrea Marcus Konz, University of Maryland

Another Look at the Cognitive Compatibility Theory of Performance Rating Accuracy
Jo Ann Lee, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Effects of Feedback Instrumentality on Reactions to Performance Feedback
Eugene F. Stone, Bowling Green State University
Dianna L. Stone, Bowling Green State University
Leslie B. Hammer, Bowling Green State University

The Relationship Between Content and Criterion-Related Validity Indices
Cheri Ostroff, Michigan State University
Neal Schmitt, Michigan State University

12:30-2:20

SYMPOSIUM: TRENDS IN THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT: IMPACT ON I/O PSYCHOLOGY
Patrick R. Pinto, Pinto Consulting Group
William A. Johnson, IBM
Kammer Boyle, Management & Assessment Services
Wayne F. Cascio, University of Colorado at Denver

12:30-2:20

SYMPOSIUM: THE DIMENSIONALITY OF WORK: FUTURE DIRECTIONS, APPLICATIONS, & INSTRUMENTATION
Milton D. Hakel, University of Houston
P. R. Jeanneret, Jeanneret & Associates
J. W. Cunningham, North Carolina State University
Ronald A. Ash, University of Kansas
Robert J. Harvey, Rice University
Mark A. Wilson, Iowa State University
Lee Friedman, George Mason University
Edwin T. Cornelius, University of South Carolina

12:30-2:20

PANEL DISCUSSION: PERSPECTIVES ON ROUTINIZED BEHAVIOR IN ORGANIZATIONS
Howard M. Weiss, Purdue University
Daniel R. Ilgen, Michigan State University
J. Richard Hackman, Harvard University
Connie Gersick, University of California at Los Angeles
Terence R. Mitchell, University of Washington
Lee Roy Beach, University of Washington
12:30-2:20

**Essex**

**PANEL DISCUSSION: ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS OF WHY ASSESSMENT CENTERS WORK**

Richard Klimeski, Ohio State University
George C. Thornton, Colorado State University
Glenn McEvoy
Sheldon Zedeck, University of California at Berkeley
Paul R. Sackett, University of Illinois at Chicago
Mary Brickner, University of Akron

12:30-2:20, 3:00-3:50

**Lancaster A & B**

**SYMPOSIUM: PROJECT A: WHEN SCIENCE AND PRACTICE ARE FORCED TO MEET**

John P. Campbell, University of Minnesota
Joyce L. Shields, Hay Systems, Inc.
Norman G. Peterson, Personnel Decisions Research Institute
Charlotte H. Campbell, Human Resource Research Organization
Winnie Y. Young, American Institutes for Research
James H. Harris, Human Resource Research Organization
Jeffrey J. McHenry, American Institutes for Research
Laurel L. Wise, American Institutes for Research
Newell K. Eaton, Army Research Institute
Richard Campbell, AT&T

12:30-2:20

**Lancaster C**

**SYMPOSIUM: DEALING WITH SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND ADDICTIVE DISORDERS IN THE WORKPLACE**

Stanley J. Smits, Georgia State University
Robert Williams, General Motors Corporation
Larry A. Pace, Xerox Corporation
Richard E. Miller, Xerox Corporation
William J. Perryman, Aluminum Company
C. Howard Grimes, Georgia Institute of Technology

1:00-2:20

**Austrian/Italian**

**PANEL DISCUSSION: THE USEFULNESS OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH?**

Michael J. Burke, New York University
John L. Cotton, Purdue University
Christina Banks, University of California at Berkeley

2:30-3:00

**Sponsored Coffee Break**

3:00-3:50

**French/English**

**PANEL DISCUSSION: FACILITATING SCIENTIST-PRACTITIONER INTERACTIONS: THE ROLE OF THE REGIONAL I/O ASSOCIATION**

Mary D. Zalesny, University of Missouri at St. Louis
David Brookmire, Frito-Lay
Howard C. Carlson, General Motors Corporation
Milton Hakel, University of Houston
John R. Hinrichs, Management Decision Systems
Nancy Rotchford, Bank of America
John F. White, Georgia Power
Richard Klimeski, Ohio State University

3:00-4:20

**Austrian/Italian**

**3-WAY INTERACTIVE PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION: A UNIQUE APPROACH TO RESOLVING SCIENTIFIC DISPUTES: DESIGNING CRUCIAL EXPERIMENTS**

Edwin A. Locke, University of Maryland
Gary P. Latham, University of Washington
Miriam Erez, Technion

3:00-4:20

**York/Italian**

**PANEL DISCUSSION: UTILITY ANALYSIS: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE**

Michael J. Burke, New York University
Olen L. Greer, Accounting Department, Southwest Missouri State University
James Ledvinka, Psychology and Management Departments, University of Georgia
Brian D. Steffy, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota
Thomas Wyrick, Economics Department, Southwest Missouri State University
3:00-4:20 

ROUND TABLE SESSIONS

Table #1: Link-Up: An Opportunity for SIOP Members in Search of Collaborators to Find Each Other
Michael A. Campion, Purdue University

Table #2: Problems in Group Productivity: Perspectives from Social Loafing
Mary A. Brickner, University of Akron
Elizabeth Weldon, Northwestern University

Table #3: Level of Analysis Issues in Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Fred Dansereau, State University of New York/Buffalo
Katherine J. Klein, University of Maryland
Benjamin Schneider, University of Maryland

Table #4: The Status of I/O in Psychology
Mary Anne Lahey, Auburn University at Montgomery
Karl W. Kuhnert, Ohio State University

3:00-4:50 

PANEL DISCUSSION: PERSPECTIVES ON PRACTICING I/O PSYCHOLOGY AT THE MASTERS LEVEL
William D. Siegfried, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Douglas Bray, Development Dimensions International
Nancy Rotchford, Bank of America
John L. Michela, Columbia University
Salletta Boni, Columbia University
Lilly Berry, San Francisco State University
Michael P. Cook, Appalachian State University

3:00-4:50 

PANEL DISCUSSION: THE ACADEMICIAN-NONACADEMICIAN GAP: A TIME FOR UNDERSTANDING
Kenneth P. De Meuse, Intergraph Corporation
Raymond D. Hedberg, Norfolk Southern Corporation
Kalman A. Lifson, Lifson, Herrmann, Blackmarr and Harris, Inc.
David A. Lopater, Intergraph Corporation
Robert F. Morrison, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
Jerry R. Niven, The Boeing Aircraft Company

3:00-4:50 

SYMPOSIUM: COGNITIVE RESEARCH IN I/O PSYCHOLOGY: CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE
Kevin Williams, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Robert Lord, University of Akron
Kevin R. Murphy, Colorado State University
Angelo DeNisi, University of South Carolina
Frank Landy, Pennsylvania State University

4:00-5:50 

PANEL DISCUSSION: NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF BACKGROUND DATA MEASURES
Michael D. Mumford, Georgia Institute of Technology
Lyle F. Schoenfeldt, Texas A&M University
Richard J. Kiniomski, Ohio State University
Ronald Pannone, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
William A. Owens, The University of Georgia
Terry W. Mitchell, Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association
Kenneth Peariman, AT&T
Paul M. Muchinsky, Iowa State University

4:00-5:50 

SYMPOSIUM: AFFECT IN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR APPRAISALS, PROMOTIONS, AND SANCTIONS
Gregory H. Dobbins, Louisiana State University
Kevin Williams, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
W. Charles Keating, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Robert L. Cardy, State University of New York at Buffalo
Anne Tsui, Duke University
Patty Ohlott, Duke University
Evelyn Dadzie, Duke University
Taylor Cox, Duke University
Daniel R. Ilgen, Michigan State University
Jerad F. Kehoe, AT&T
4:30-5:50

PANEL DISCUSSION: I/O PSYCHOLOGY AND SMALL BUSINESS: MISPLACED OR LOST OPPORTUNITY?
Reginald A. H. Goodfellow, California State University
Andrew S. Imada, University of Southern California
Paul M. Connolly, Management Decisions Systems, Inc.
Milton D. Hakel, University of Houston

4:30-5:50

PANEL DISCUSSION: VALUES AT WORK
Arthur P. Brief, New York University
Edwin T. Cornelius, University of South Carolina
Walter Nord, Washington University
Loriann Roberson, New York University
Milton Rokeach, University of Southern California
M. Susan Taylor, University of Maryland
Sandra J. Ball-Rokeach, University of Southern California

4:30-5:50

ROUNDTABLE SESSIONS

Table #1: Human Resource Management in a Global Economy
Richard J. Campbell, AT&T

Table #2: Strengthening the Scientist-Practitioner Bond: Options, Opportunities, and Pitfalls
Michael D. Coovert, University of South Florida
Philip G. Benson, Auburn University
Eduardo Salas, Naval Training System Center

Table #3: The Interpersonal Effectiveness Simulation
Marti Smyc, Jackson-Smyc, Inc.
Mitchell Rothstein, Jackson-Smyc, Inc.

Table #4: APA's Guidelines for Computer-Based Tests and Interpretations: Implications for I/O Psychologists
Michael J. Burke, New York University

5:00-5:50

PANEL DISCUSSION: GETTING EXPERIENCE IN ORGANIZATIONS: GRADUATE STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES
Kevin R. Murphy, Colorado State University
Theresa Philbin, Colorado State University
Gerard Brandon, Pennsylvania State University
Barbara Gannett, New York University
Michael Kirsch, Michigan State University

5:00-5:50

TUTORIAL: DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF THE OCCUPATIONAL PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRES
Peter F. Saville, Saville & Holdsworth Ltd., England

5:00-5:50

CONVERSATION HOUR: A REVIEW OF TITLE VII WORKFORCE/LABORMARKET CASE LAW
R. Lawrence Ashe, Paul, Hastings, Janofsky and Walker

6:00

CASH BAR
EVERYONE WELCOME!

SATURDAY
8:30-10:00

PANEL DISCUSSION: THE UTILITY OF UTILITY ANALYSIS
Ralph A. Alexander, University of Akron
John W. Boudreau, Cornell University
Stephen M. Colarelli, Central Michigan University
Kevin R. Murphy, Colorado State University

8:30-10:00

PANEL DISCUSSION: FROM MANAGER TO ACADEMICIAN AND ACADEMICIAN TO MANAGER: A LOOK AT TRANSITIONS
Angelo S. DeNisi, University of South Carolina
Keneth Alvares, Frito-Lay, Inc.
Michael Campion, Purdue University
8:30-10:00  
**DEBATE: PARTICIPATION IS A MORAL IMPERATIVE**
John L. Cotton, Purdue University  
Lyman W. Porter, University of California at Irvine  
Edwin A. Locke, University of Maryland  
Marshall Sashkin, U.S. Department of Education  
David M. Schweiger, University of South Carolina  
Richard A. Guzzo, New York University

9:00-10:00  
**SYMPOSIUM: COGNITIVE HEURISTICS AS DETERMINANTS OF LEADERSHIP PERCEPTION: NEW RESEARCH ADVANCES**
Robert G. Lord, University of Akron  
Steven F. Cronshaw, University of Guelph  
Mary Anne Taylor, University of Akron  
Laura Kollar, University of Akron  
John F. Binning, Illinois State University  
Roseanne J. Foti, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

9:00-10:00  
**TUTORIAL: THE LEGAL STATUS OF VOLUNTARY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS**
Lawrence S. Kleiman, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga  
Robert H. Faley, Kent State University

9:00-10:00  
**SYMPOSIUM: APPLYING POLICY CAPTURING & PROCESS TRACING METHODOLOGIES TO STUDY RATER COGNITIVE PROCESSES**
J. Kevin Ford, Michigan State University  
Steve W. J. Kozlowski, Michigan State University  
Michael P. Kirsch, Michigan State University  
Susan L. Schechtman, Michigan State University  
Richard J. Klimoski, Ohio State University

10:00-10:30  
**SPONSORED COFFEE BREAK**

10:30-11:20  
**SYMPOSIUM: THE ROLE OF MENTORING IN ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS**
Georgia T. Chao, Michigan State University  
Steve W. J. Kozlowski, Michigan State University  
Raymond A. Noe, University of Minnesota  
Robert F. Morrison, Navy Personnel Research & Development Center

10:30-11:20  
**SYMPOSIUM: TOWARD THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**
Karl Kuhner, Ohio State University  
Philip Lewis, Auburn University  
Patrick Knight, Kansas State University  
Bernard Bass, SUNY at Binghamton  
John B. Miner, Georgia State University

10:30-11:50  
**PANEL DISCUSSION: THE NEED FOR THEORY IN TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS**
Richard J. Klimoski, Ohio State University  
Irwin L. Goldstein, University of Maryland  
Scott L. Martin, Ohio State University  
Carl Oltragge, IBM Corporation  
Paul W. Thayer, North Carolina State University  
Kenneth N. Wexley, Michigan State University
10:30-11:50  Tudor

**TUTORIAL: THE NUTS AND BOLTS OF FOCUS GROUP RESEARCH**
Wayne W. Sorensen, State Farm Insurance Companies
Thersa Spalding, State Farm Insurance Companies
Elizabeth J. Johnston-O'Connor, LIMRA

10:30-11:50  Essex

**SYMPOSIUM: SETTING CUTTING SCORES: PSYCHOMETRIC, LEGAL AND PROFESSIONAL ISSUES AND GUIDELINES**
Richard D. Arvey, University of Minnesota
Gerald V. Barrett, University of Akron
Wayne F. Cascio, University of Colorado at Denver
Ralph A. Alexander, University of Akron

10:30-11:50  Lancaster A & B

**PANEL WITH GROUP DISCUSSIONS: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL RESEARCH: MAKING SENSE AND MAKING PROGRESS**
Jeanette N. Cleveland, Colorado State University
Cristina G. Banks, University of California
Janet L. Barnes-Farrell, University of Connecticut
Kevin R. Murphy, Colorado State University

10:30-11:50  Lancaster D & E

**SYMPOSIUM: PAST PRESIDENTS REFLECT ON I/O: YESTERDAY, TODAY, TOMORROW**
Benjamin Schneider, University of Maryland
Marvin D. Dunnette, University of Minnesota
Douglas W. Bray, Development Dimensions International
Stanley E. Seashore, University of Michigan

12:00-2:00  Condor

**SIOP LUNCHEON WITH SPEAKER**

2:30-4:20  Austrian/Italian

**PANEL DISCUSSION: ISSUES AND DIRECTIONS IN JOB PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**
Michael J. Kavanagh, SUNY at Albany

Jerry W. Hedge, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
Walter C. Borman, Personnel Decisions Research Institute
Robert J. Vance, Ohio State University
Kurt Kraiger, University of Colorado at Denver
Terry Dickinson, Old Dominion University
Christina G. Banks, University of California at Berkeley

2:30-4:20  French/English

**SYMPOSIUM: PERSONALITY MEASUREMENT AND I/O PSYCHOLOGY**
Robert Hogan, University of Tulsa
Joyce Hogan, University of Tulsa
Steve Arneson, University of Tulsa
Susan Raza, University of Tulsa
Leaetta M. Hough, Personnel Decisions Research Institute
Marvin D. Dunnette, University of Minnesota and Personnel Decisions Research Institute

2:30-4:20  York/Stuart

**SYMPOSIUM: EMERGING CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND USES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DATA**
John L. Michela, Columbia University
Saletta M. Boni, W. W. Burke Associates
W. Warner Burke, Columbia University
George Manderlink, Hay Associates
Lawrence R. James, Georgia Institute of Technology

2:30-4:20  Tudor

**PANEL DISCUSSION: ARE I/O PSYCHOLOGISTS PSYCHOLOGISTS?**
Joel Lefkowitz, Baruch College, City University of New York
Judith L. Komaki, Purdue University
Abraham K. Korman, Baruch College, City University of New York
Joseph L. Moses, AT&T
Frank L. Schmidt, University of Iowa
Kenneth N. Wexley, Michigan State University
2:30-4:20 Essex

SYMPOSIUM: TOWARD AN INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM: USAF TRAINING RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
Hendrick W. Ruck, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
Jack Blackhurst, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
W. S. Sturdevant, McDonnell Douglas Astronautics/Aurora
Daniel L. Collins, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
David S. Vaughn, McDonnell Douglas Astronautics/St. Louis
Rodger Ballentine, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
Jerry W. Hodge, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
Hendrick W. Ruck, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
Jimmy L. Mitchell, McDonnell Douglas Astronautics/Converse
Joseph W. Cunningham, North Carolina State University

2:30-4:20 Lancaster A & B & C

SYMPOSIUM: AREAS OF CONTINUED DEBATE IN PERSONNEL SELECTION: PRINCIPLES III
Neal Schmitt, Michigan State University
Mary L. Tenopyr, AT&T
Marilyn K. Quaintance, Laventhal & Horvath

2:30-4:20 Lancaster D & E

SYMPOSIUM: THE GREYING OF THE AMERICAN WORK FORCE: IMPLICATIONS FOR INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
Donald L. Grant, The University of Georgia (Chair)
Christopher Hertzog, Georgia Institute of Technology (Presenter)
Ann Howard, AT&T (Presenter)
Anderson Smith, Georgia Institute of Technology (Presenter)
Michael D. Mumford, Georgia Institute of Technology (Presenter)
Terry A. Beehr, Central Michigan University (Presenter)
Harvey L. Sterns, University of Akron (Presenter)
Warner K. Schaie, Pennsylvania State University (Discussant)
NEW BOOKS FROM

Peter Block
THE EMPOWERED MANAGER
Positive Political Skills at Work

Peter Block explains in this new book how to create an environment where people take rather than avoid responsibility, where reasonable risks are more highly valued than cautious maintenance of the status quo, and where getting results counts more than pleasing others. He shows how managers at all levels can create a vision of what their organizations can be that will bring out the best in themselves and others and how they can become honest and strong advocates for that vision.

January 1987, $19.95

Robert L. Desatnick
MANAGING TO KEEP THE CUSTOMER
How to Achieve and Maintain Superior Customer Service Throughout the Organization

This new book describes key employee relations and training strategies used by companies as diverse as McDonald's and Citicorp to achieve superior customer service and explains step by step how others can apply these strategies in their own organizations. It details how to recruit, interview, train, and motivate a high-quality front-line and managerial work force dedicated to offering superior customer service.

February 1987, $19.95

Donald A. Schön
EDUCATING THE REFLECTIVE PRACTITIONER
Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions

Donald A. Schön argues that professional education should focus on developing the practitioner's ability to "learn by doing" and then continue to learn and adapt to new problems. Building on the concepts introduced in his book, The Reflective Practitioner, the author offers a new approach to educating professionals that fosters this ability and so prepares students to handle the complex and unpredictable problems of actual practice.

January 1987, $24.95

John L. Ward
KEEPING THE FAMILY BUSINESS HEALTHY
How to Plan for Continuing Growth, Profitability, and Family Leadership

John Ward presents a comprehensive and practical guide designed to help family businesses remain profitable, adapt to change, and prepare for the next generation of leadership. Ward shows how to plan for the business and the family—and then how to combine those plans into an overall strategy that is tailored for a particular business.

January 1987, $22.95

William M. Fox
EFFECTIVE GROUP PROBLEM SOLVING
How to Broaden Participation, Improve Decision Making, and Increase Commitment to Action

This concise guide presents a tested approach to group problem solving that can be used in task forces, quality circles, and other settings to encourage active participation by group members and enhance decision making. It describes in detail how to use this structured approach and shows how it improves upon standard group problem-solving methods.

Ready March 1987, $21.95 (tentative)

Barry Bozeman
ALL ORGANIZATIONS ARE PUBLIC
Bridging Public and Private Organizational Theories

In this new book, Barry Bozeman argues that all organizations are public to the degree that they are affected by political factors, and so should be studied as such. The author shows how the behavior, culture, and structure of an organization reflect the extent to which it is constrained or empowered by political authority—and explains the implications of these findings for management research and practice.

Ready March 1987, $22.95 (tentative)

Guy Benveniste
PROFESSIONALIZING THE ORGANIZATION
Reducing Bureaucracy to Enhance Effectiveness

With this new book, Guy Benveniste explains how organizations can become more productive, competitive, and adaptive by discarding management approaches that can discourage creativity and risk taking in professional staff. It offers specific management strategies that will foster creative problem solving, attention to detail, and personal dedication in professional employees.

Ready March 1987, $23.95 (tentative)

Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
433 California Street • San Francisco 415/433-1767
SiOP Awards Presented at APA Convention

Several Society awards were presented at the APA Convention in Washington. We congratulate the following winners.

**Ernest J. McCormick**

**Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award, 1986**

Dr. McCormick received his Ph.D. at Purdue University in 1948 and joined its faculty upon graduation. He is noted for many contributions in human factors and personnel psychology. His major scientific contribution and the greatest service to our field is his invention of structured job checklists for describing all facets of the world of work. Development of the Position Analysis Questionnaire caused a revolution in the technology and science of job analysis, job description, job component validation and job evaluation. Dr. McCormick’s career is a model of excellence in research, integrity in practice, and strength in personal character. His independence and persistence in conducting research on job analysis, a topic that was pedestrian and stagnant and which many people still consider to be unglamorous, is a signal service, a distinguished contribution.

**Paul W. Thayer**

**Award for Outstanding Professional Practice, 1986**

Paul W. Thayer was graduated with a Ph.D. in Psychology from Ohio State University. He has had a distinguished career, most often identified with his work at Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association, where he rose to senior vice president. For the past nine years he has been professor and head of the Psychology Department at North Carolina State University.

Dr. Thayer, a fellow of the American Psychological Association, has held a number of posts within the organization, including Membership Committee, Policy and Planning Board, Board of Convention Affairs, and Finance Committee. Within the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, he has not only been president, but has continued to serve the society on the APA Council of Representatives.

Although he has devoted considerable time and energy to professional matters, he has not neglected the scientist portion of “scientist practitioner.” His book with McGeehe on training was a classic. His leadership in selection research in the life insurance business has a continuing impact, and the continuing contributions of Dr. Thayer and his students, all well-educated, continue to influence the field.

**Craig J. Russell and Mary Van Sell**

**Edwin E. Ghiselli Award for Research Design**

Craig Russell of Rutgers University and Mary Van Sell of Oakland University won the 1986 Ghiselli Award for Research Design for their proposal, “An Examination of Processes Underlying Models of Job Choice and Turnover.”

**Cynthia Bentzon**

**Robert J. Wherry Award**

Cynthia Bentzon of Colorado State University won the 1986 Robert J. Wherry Award for the outstanding paper at the I/O-OB Student Conference.

---

**Industrial Relations**

A special issue of the *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, guest edited by John Kelly (London School of Economics and Political Science) and Jean Hartley (Birkbeck College, University of London) and available as Part 3 (September 1986).

Contents

- Editors’ introduction: Psychology and industrial relations
- The Amos Brewery dispute: A social-cognitive approach to the study of strikes. David Waddington
  (Faculty of Communication Studies, Sheffield City Polytechnic)
- Voluntary union membership of women and men: Differences in personal characteristics, perceptions and attitudes. Robert Snyder (Northern Kentucky University), Kathleen S. Verderber (Northern Kentucky University) & James H. Morris (US Naval Postgraduate School)
- Public opinion, trades unions and industrial relations. Martin Reiss & Tim Little (Ealing College of Higher Education, London)
- Psychology and trade unions: Joining, participating and quitting. P. G. Klandermans (Free University of Amsterdam)
- The multidimensionality of union participation. Steve McShane (Simon Fraser University, Canada)
- Arbitrating and mediating: Third parties in industrial disputes. Janette Webb (University of Aston Management Centre, Birmingham, UK)
- Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. Rupert Brown, Susan Condor, Audrey Mathews, Gillian Wade & Jennifer Williams (Social Psychology Research Unit, University of Kent, UK)
- Union growth and decline: The impact of employer and union tactics. John Lawrence (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

Special price for the single special issue for a limited period (until June 1987 only) $5.95 (US$11.95)

The *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, an international journal of industrial and organizational psychology, edited by David Guest (London School of Economics and Political Science) is published four times a year.

Orders and subscriptions to:
The British Psychological Society
The Distribution Centre, Blackhorse Road, Letchworth, Herts SG6 7HN, UK
New SIOP Fellows Named

At the APA Convention in Washington this past summer, the following seven individuals were elected as Fellows of the Society. Their citations are also given below. Congratulations to all and thank you for your contributions to I/O psychology!

**Paul A. Banas**
Innovative and practical design and implementation of processes for achieving employee involvement and improved labor-management relations at Ford Motor Company.

**William C. Byham**
Numerous contributions to the utilization of I/O Psychology in organizations through creative packaging, promotion, and application while maintaining high standards of professionalism. Especially significant is the impact on management in non-US settings.

**David P. Campbell**
Major contribution in revising Strong VIB with new scoring keys. Research and publication in leadership and creativity. Important contribution in training community leaders in solving community problems.

**Madeline E. Heilman**
Creative and extensive programmatic work on the effects of gender in attribution processes and implications for discrimination in organizations.

**Ann Howard**
Contribution to the Management Progress Study at AT&T and publication of important findings from this unique, large-scale longitudinal study as well as the correlated Management Continuity Study.

**Mildred E. Katzell**
Repeated and important positive impact on the practice of psychology with long and consistent record of dedication to enhance the profession.

**Manuel London**
Policy capturing research on promotion decisions. Investigation of career motivations of young managers.

---

The 21st International Congress of Applied Psychology

**Geula Lowenberg**
University of Wisconsin, Parkside

**and**

**Edwin A. Fleishman**
George Mason University

A major happening in applied psychology occurred this past summer. Your Committee on External Affairs wanted to share some of the excitement of this event with those of you who could not be there. Approximately 1,500 psychologists from more than 50 countries came together at the 21st International Congress of Applied Psychology held in Jerusalem, July 13-18, 1986. The Congress was held under the auspices of the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP) and the Israel Psychological Association.

The whole affair was superbly organized by the Israeli hosts and was headquartered at the Jerusalem Convention Center and the adjoining Jerusalem Hilton Hotel, situated on a hilltop setting with the backdrop of ancient and modern Jerusalem, under a perpetually blue sky. The organizers, together with the IAAP Officers and Divisions, had been working on arrangements for the Congress for more than four years, and their hard work, sophistication in their fields, and their dedicated professionalism showed. The Congress was a scientific, professional, and social success. We can only provide a glimpse of what transpired.

Considering the cautious attitude toward overseas travel, the representation was remarkable. Countries represented included all the Western European countries, India, Thailand, Japan, Nigeria, Argentina, Brazil, Australia, and a strong showing from Eastern Europe, including Romania, Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. The largest foreign contingent was from the U.S.A.; several hundred Israeli psychologists participated. The sight of participants from these diverse lands and cultures, drawn together by common interests in psychology, folk dancing joyously together following the opening session and reception set the tone for a truly up-beat collegial atmosphere throughout the week.
The program included 130 symposia, 30 invited speakers, and numerous workshops and interactive papers (poster sessions). There were 92 interactive paper sessions covering just organizational and educational psychology and career development. Altogether, 1,344 psychologists were participants in the program.

Traditionally, I/O psychology is the largest division of these Congresses and this was the case in Jerusalem. However, this Congress included a balanced program in psychological assessment, environmental psychology, clinical and community psychology, applied gerontology, health psychology, psychology and natural development, social psychology, and sport psychology.

The Organizational Psychology program included “Invited Lectures” by Bob Guion, Don Super, Ed Locke, and Lyman Porter from the U.S. Other Invited Lectures included those by Peter Dachler from Switzerland, and Louis Guttman from Israel, Donald Campbell and Bill McKeachie of the U.S., among many others. There were 22 symposia in organizational psychology representing a diversity of subject matters, countries, and accents ranging across work socialization, work values, personnel training, assessment centers, pay and behavior, etc. We cannot mention all the Division 14 participants on the program, but we spotted (in addition to the above) Gary Latham, Abe Korman, Ken Wexley, Irv Goldstein, Shelly Zedeck, Fred Fiedler, Harry Triandis, Joel Moses, Pete Weissenberg, Simcha Ronen, Bernie Bass, Terry Mitchell, Ben Schneider, Ray and Kitty Katzell, Geula Lowenberg, Miriam Erez, Ed Fleishman, Roya Ayman, Al Glickman, George (Bill) England, Dan Ilgen, and Art Brief. (We apologize to those we missed.)

Of course, there were many other foreign psychologists on the program who are well known to Division 14 members (e.g., Pieter Drenth and Charles de Wolff, Netherlands; Frank Heller, Roy Payne, Ken Miller, U.K.; J. Misumi, Japan; Bilha Manheim, Teddy Weinshall, Zur Shapira, Dov Elizur, and Arye Perlberg of Israel; Gunnar Borg, Sweden; Pol Coetsier, Belgium; D. Sinha, India, to sample a few). Examples of additional luminaries from the U.S. on various symposia in other topic areas included Irv Altman, John Carroll, Bill Angoff, Seymour Wapner, Charles Spielberger, Joe Matarazzo, and Bill Turnbull.

A pleasing feature of the Congress was the efficient organization of the events together with a personal touch attached to each event and procedure. Unlike recent APAs, it was a relief to be able to immediately find the halls, rooms, people, and locations of events without wasting time and effort. The organizers had personnel at key locations to advise, direct, and consult continuously. Even security checks were cheerful, quick, and efficient. Coffee, tea, and refreshment snacks were conveniently arranged.

In addition to the scientific program, there was a full program of “professional tours” to Israeli institutions representing psychological research or applications—there were 15 such tours from which to choose. For organizational psychologists, there was a visit to Kibbutz Givat Brenner to learn about the management and organization of an industrial plant in a Kibbutz, and the transition of the Kibbutz from a complete agricultural community to, at least partially, an industrial collective community. A tour to the famous Dead Sea Bromines Works gave the visitors a chance to see the operation of a heavy industrial plant in Israel. A case study of management change was demonstrated by a visit to Teva Pharmaceutical Ind. in Jerusalem, and vocational counseling in Israel was illustrated by visits to the Hadassah Vocational Guidance Institute and the Center for Occupational Information and Counselling in Jerusalem and the Tel Institute in Tel Aviv. Other visits included visits to programs illustrating new conceptions of neighborhoods, Arab-Jewish cooperative villages, innovative educational programs, prison rehabilitation programs, the Wingate Institute for Physical Education, Sport Psychology, and Motor Learning, among others.

Also impressive were the social events, which help bring participants together. The opening evening session included a scholarly welcoming speech by his excellency, Dr. Haim Herzog, the President of the State of Israel, and brief remarks by Congress Chairperson, Yebudah Amir; the current President of IAAP, Claude Levy-Leboyer; and Ze'ev Klein, Scientific Committee Chairperson. A stunning feature of the opening session was a high technology, multiple screen film and slide extravaganza about the sights and people of Israel, which included film photographed and processed that day. It showed Congress participants arriving, getting settled, participating in meetings, etc., together with pictures and narration about technological, cultural, and economic developments in Israel society. This was followed by a reception and music for dancing. On other evenings, there was a concert by the highly acclaimed Kiryat-Ono Youth Orchestra, a reception sponsored by APAA on the Hilton pool terrace, featuring “A Taste of Israeli Wines,” and a special guided tour of the Israel Museum opened by remarks from the long-time Mayor of Jerusalem, Teddy Kollek. Another feature was the specially arranged “home hospitality” to increase opportunities for informal interactions with colleagues. The closing ceremony featured a folklore evening.

For accompanying persons and participants, and for participants before and after the Congress, numerous tours were arranged to such local sites as the Old Walled City, the Mosque of Omar, the Western Wall, the Via Delarosa, Mount of Olives, the Dead Sea and Massada, Nazareth, Tiberias, the Sea of Galilee, Jericho, the Chagall windows, and many other fascinating places.
All through the Congress there were many behind-the-scenes activities, including IAAP Executive Committee meetings, meetings of Divisions, and meetings of special interest groups.

Enjoyment of International Congresses is based in large measure on reunions with colleagues from foreign lands, sharing of new experiences with one's own colleagues in a new exotic setting, and exposure to famous colleagues one has read about but not seen before. However, it is the meeting of new colleagues, unexpectedly sharing similar research enthusiasms, that inevitably leaves its mark on participants. These contacts enrich our experiences as psychologists.

At a time when the Society of I/O Psychology is reaching out for contacts with foreign colleagues, the International Association of Applied Psychology seems an appropriate vehicle. The goal of the Association is to increase communication among psychologists around the world. The Association is more than 60 years old and is the oldest international body of psychologists. While only two U.S. psychologists have been President (Morris Viteles, 1958-1968, and Ed Fleishman, 1974-1982), U.S. participation has markedly increased over the past 20 years. Harry Triandis is currently Vice-President. The current President, Claude Levy-Leboyer of France, and the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles de Wolff of the Netherlands, are I/O psychologists. There are six U.S. psychologists on the 45-member Executive Committee. The appropriate mechanism for joining is through the IAAP Division of Organizational Psychology (Bernie Bass is Past President, Pieter Drenth of the Netherlands is immediate Past President, and Frank Heller of the U.K., current President). Dues are $22 per year and members receive a newsletter about international developments in the field as well as the Quarterly Journal, Applied Psychology: An International Review, under the new Editor, Bernhard Wilpert of West Berlin. To join, contact Peter Weissenberg, U.S. Secretary-Treasurer, Department of Business Administration and Accounting, Rutgers, the State University, Camden, New Jersey 08102, (609) 757-6215.

The next Congress will be in Kyoto, Japan, in 1990, with J. Misumi as Chairperson. Plans are beginning to be made and the Society of I/O Psychology will play an active role. The Congress in Israel had its own special flavor and dynamism, as did the previous two Congresses in Munich (1978) and Edinburgh (1982). The Congress in Japan promises to be very special. We're looking forward to it.
When Words Become Separated From Meaning

Daniel C. Feldman
University of Florida

Making fun of academic jargon is a long, and well-deserved, tradition within the business community. The butt of the humor has always been phrases and words that are long-winded and pompous. For instance, the academic phrase “He’s interpersonally incompetent” quite clearly means “He’s a jerk.” Lazy begat unmotivated begat low effort-performance expectancies. “I hear you” most often means “I don’t.”

Now, for perhaps the first time, the jargon of the business community has become as peculiar as that of academia. The special form that most jargon takes is that of the meaningless slogan: “Problems are opportunities”; “We believe in the team concept” (as opposed to teams?); “People are our main resource.” These phrases are as vacuous as anything academics ever came up with, and have the emotional depth of needlepoint samplers.

However, more recently some disturbing trends in the use of jargon have emerged among both academics and business leaders. Originally used to ease or shorten communication among members of a professional group, jargon today is being used to obscure what people are really saying. New words and expressions are being coined that confuse us, or purport to say A when they really mean B. The end result of this proliferation of jargon is that the use of words is becoming separated from meaning and comprehension. Four twists in the use of jargon, in particular, are disturbing and becoming more widespread.

Blunting of emotional impact. Certainly jargon should try to be as descriptive as possible, and without any unnecessary connotations. There is nothing inherently wrong in telling subordinates their performance is “substandard” when one feels their performance is horrendous, for example. There is also probably nothing wrong with using the expression “plateaued performer” instead of “obsolete,” or even worse, “deadwood,” or “shelf-sitter.”

There is a problem, though, with jargon that goes beyond being descriptive, and that completely blunts and obscures individual emotions. For instance, take the latest set of buzzwords for layoffs: “de-hiring,” “out-placing,” “excessing.” The use of these terms lulls the uninformed into the belief that these are new and innovative human resource practices that provide great benefits to employees when, indeed, the exact opposite is the case. The terms “firing” and “layoff” rightfully make us wince a little. The terms “outplace” and “excess” make us think of benevolent, or at worst slightly inconvenienced, personnel directors.

Increasing managerial bias. Another disturbing trend in the use of jargon is its tendency to glorify, or justify, all management practices. Take, for instance, the jargon which has sprung up in the career development literature. “Demotions” are out; now they are referred to as “downward career growth.” In scanning the journals, we can also read about “job loss as a career transition.”

Besides simply being unclear phrases, these terms try to swathe unpleasant management actions in virtue. One can almost feel the users of these terms wanting to be congratulated for their thoughtfulness. By demoting a person, by gosh, we’ve given him an opportunity for growth! By laying off a person, we’ve forced them to grow in new directions they wouldn’t have chosen otherwise! When self-contradictory phrases like “downward growth” and “de-hiring” start getting flung around, watch out: some manager or academic is trying to put lipstick on a pig.

Confusing parts of speech. By this time, we’ve probably all adjusted to the use of “interface” and “input” as verbs, as in, “Let’s interface on this again” or “We inputted into the decision.” In the normal growth of a language, this is not an uncommon phenomenon.

What is somewhat more troubling is the important nuances of terms that get lost when nouns become verbs, and vice versa. For example, take the term “network.” Traditionally, network has meant a relatively stable set of friendship patterns or information-sharing links. However, used as a verb, network conjures up very different, and often opposite, images. When we hear about people going to cocktail parties, conventions, and lunches to “network,” they are really talking about hit-and-run instrumental relationships. “Stable” and “friendship” are not the terms that come to mind.

Another good example is management-by-objectives (MBO). As originally described, management-by-objectives is a participative goal setting program in which there is a good deal of give-and-take among managers and subordinates. Today, many managers use MBO as a verb that takes an intransitive object, as in “We MBO’d our division.” In fact, one frequently sees all forms of the conjugation: I MBO, you MBO, he MBO’s, we MBO, you MBO, they MBO. What’s lost in the transition, however, is that MBO used to be something you did with somebody; now it’s something you do to somebody. The way we use the word changes the way we think about its meaning.

Obscuring the main points. Historically, at least, both academic and business writing was valued if it came right to the point as quickly as
possible. Business writing was nothing fancy and nothing poetic, but it was direct and clear.

Today, it seems as if totally opposite values are in place; academic and business writing are more appreciated to the extent they obscure and confuse the reader. For instance, in reading the literature on organizational culture, we come across such terms as “meta-metaphors” and “tripes.” The use of such terms tends to aggrandize the topics at hand; whether the reader understands these terms is of relatively minor import. When we read whole articles and journals like this, it feels like we’re trying to bat our way out of a whole room filled with strawberry cotton candy. Even though it weighs virtually nothing and has no substance, it’s still a hell of a job wading through it.

The ultimate danger of such trends, of course, is that sooner or later people are going to stop reading what we write, listening to what we say, or heeding what we advocate. The coining of words and phrases will become an end in and of itself, with the conveying of meaning becoming a completely separate entity. Perhaps we should work a little harder on meaning what we say and saying what we mean. It wouldn’t hurt, either, if we heeded the famous advice of Humpty Dumpty in Alice in Wonderland: “When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.”

Announcement: REVISED JDI (1985) AND JOB IN GENERAL

We are pleased to announce an updated and revised edition of the original Job Descriptive Index (1969). The revision includes the original five facets: Work, Pay, Promotions, Supervision, Co-Workers. It was based on a broad sample of employees and organizations using Item Response Theory as well as more traditional psychometric methods. Changes incorporated in the revised JDI (1985) include:
- improved scale and item distributions
- increased applicability of items to all jobs
- updated norms

A new sixth global scale, Job in General, has been added. It furnishes reliable estimates of overall evaluation of satisfaction with one’s job. The JIG was constructed using IRT and traditional psychometric methods. It is designed to be administered along with the original or revised JDI and also provides normative comparisons.

Relevant norms and both original and revised copyrighted forms are now available. For information please write or call: Patricia C. Smith, Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403, Telephone: 419-372-8247.

Undergraduate Programs in I/O Psychology:
Response to Larry Peters and More

Geula Lowenberg
University of Wisconsin-Parkside

In Peters’ November 1985 TIP article on undergraduate programs in I/O Psychology, he states, “It would be instructive to learn more about . . . the few existing programs . . . ” (p. 38). This article presents the description of one such program.

The program is part of the B.S. major in Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside. It does not aim toward replacing graduate programs in I/O. Its goals are twofold: (1) to enhance students’ preparation for graduate programs in I/O, and provide them with better knowledge of what the field encompasses; (2) to supply those who want to go first to the job-market with knowledge and skills applicable to related jobs. The program is called the I/O Concentration within the Psychology Major. Thus, students cannot major in I/O; they achieve a B.S. degree in Psychology with an I/O concentration.

I started the program about 10 years ago, following a request from the University administration. The program went through several changes, some installed after information exchanges with I/O people at other universities. About six years ago, the Central Administration of the University of Wisconsin System approved the program as the only formal concentration within the psychology major. Students in the concentration need to fulfill all requirements for the psychology major, and to take the additional courses that are part of this program: Personnel Psychology (where issues of job analysis, criteria, performance appraisal, validity and personnel decisions, etc. are covered); Organizational Psychology (where we cover training, satisfaction, motivation, leadership); Individual Differences; Psychological Assessment (where reliability and validity issues are applied to areas of personnel, educational and clinical assessments), etc. Each of these courses covers material in depth, requiring APA format papers and presentations. Statistics is a prerequisite to all of the courses. Texts like Landy’s (1985) Psychology of Work Behavior, and Anastasi’s (1982) Psychological Testing are used in our courses. Elective courses are also part of the program, depending on the student’s interests. Let me just say that the program is considered difficult by the students and that it appears to experience a “natural selection” process; only a few students reach the final required step of the Externship in I/O.
Students are selected for the Externships. They have to have a high average GPA in the I/O courses and be approved by a qualified I/O psychologist outside the University and by the I/O academic advisor. The externship requires the student to carry out a one-semester project within an industrial organization or a consulting firm. The project must be supervised by the firm's I/O psychologist together with the academic advisor. An APA format paper and a report or presentation to management are the final products of the externship. The results of the projects have actually been used and applied by the firms' I/O psychologists. Many of these students have presented their projects in Psi Chi meetings in Madison. Others have been coauthors of papers presented at the APA conventions.

Regretfully, no funds are available for a systematic follow up of the graduates; however, many of them keep in touch continually. If salary progress can be used as an index, the fact that those who are in the job market earn about twice as much as their ex-advisors should serve as evidence of success. The increasing number of students in the I/O concentration whose goals are to get into graduate programs in I/O can serve as an indicator of student knowledge and interest in I/O as a profession. At UW-Parkside we have progressed from having no students interested in I/O graduate work a few years ago to the point where we now have 7 out of a total of 40 undergraduate I/O students applying for admission to Ph.D. programs in I/O.

The University Affairs Subcommittee of the External Affairs Committee has the goal of increasing awareness among undergraduates of the I/O specialty. As a member of that subcommittee, I would welcome receiving from the Division 14 membership descriptions of other undergraduate programs in I/O psychology. Please send those descriptions to: Dr. Geula Lowenberg, Associate Professor of Psychology, Behavioral Science Division, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha, Wisconsin, 53141.

The Social and Applied Psychology Unit, University of Sheffield, England

Peter Warr
University of Sheffield

The Social and Applied Psychology Unit is an unusual place. It is a research center established to study issues broadly in the area of industrial/organizational psychology. More than 30 full-time researchers are employed, and postgraduate students undertake Master's and Doctoral programs. However, undergraduate teaching is carried out only infrequently.

The Unit's funds are provided on a continuing basis. They come primarily from two "Research Councils," agencies which finance research in a manner similar to NSF or NIMH. In addition, contracts for work in the Unit are placed by commercial organizations and government departments. Particularly large investment in recent years has come from the Department of Employment and Department of Health.

The Unit's general objective is to advance understanding of employee effectiveness and well-being. This means that research is undertaken in the area of I/O psychology (referred to in Britain as "occupational" psychology), but particular emphasis is placed on longitudinal investigations which may extend over months or years. However, in addition, the Unit seeks to expand its occupational focus by including among its staff clinical psychologists and researchers with backgrounds in other fields.

The Unit's Research Program

The Unit's Director is Peter Warr, and other senior staff include Michael Banks, Chris Clegg, Bob Hockey, Nigel Nicholson, Roy Payne, David Shapiro, and Toby Wall. Its program is currently made up of eight interrelated projects as follows:

1. New technology in manufacturing industry. Studies in this area are examining the introduction, operation and management of advanced manufacturing technology. The focus is upon computerized numerically controlled equipment and flexible manufacturing systems, and their consequences for job content, reporting and control procedures, productivity, and the relationship between production and support staff.

Work is underway in several British companies introducing computer-based systems, with the Unit carrying out observational studies, initiating experimental interventions, and acting as advisers to manage-
levels: job mobility, and innovation in organizations. For example, the effects of job change and mobility on individuals and organizations have been investigated through several cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. Issues of career development and management training emerge naturally from this focus. Related work is examining innovation in textile manufacturing companies, seeking to identify relationships among career development, innovation, and company performance. Within the health service, parallel investigations are examining group and individual factors associated with innovation and successful performance.

6. Occupational strain. The Unit has for many years carried out studies of employee strain, examining its organizational and personal origins and consequences. Current research is emphasizing conceptual and methodological issues, through studies which explore the links between manifestations of strain at the affective, physiological and performance levels. For example, studies have measured endocrinological and cardiovascular changes in surgeons, anesthetists and psychiatric nurses as they undertake particular tasks, relating observed values to self-report data gathered at the same time.

7. Young workers' entry to jobs or unemployment. A longitudinal study of over 1,100 respondents has covered the first four years in the labor market, from ages 16 to 20 years. Psychological health, commitment to the labor market, social networks, perceived job discrimination, and other factors are being examined as a function of duration of unemployment, sex, and ethnic group. This research is now being extended to cover economic socialization more broadly, investigating how young people develop as consumers as well as producers as they move through educational and employment institutions. Career paths and transitions from one status to another are of particular interest in this project. Associated research is underway on a cross-national level, with colleagues in nine other countries, including the U.S.

8. Psychological aspects of unemployment. Interview studies with several thousand unemployed people have mapped out decrements in psychological health caused by unemployment. It is consistently found that the impact of being without a job varies between groups of people, and research attention has been particularly directed to the identification of variables which might moderate this impact: for example, age, socio-economic status, sex, length of unemployment, personal employment commitment, and psychological vulnerability. This project has recently been extended to examine changes in the nature of social networks and family relationships during continued unemployment.

International Collaboration

SAPU has received many visitors from the U.S. and other countries,
and readers of TIP who are anticipating a period of research abroad might find the Unit an attractive location. Sheffield is the fourth largest city in England, and is well-placed in the centre of the country, adjacent to a National Park.

Experience has suggested that both visitors and Unit staff gain most from a relatively long attachment rather than from a brief stay. Longer visits encourage closer involvement in the design and execution of studies, and permit families to become involved in community networks and local schools.

A more detailed description of the Unit and its programs is published in SAPU Work in Progress, which is available on request. If you would like a copy, or wish to make closer contact with individual projects outlined above, please write initially to Professor Peter Warr, MRC/ESRC Social and Applied Psychology Unit, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S10 2TN, United Kingdom.

(Editor’s Note: I was a visitor at SAPU for six months in 1985 and would be glad to discuss my experiences there with anyone who is considering a possible visit there.)

---

**SIOP CALENDAR**

**TIP deadline for May issue**

Professional Practice Award submission

Ghiselli Research Design Award submission

Distinguished Scientific Contribution submission

SIOP Pre-Conference Workshops—Atlanta

SIOP Second Annual Conference—Atlanta

SIOP Pre-APA Workshops—New York City

APA Annual Convention—New York City

March 15, 1987

February 15, 1987

February 15, 1987

April 2, 1987

April 3-4, 1987

August 27, 1987

August 28-September 1, 1987

---

**Research Funding**

**in Industrial/Organizational Psychology**

Robert G. Lord, University of Akron

Allan Jones, University of Houston

Terry L. Dickinson, Old Dominion University

Jim Ledvinka, University of Georgia

Joseph L. Balloun, University of Dayton

This report, produced by a subcommittee of the Division 14 Scientific Affairs Committee, provides basic information and direction for individuals seeking funding for research relevant to industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology. We have attempted to find reasonably current information on potential sources of funding and the likelihood that various governmental or private agencies would support I/O research. In addition, we have identified some sources that provide advice on how to complete a successful grant proposal.

**Sources of Funding for I/O Research**

We have organized the possible funding sources into three areas—Department of Defense government agencies, nondefense government agencies, and private foundations. In the following sections we comment specifically on several sources and provide information on contact people or points of entry into these organizations. However, two other sources should be noted at the outset. The first is the APA Guide to Research Support. The latest edition of this guide (1984), which is available from APA, provides a comprehensive listing of federal and private sources of research support, including a one-page description of each source. The guide also provides chapters on understanding the federal budget process, funding trends in psychology, and how to write a proposal. Although the orientation is toward psychology as a whole, much of this guide is relevant to I/O psychologists. The second source which should be noted is the development officer or research director at your local university. Such people specialize in funding and often have current information on many of the sources mentioned below.

**Department of Defense Agencies**

For more than the past three decades, the Department of Defense (DOD) has formed a primary source of funding for basic and applied research in I/O psychologists. Over the next few years, however, funding
patterns will be changing. The Division 14 member who desires to conduct research under the DOD umbrella will have to be more flexible and expend more effort to gain funding. The sections below review some of the funding agencies with DOD that appear most relevant to the interests of Division 14 members, the mechanisms that seem likely to produce an effective collaboration, and a brief summary of content emphases.

Air Force

Three sources are available for funding I/O research within the Air Force. Each year the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) publishes a general description of its Research Interests. More specific descriptions are announced in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD). In general, research is supported that addresses the Interests, but the Air Force will consider concept papers (3-5 pages) for other research topics. Before sending a concept paper, the Division 14 member should find out if someone at AFOSR or at an Air Force Laboratory is interested in the research topic. Names and telephone numbers are listed in the publication.

The Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL) was established to foster research and development (R&D) efforts in the related areas of personnel and training. Each year AFHRL publishes an annual report to describe its objectives, accomplishments, and current activities. The Laboratory is structured by division, and Division Chiefs should be contacted for more information about emphases described in the annual report. Names and addresses are included in the report.

Finally, each of the major air commands (military, strategic, and tactical) has its own budget, and a command can allocate some of its resources for research. Announcements of needed research may be placed in the CBD. However, the commands typically fund projects without a public request for a proposal.

Army

Basic research is sponsored primarily by the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) and the Army Human Engineering Laboratory (HEL). ARI is concerned with the development of a behavioral science knowledge base to improve the effectiveness of Army personnel, while HEL is concerned with the ability of soldiers to operate and maintain Army material. Content targets vary somewhat from year to year, but interest areas and areas for invited proposals are advertised in the CBD.

Researchers are encouraged to prepare brief concept papers (3-5 pages) that appear relevant to the advertised content targets and submit them to the appropriate agency. The concept papers should describe the problem to be addressed, justify the theoretical significance and uniqueness of the effort, and state the potential outcomes in terms of the agency’s mission. The investigator should also provide an estimated budget, statement of project duration, and a brief vita. Such information will allow review for appropriateness to the agency’s funding priorities and will form a basis for feedback and/or invitation to submit a formal proposal. Lag time from submission of the concept paper to funded project is a year or more. Preference is given to multi-disciplinary collaborative efforts.

Navy

The traditional source of funding for basic research within the Navy has been the Office of Naval Research (ONR). At present, however, ONR has eliminated its funding for basic research in social/organizational psychology and has very limited funds for applied organizational research in its Manpower R&D program. Proposals are still solicited, but competition is likely to be severe and success difficult.

Primary sources of funding for I/O research in the near future seem to be the various laboratories and centers such as the Navy Personnel Research and Development Command (NPRDC) or the Navy Training Systems Center. Each of the laboratories and centers produces an Annual Report that describes research priorities, mission, and key personnel who might serve as a contact for further information. A brief concept paper is one of the best ways to identify mutual interest.

Content Areas

The branches of DOD have developed a taxonomy of Personnel Performance and Training research areas that are relevant to their mission. They include:

- Manning and maintaining the force
- Training for combat effectiveness
- Manned systems integration
- Organizational cohesion and commitment
- Operational performance of military units

More specific information about research needs is contained in announcements in the CBN, in mission statements from the various agencies, and in annual reports issued by the agencies and laboratories. A booklet listing the interest areas and addresses of the laboratories entitled Military Psychology: An Overview is published by Division 19.

Addresses for further information:
Chief Scientist, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, AFHRL/CCN Brooks, AFB, TX 78235-5601
Nondefense Government Agencies

This category includes departments in the federal government as well as state and local government. It was not practical for us to investigate state and local fundings sources, but we would advise anyone seeking funding to consider such sources.

Many departments of the executive branch of government support research on topics related to I/O psychology. For example, worker retraining research might be funded under the Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education or the Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. The Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration funds research related to highway safety. Other sources with nonobvious relations to the I/O area may still fund I/O research. For example, under the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Institute of Mental Health has a Small Grants Program ($15,000 or less) which provides a quicker funding processes and is relevant to newer professionals. Also, the National Institute on Aging has a Behavioral Sciences program which might fund research relevant to the older worker.

We note such sources to emphasize that one needs to search through the morass of federal departments and agencies to find possible sources of funds. (The APA Research Guide can help in this task.) There is no single agency whose main objective aligns very well with the I/O field. This is also true of the National Science Foundation (NSF), perhaps the most obvious source of research funding, which is discussed in detail below.

National Science Foundation

NSF considers proposals for support of non-clinical research in any field of science, including applied research in psychology and management. NSF is organized into scores of programs, each with its own grant support budget and director. The programs that seem most relevant to I/O psychology are in three divisions of NSF, which are listed below with telephone numbers in parentheses.

Behavioral and Neural Sciences Programs
Social and Developmental Psychology (202-357-9485)
Memory and Cognitive Processes (202-357-9898)
Sensory Physiology and Perception (202-357-7428)

Social and Economic Sciences Programs
Decision and Management Science (202-357-7569)
Sociology (202-357-7802)
Measurement Methods and Data Improvement (202-357-7913)

Information, Robotics, and Intelligent Systems Programs
Information Impact (202-357-9572)
Knowledge and Database Systems (202-357-9592)
Interactive Systems (202-357-9592)
Robotics and Machine Intelligence (202-357-7345)

The absence of any applied psychology research areas is a good indicator of NSF’s posture toward applied research. Although NSF encourages applied research proposals, practically, the review panels and staff in the above programs tend to be more basic in their orientation to research. However, NSF takes special steps to encourage and support applied research proposals. How much in the way of encouragement and support varies in response to external considerations involving politics: budget levels, Congressional mandates, preferences of NSF’s director, and the like. Currently, the level of encouragement and support does not seem particularly high. Applied psychology used to have its own program at NSF, but it has been eliminated. Nonetheless, there are still reasons not to give up hope for NSF.

First, NSF has a coordinator for applied psychology, Joseph L. Young (202-357-9898). Young reviews the applied psychology research proposals that come to NSF, separates those that do not seem to fit into any of the program categories, and arranges a special review process for those proposals. Young would seem to be a logical first contact for help in understanding the system at NSF and how to work within it.

Second, it is possible to request review by more than one program. This would help with I/O proposals that seem to fall between program areas. Double review does not mean double jeopardy—if anything, it means double opportunity. To request review by more than one program, send single copies of the proposal to the relevant program directors, along with a cover letter stating the request. While NSF directors are not obligated to honor such requests, they would consider them seriously.

Third, the Decision Management Sciences program has been expand-
ing recently. NSF funding of research in that program has doubled in the past three years.

In addition, NSF occasionally gives special support to one or more narrower research areas, and some I/O psychology proposals might fit under those areas. For example, NSF now give special priority to proposals in an area called risk assessment, which includes research on health, safety, and environmental risks. The NSF coordinator for risk assessment research is Vincent T. Covello (202-357-7417).

Finally, and most important, even mainstream I/O psychology research proposals can often be made to fit those seemingly nonapplied program titles by emphasizing the connection between the research and its basic theoretical underpinnings. For example, if a rater training research project has logical connections to behavioral decision theory, those connections could be stressed, and the proposal could be directed to the Decision and Management Sciences program. Or if a pay satisfaction research project has logical connections to equity theory, a proposal stressing those connections could be directed to the Social and Developmental Psychology program. In other words, a proposal has better chances for success if it is an applied decision theory research proposal (or an applied social psychology research proposal) than if it is a rater training research proposal (or a pay satisfaction research proposal).

Private Foundations

One must successfully manage two additional problems to obtain research funding from private sources. First, there are many different possible sources; The Foundation Directory lists over 4,000 foundations! In addition, there are approximately another 20,000 private foundations not listed in The Foundation Directory! Fewer than 1,000 of the foundations make grants directly to private individuals; most of the grants are made only to non-profit organizations. Most universities qualify as "non-profit" for this purpose. A researcher can anticipate a large search effort to locate appropriate potential sources of funding!

Second, many outsiders don’t understand the nature of I/O psychology. Others tend to assume that industrial psychology is clinical psychology practiced in a business context. Some areas such as consumer psychology, human engineering or personnel selection can be readily understood; but others such as research on social systems, organizational development and related "soft" topics are confused with clinical psychology.

Returning to the first problem, there are four regional Foundation Center libraries in the United States. These provide extensive information on the 24,000 private foundations. They are not adequately staffed to provide reference services over the telephone. There are about 100 "cooperating collections" in other libraries. The cooperating collections often provide many of the same services as the regional libraries, and they tend to be more accessible than the regional libraries.

A researcher can locate the closest cooperating collection by calling The Foundation Center at 800-424-9836. In addition, the regional libraries are listed below, with their telephone numbers.

Cleveland, Ohio 216-861-1933
New York 212-620-4230
San Francisco 415-397-0902
Washington, D.C. 202-331-1400

Anecdotal evidence suggests that many individuals in industrial psychology and related areas also develop research support as a result of consulting contacts on specific topics of interest to client organizations. Clients are interested in solving specific immediate problems, and I/O psychologists may be able to generate considerable useful research in such contexts.

Writing a Successful Proposal

While we can give no prescriptions for writing a successful proposal, we can identify some sources of help. First, the APA Guide to Research Support has a chapter that provides a primer for proposal writers (pp. 41-53). As this chapter makes clear, successful proposals are the outcome of a process that may involve multiple discussions with funding sources, formal or informal concept papers, critical evaluation by peers prior to submission, carefully written formal proposals, and negotiations with the funding source. This is a complex process which can often take a year or more.

Given such an investment in time, one may reasonably ask what agencies look for in evaluating proposals. One answer is suggested by Kent Norman (1986, Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 156-162) who found in a study of National Institute of Health review personnel, that four factors were especially predictive of proposal ratings: scientific relevance of the proposed research, the clarity of the proposal, the soundness of the experimental methods, and the evaluation of the principal investigator.

**WRITTEN A GOOD BOOK LATELY?**

Encourage your publisher to advertise your masterpiece in TIP! Advertising rates and additional information appear on the last page of this issue. This is an excellent way for you to support the Society while enhancing your royalties!
Lower court decisions on the legality of preferential treatment and amicus positions, pro & con, before the Supreme Court in Johnson v. Transportation Agency, Santa Clara County

James C. Sharf (1)

Abstract: The reasons why the Supreme Court chose to hear this case are not self evident. The affirmative preference granted a female by a public employer and challenged by a male was not based on remedying specific acts of prior discrimination, but rather on the absence of any females in skilled craft job categories. Questions as to the “business necessity” (validity) of the decision making process were apparently not of interest to the Court. Perhaps a clue may be found from the oral arguments in which members of the Court expressed their skepticism with the County’s rationale for setting numerical hiring “goals” for various racial, sex and handicapped groups and whether it was statistically reasonable to expect as many women as men working on road crews. Oral arguments were heard in November with a decision expected by June. The fact situation, decisions of the lower courts, and the several of the amicus questions presented and their abbreviated arguments follow.

Fact Situation

Petitioner Johnson had applied for a Road Dispatcher job which was classified under the Santa Clara County’s merit system as a skilled craft job. Nine of the 12 candidates met the minimum qualification standards and were given the initial oral interview with two interviewers (4/80). Seven of those nine obtained passing scores on the interview of 70 or greater, qualifying them for the civil service eligibility list. The top candidate received an 80 followed by the petitioner and one other individual tied at 75. Ms. Joyce received a 72.5 (rounded up to 73) placing her fourth out of the seven on the eligibility list.

All eligibles were given a second structured oral examination conducted by three supervisors and were asked their: motivations, understanding of the job, adjustment to indoor work, and qualifications. Two problem situations were also presented. Following the second interview, Johnson was ranked first and unanimously recommended as the best qualified for the promotion. Ms. Joyce was ranked third. Prior to the second interview, Ms. Joyce had contacted the County’s Women’s Coordinator who contacted the Agency’s Affirmative Action Coordinator who, in turn, contacted the Director of the Transportation Agency, recommending that Ms. Joyce be promoted because she was the only applicant within a ‘protected class’, as defined by the Agency’s affirmative action plan (AAP).

The Agency’s AAP had been adopted to attain an Agency work force whose composition reflected the ethnic and sexual make-up of the labor market. While the County’s work force was 22.4% female overall (compared with a labor market that was 36.4% female), before Ms. Joyce was promoted to the Road Dispatcher position, there were no women among the 238 employees classified in the Skilled Craft category (note 2). At trial, the County Personnel officer testified that the statistical underrepresentation was due in part to the fact that women had never trained for and were not interested in heavy labor positions.

The goal of 36.4% female representation in each of the County’s 118 job classifications had been adopted so that female representation would approximate the representation of females in the Santa Clara County labor market. Under the AAP, specific goals also had been set for blacks, Hispanics, Asians, American Indians, Filipinos and disabled persons possessing “the desired qualifications or potential for placement.” While the County’s AAP did not identify a single Agency act, practice or process as causing the disparity in the percentage of women in the Agency’s work force compared to the percentage of women in the area work force, the plan nevertheless instructed that it was not sufficient merely to prohibit discrimination, but that it was necessary to take affirmative steps to eliminate the imbalance.

Pursuant to the AAP, the promotion to Road Dispatcher was awarded to Ms. Joyce (6/80). Johnson learned at that time that he would have received the promotion but for the intervention of the Affirmative Action Director. Johnson filed a Title VII complaint with the EEOC alleging sex discrimination, complaining that the Agency discriminated against him on account of his sex in denying him the promotion. Johnson received a “right to sue” letter from the EEOC (3/81) and filed suit in the U.S. District Court that same month.

District Court Decision

The District Court found that Johnson was the best qualified candidate and that “but for the plaintiff’s sex, male, he would have been promoted to the position of Road Dispatcher” and “But for Ms. Joyce’s sex, female, she would not have been appointed to the position of Road Dispatcher.” Additionally the District Court determined that the Agency had not discriminated against females either in the past or in the present. Further the Court noted: “There is nothing within the (affirmative action) plan which is consistent with any temporary remedial purposes.
Rather it contains 82 full pages of instructions pertaining to the annual, ongoing and apparently perpetual maintenance of an Affirmative Action plan.” “In a like manner, the (affirmative action) plan reveals no discrete time period or ultimate goal to be accomplished within a reasonable time from which the court can infer that the plan is temporary and remedial, as distinguished from ongoing and designed to maintain balanced employment of persons in categories designed to be protected under the plan.” The District Court found the County’s refusal to promote Johnson was a violation of Title VII and ordered the County to promote him and provide back pay.

Court of Appeals Decision

The Court of Appeals reversed, holding that “the District Court adopted an overly restrictive view” of Weber. The Court of Appeals did not disturb most of the District Court’s findings of fact, including the finding that the Agency had not discriminated in the past. They did declare, however, that an employer need not “... show its own history of purposeful discrimination. Instead, a plan is sufficiently remedial if it is based upon a conspicuous imbalance in its work force.” “Statistics are extremely useful in showing a conspicuous work force imbalance. We note particularly the difficulty that may confront an employer whose plan is intended to remedy discrimination resulting from societal norms.” Thus, because not one of the skilled craft positions was filled by a woman and “strong social pressures weigh against their participation,” the promotion of Joyce aptly served the remedial purpose of the AAP. “The import of the plan, as with any lawful affirmative action plan, is to give preference to members of underrepresented groups. The plan does not indicate, however, that other employees will be barred or that their interest will be unnecessarily infringed.” “When there is but one opening, the selection of one candidate will necessarily result in exclusion of all others. Unless we are shown a distinct pattern of exclusion of non-minority candidate from such positions, we cannot conclude that a single employment decision serves as a bar or unnecessarily trammels the interests of other employees.” Accordingly, the Court of Appeals held that the plan “was necessary and lawful, within the guideline of Weber, to remedy longstanding imbalances in the work force.”

Petitioner Johnson’s Brief to the Supreme Court

Question: May a public employer lawfully promote a less qualified female allegedly pursuant to an AAP adopted solely to eliminate a statistical disparity in the work force, unrelated to sex discrimination?

A) A voluntary AAP under Title VII by a public employer must also comply with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Wygant): based on legitimate remedial purpose, narrowly tailored, and impose no substantial hardships on other employees.

B) An AAP serves no legitimate remedial purpose when it is based solely on a statistical disparity. Affirmative action can only be justified under Title VII to remedy actual past discrimination. Neither lower court had found discrimination.

C) Even if the AAP was supported by a compelling or even important state interest, it imposes disproportionate burdens on the individual employee who is not a member of a protected class.

D) Even if Weber were applicable, the AAP is unlawful under that decision: The plan lacked any remedial purpose other than to correct societal attitudes. The unrealistic nature of the employment goal for women, coupled with the low turnover and lack of any new positions, meant that affirmative action would always bar petitioner from advancement, when competing with an employee who is a member of a protected class.

E) Petitioner conclusively proved that the county intentionally discriminated against him and that the AAP is not a legitimate reason for such discrimination.

Amicus Brief Supporting Petitioner Johnson

Department of Justice for the United States

Question: Whether respondent, a public employer, violated Title VII by promoting a female employee over petitioner, a more-qualified male employee, pursuant to an AAP.

A) A mere desire to achieve some numerical proportion or balance of races or gender cannot serve as a justification for discrimination.

B) The justification for non-victim-specific affirmative action must remedy past discrimination by the employer, not by society.

C) The County’s AAP was not remedial and was not narrowly tailored (Weber). Other minorities could suffer under this plan (i.e., females would receive preference over black males and Hispanic males, etc.).

D) If the case is remanded, the County should indicate precisely what it is seeking to remedy, and explain why “reverse discrimination” is necessary to achieve that end.

Respondent Santa Clara County’s Brief to the Supreme Court

A) Statistics demonstrated discrimination against women even greater than that in Weber;

B) The preferential hiring plan was used to remedy a statistical imbalance had been found to be consistent with Title VII in Weber; and
C) The remedy in this case was less intrusive than in Weber since there were no quotas or rigid preferences.

Amicus Briefs supporting Santa Clara County:

1) The American Society for Person nel Administration (ASPA)
   Question: May an employer promote a fully qualified female applicant to a craft position after consideration of applicants' qualifications, job requirements, agency affirmative action policies and equal employment data indicating severe underutilization of females?
   A) The Santa Clara merit system rules did not require the selection of the individual who received the highest rating on any one of the selection steps.
   B) The record does not indicate that the test procedures, the questions asked, or the scoring system employed by either panel were validated as job-related in accordance with either professionally accepted validation procedures or federal guidelines.
   C) There was no evidence that the difference between Johnson's score of 75 on the initial interview and Ms. Joyce's score of 73 was a significant difference rather than one within the range of error inherent in the examination and scoring procedure.
   D) Petitioner did not introduce evidence that the second reviewing panel, which based its recommendation for selection on the responses of the candidates to six questions, received any instructions as to how it should rate the answers of applicants or the criteria it should follow in developing its recommendation. In short, there is simply no valid, reliable basis for concluding that Petitioner was more qualified than Ms. Joyce.

2) NOW, ACLU, NAACP, et al.
   A) Statistics alone can prove employment discrimination (Teamsters).
   B) Title VII does not require an employer to admit past discrimination in order to adopt a plan (Weber).
   C) The AAP conformed with Weber: 1) designed to increase employment opportunities of women and to break down old patterns of gender segregation and hierarchy; 2) did not unnecessarily trammel the rights of male employees—no absolute preference for females; 3) did not create an absolute bar to the advancement of male employees—male employees were not laid off; 4) AAP was temporary—would end with the attainment of a representative work force.
   D) Women will not gain access to nontraditional jobs unless gender-conscious decision making is implemented.

3) Equal Employment Advisory Council (EEAC)
   A) An employer is not required to undertake affirmative action under Title VII, but is permitted;
   B) A flexible approach to affirmative action is consistent with Weber and voluntary compliance is the preferred means of eliminating discrimination;
   C) A conspicuous statistical imbalance provides sufficient basis for adopting voluntary affirmative action;
   D) Findings of or admission to discrimination is not required to justify AAPs;
   E) An AAP is lawful if it is designed to achieve a work force roughly representative of the relevant area labor market, is temporary, does not result in hiring unqualified applicants, and does not bar nonminorities or males or otherwise unnecessarily trammel their interests;
   F) Regardless of the Court's decision in this case, it should be clearly affirmed that legitimate, voluntary AAPs are permitted under Title VII and Executive Order 11246 calling for Federal contractors to set goals and timetables should be reaffirmed;
   G) If conspicuous imbalances are insufficient to support the voluntary adoption of an AAP, the decision should be applied prospectively only.

NOTES

1) The opinions expressed are those of the author and not necessarily official policy statements.

2) The Dictionary of Occupational Titles does not list a Road Dispatcher position per se, but does have dispatcher jobs under both clerical and construction occupations. An interesting point is that had the road dispatcher job been classified as a clerical position, there would have been no "underutilization" since clerical positions in the County merit system were 78% female.
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TIP-BITS

James L. Farr

Ben Schneider has suggested that it is about time to rename this column; such change in nomenclature is somewhat of a tradition in TIP. Ben nominated one possibility (and a pretty good one), but I thought that I might open this up to all readers. Send your entries in this exciting contest to me before the March 15 deadline for the May issue. Prizes will be announced in the next issue (don’t expect much!) along with the new title.

The University of Utah has established the Frederick I. Herzberg Professorship in Human Resource Management in recognition of Professor Herzberg’s contributions to management research and practice. What a motivator factor!

Some job changes to report on the academic side, Judi Komaki informs us that Mitzi Svoboda and Mary Kay Busemeyer have joined Purdue University. Peter Dubno is now Professor Emeritus at New York University. Lise Saari is on the faculty of the business school of Richmond College in London for this year and continuing her work with Battelle at the Battelle Research Institute in London. Her address in London is 14 Pilgrims Lane, quite appropriate for a Yankee in Mrs. Thatcher’s court!

Michael Muller, Darrell Hartke, and Barry Blakely have joined the psychological consulting staff of the Houston office of Jeanneret & Associates. Mark Spool has become Manager of Human Resource Planning and Development at Volume Shoe Corporation, a division of May Company. Ed Adams has left AT&T to join PepsiCo. Is this the real thing, Ed (or is that another beverage company)?

Jane Elizabeth Allen has co-authored the leader’s guide for “Conflicts in Management under Pressure,” a new audio-visual training program produced by the American Management Association.

Finally, Ron Downey informs us of the death of Corwin A. Bennett, a professor of industrial engineering at Kansas State University and a member of the Society.

Meetings

SEVENTH ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORLD CONGRESS
September 22-26, 1987
Zakopane, Poland

17TH INFORMATION EXCHANGE
“WHAT IS HAPPENING IN OD AND HRD”
May 12-15, 1987
Williams Bay, Wisconsin

For more information on the 17th Information Exchange and the OD World Congress and a World Peace Congress to be held in Moscow immediately following, contact: Dr. Donald W. Cole, Organization Development Institute, 11234 Walnut Ridge Road, Chesterland, Ohio 44026.

For further information contact: Dr. Harish C. Jain, Faculty of Business, McMarten University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4M4, phone: (416) 525-9140, ext. 3952.

SIXTH INTERNATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL ANALYST WORKSHOP
MAY 6-8, 1987

The USAF Occupational Measurement Center will host an Occupational Analyst Workshop at the Ramada Inn (airport), San Antonio, Texas. The workshop provides the opportunity for professionals from the DOD, foreign military organizations, educational institutions and private industry to exchange ideas related to occupational analysis. Subjects will be covered by using individual presentations, symposiums, and discussion groups. For information please contact Lt. Col. Gorman, Mr. Wilcox, or Lt. Hardy at Autonov 487-6623/6811 or commercial (512) 652-6623/6811.
Positions Available

Michael Mount

Faculty Position. The Department of Management at Canisius College invites interested candidates to apply for a tenure track position in the Human Resources Management area, beginning in June or September, 1987. The position is at the assistant or associate professor level and requires an appropriate doctoral degree (or thesis near completion). A commitment to quality teaching and research is essential. The successful candidate will teach both undergraduate and graduate (MBA/MPA) level courses in Human Resources and related management topics. Salary is competitive dependent on qualifications. Send vita and other details to: Dr. Alan G. Weinstein, Chairman, Department of Management-Marketing, Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14208. Canisius College is an Equal Employment/Affirmative Action Employer.

Assistant/Associate Professor of Management. The Management Department of the College of Business Administration, co-sponsoring department of the Intercollegiate Industrial and Organizational (I/O) Psychology Program with the Psychology Department of the College of Liberal Arts, has a tenure-track position opening for Fall, 1987. A PhD in I/O Psychology is preferred although a PhD in a closely related area may be considered. The new faculty member will participate in the PhD/MS programs in I/O Psychology as well as the PhD, MBA, and undergraduate Business Administration degree programs. Service on the I/O Program Committee and heavy involvement with the I/O Program and students is expected. Candidates for consideration as an associate must present a significant record of research and publication and evidence of ability to work with graduate students in supervising research. There are approximately 45 graduate students, mostly PhD aspirants, currently in the program. [Note: Concurrently with this search, a search is underway to secure a senior I/O Psychologist (an established researcher, well-recognized scholar, and teacher) to fill the Haslam Chair of Excellence in Management for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. The Chair of Excellence is an endowed chair.] Candidates for the assistant or associate position should direct letters indicating interest, including a vita and references, to: Jack Larsen, Chair, Search Committee, Management Department, 413 SMC, College of Business Administration, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-0545. The University of Tennessee is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Senior Human Resource Consultant. Lopez & Associates, Inc., seeks a Human Resource Consultant to join its expanding staff. Candidates should possess a Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational psychology or a related field. The ideal candidate will be a recent Ph.D. with a variety of organizational experiences. The individual will be responsible for managing projects in diverse research areas such as selection andplacement, training, performance appraisal, attitude surveys and organizational diagnosis. Candidates will interface with corporate clients and must possess strong oral communication skills. The candidate will also be expected to have a strong statistical background and be able to develop project proposals and write research reports. Candidates interested in becoming directly involved in the Industrial/Organizational psychological profession by pursuing research interests, making professional presentations, etc., will be given preference. The position offers above average compensation and performance-based incentives. Send detailed resume with salary requirements to: Gerald A. Kesselman, Ph.D., Senior Vice President, Lopez & Associates, Inc., 44 South Bayles Avenue, Suite 316, Port Washington, New York 11050. Lopez & Associates, Inc., is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Industrial/Organizational Psychologist. The Department of Psychology, San Francisco State University has a tenure-track assistant professorship open beginning in the Fall Semester, 1987. Responsibilities include, in addition to participation in the graduate I/O Program, teaching undergraduate courses in general psychology. A specialization in industrial-organizational psychology is required. San Francisco State University is a multi-ethnic institution located in one of the most culturally diverse cities in the United States, providing a unique environment for exciting teaching and professional development. Applicants should send a statement outlining interests, a curriculum vitae and at
least three letters of recommendation to: Dr. Philburn Ratoosh, Chair, HRT Committee, Department of Psychology, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA 94132. Applications should be received by March 1, 1987. San Francisco State University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer. Members of minority groups are especially encouraged to apply.


Management Development. Due to our continued growth, Frito-Lay's Management Development Department has an immediate opening for a manager. Key responsibilities include organizational design and development, team building and change management, staffing and manpower utilization, assessment of managerial potential, and research for assigned client groups. The ideal candidate will have a Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology or a related discipline and post-doctoral experience in private industry or a large consulting firm. The candidate will have documented accomplishments dealing with a variety of human resource management problems and will have worked closely with senior management. Excellent interpersonal and communications skills are required for success. Salary is competitive and will be commensurate with experience. If you are interested in a position which offers opportunities for innovative work in an organization which is committed to the development of its employees, send your resume along with salary history to: Dr. Ken Alvares; Director, Management Development; Frito-Lay, Inc.; P.O. Box 660634; Dallas, Texas 75266-0634. Frito-Lay, Inc., is an Equal Opportunity Employer M/F/V/H.

Faculty Position. The University of Washington, Department of Management and Organization, has a potential opening in the area of human resource management effective Fall 1987. Duties include both teaching and research. Candidates for positions must have completed a Ph.D. or DBA Degree and have a demonstrated record of scholarly achievement in teaching and research. Starting salary and rank is dependent on qualifications and experience. The University of Washington is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Applications from minorities and women are encouraged. Please send resume and names of four people whom we can contact for letters of reference to: Professor Terence R. Mitchell, DJ-10, School of Business Administration, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195.

Industrial/Organizational Psychologist. The Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, has been authorized to reopen the search for a person to fill a tenure track position for Fall, 1987. Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology required. Demonstrated research productivity is more important than specific interest areas. Development of an extramurally funded research program (or its potential) is desirable. Rank and salary are dependent upon experience and qualifications of the applicant. Candidates are expected to teach both graduate and undergraduate students, conduct scholarly research and supervise Ph.D. candidates. Applicants should send vitae, letter describing research and teaching interests and the names and addresses of three references to: Alan R. Bass, Dept. of Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202. An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Applications are invited for teaching appointments in the School of Management commencing from the academic year 1987/88, which will begin in July 1987. Preference will be given to those who are able to teach in one or more of the following areas:

International Management
Personnel Management and Industrial Relations
Organizational Behaviour and Development
Strategic Management

The School of Management undertakes teaching at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. It is active in research and conducts regular executive courses for middle and senior level managers. Currently, there are some 1,500 BBA and 350 MBA students.

Openings are available at the ranks of Lectureship, Senior Lectureship and Associate Professorship on normal 3-year contracts.

Short term appointments ranging from 1 term to 2 years are also available.
Candidates should possess an appropriate PhD degree, or expect to complete their doctoral programme by mid-1987. Those applying for Senior Lectureships and above must have considerable teaching, research and/or industrial experience.

Gross annual emoluments range as follows:

- Lecturer: S$28,300 — 58,800
- Senior Lecturer: S$35,160 — 94,090
- Associate Professor: S$82,430 — 113,530

(US$1 = S$2.19 approximately)

The commencing salary will depend on the candidate's qualifications, experience and the level of appointment offered.

Leave and medical benefits will be provided. Depending on the type of contract offered, other benefits may include: provident fund benefits or an end-of-contract gratuity, a settling-in allowance of S$1,000 (single) or S$2,000 (married), subsidised housing at nominal rentals ranging from S$100 to S$216 p.m., education allowance for up to three children, subject to a maximum of S$10,000 per annum per child, passage assistance and baggage allowance for the transportation of personal effects to Singapore. Staff members may undertake consultation work, subject to the approval of the University, and retain consultation fees up to a maximum of 60% of their gross annual emoluments in a calendar year.

Application forms and further information on terms and conditions of service may be obtained from:

The Director
Personnel Department
National University of Singapore
10 Kent Ridge Crescent
Singapore 0511

Industrial/Organizational Psychologist. The Department of Psychology seeks a doctoral-level Industrial/Organizational psychologist for a tenure-track position at the Assistant or Associate Professor level. The department offers an M.A. degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology and has a strong commitment to teaching. Preference will be given to candidates with a strong background in research and practical experience as an Industrial/Organizational psychologist. Duties include teaching undergraduate and graduate courses including graduate survey methods course. In addition, the successful candidate will be expected to conduct research and perform service activities. Applicant should send a letter, graduate transcripts, and curriculum vita, as well as the names and phone numbers of three references, and all these materials must be received by Friday, February 20, 1987. These materials should be sent to Dr. Joyce Crouch, Chairperson, Psychology Department, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608. ASU is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

I/O Graduate Student Internships. The Human Resources Research (HRR) staff at BellSouth Corporation announces one 12-month research internship opportunity beginning late winter/early spring, 1987 and three summer internship opportunities beginning in mid-May, 1987. BellSouth operates middle management and advanced management assessment centers that serve several of the former Bell System companies. The 12-month intern will be responsible for conducting research to support various aspects of the programs and preparing technical reports documenting research findings. Each summer intern will be responsible for administering assessment exercises, writing summary reports of candidate behavior, conducting an independent research project, and preparing a technical report of the project results. All applicants should have completed a Masters degree (or at least two years of graduate study) and possess strong research and written communication skills. Expertise in using SAS to perform data set manipulations and conduct statistical analyses is required for the 12-month position and strongly recommended for the summer positions. In addition, the summer interns should possess strong interpersonal skills in order to effectively interact with managers who serve as assessors or participate as candidates. All positions provide an excellent opportunity to get first-hand exposure to an operating management assessment center, conduct applied research, interact with a large HRR staff (currently consisting of twelve I/O psychologists), and gain some insight regarding a corporate headquarters environment. Interested graduate students are invited to submit a vita, cover letter, and two letters of recommendation to: Dr. Keith Lykins, Manager—Human Resources Research, BellSouth Corporation, Suite 400, 2200 Century Parkway, Atlanta, GA 30345. BellSouth Corporation is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Organizational Psychologist, Ph.D. Anticipated entry-level opening for tenure-track faculty member in an established program in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Teach undergraduate and graduate courses in organizational psychology, teach related courses and introductory psychology, advise students, supervise masters and doctoral theses, and participate in program development. Candidates must have teaching and research competence in some area of organizational psychology. Appointment date: August, 1987. Applicants should send curriculum vitae, letters from at least three references, and a statement of research and teaching interests to: George C. Thornton III, Chairman, In-
Industrial/Organizational Psychology Section, Department of Psychology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523. In order to receive full consideration, applications must be received by February 15, 1987. Colorado State University is EEO/Title IX employer. Equal Opportunity Office: 314 Student Services Building.

Industrial/Organizational Psychologist. McDevitt & Street “driven to win for the client, the individual, the company.” The fifth largest commercial general builder in the U.S., experiencing 50% compounded annual growth over the last eight years with current revenues of $800 million and operating throughout the U.S., is seeking an individual to design, develop and implement an employee selection program with both testing and interviewing. Candidates will have a PhD in Industrial/Organizational Psychology or related field, and have 3-5 years experience with a similar program in a corporate environment. Strong interpersonal skills are needed with a desire to work with highly productive professionals in top levels of the organization. The individual will interface with other HRD programs, recruiting, individual development and teach an in-house course in behavioral psychology. Some travel required. Report to: V. J. Josephs, Senior V.P., Director of Human Resource Development, McDevitt & Street Company, P.O. Box 32755, Charlotte, NC 28222. Send resumes to above address. McDevitt & Street is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

ATTENTION

INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
DOCTORAL STUDENTS AND FACULTY
ANNOUNCING
the
SECOND ANNUAL
INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
DOCTORAL STUDENT CONSORTIUM
Thursday, August 27, 1987

On the day before the start of the annual APA Convention in New York, NY, the Society (Division 14) will sponsor its Doctoral Student Consortium. The Consortium is intended for outstanding graduate students in I/O and OB who have completed most of their doctoral coursework.

This conference provides a unique opportunity for graduate students to attend presentations on the latest research trends and to network with other students.

Participation will be limited to 60 students. To apply for consideration, students should complete a nomination form including appropriate faculty signatures. Faculty members are also encouraged to nominate students. Nominations forms must be received by June 1, 1987. There will be a registration fee of $15 for the conference.

Nominations forms may be obtained from:

Dennis Doverspike
I/O Doctoral Student Consortium
Department of Psychology
The University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325

Have you examined the expanded new edition of this popular text?

Staffing Organizations
Second Edition
Benjamin Schneider, University of Maryland
Neal Schmitt, Michigan State University

This new hardbound edition offers a greatly expanded treatment of staffing the modern organization. Thorough coverage of job and organizational analysis, performance appraisal, recruiting, and validity and utility analysis makes this edition outstanding in its comprehensiveness. The authors review the various employee selection procedures and offer samples of each. In-depth discussion of EEO legislation and of current theories about the role of staff in organizational effectiveness is included. Numerous examples are found in each chapter. Available Now, ©1986, 478 pages, hardbound, Instructor's Manual.

For further information write Meredith Helveston, Department SA-IOP
1900 East Lake Avenue, Glenview, Illinois 60025

Scott, Foresman and Company
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AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN CONSULTATION

The Division of Consulting Psychology of APA announces a call for nominations for two awards of $1,000 each for demonstrated excellence in the practice of consultation. Both awards will be presented at the APA Convention in New York in 1987.

The Perry L. Rohrer Award, funded by the consulting firm of Rohrer, Hibler, & Replogle, is named in honor of a founding member of that firm who epitomized the standards of excellence which the Division seeks to perpetuate. The award is given annually to an APA member from any field of psychology whose career has reflected outstanding service to organizations, public or private, by helping them respond more effectively to human needs. The 1986 recipient was Douglas W. Bray, whose work in the development of assessment centers and his longitudinal studies of career motivation and change have helped countless organizations cope more appropriately with people problems.

The National Psychological Consultants to Management Award is funded by that organization, (NPCM), an association of consulting psychology organizations across the country, ranging in size from one-person to multi-office consulting firms. In sponsoring the NPCM Award, they seek to encourage innovation and experimentation in consultation by recognizing and rewarding specific instances of outstanding work: a project, case study, experiment, research study, or intervention where the positive impact on the organization and/or its contribution to our knowledge serve to enhance our profession. In 1986, the award went to Nancy Norvell of the University of Florida for her work on stress management for the Florida Highway Patrol.

Nominees must be APA members, or graduate students sponsored by a member, from any area of specialization. Anyone, including oneself, may submit a nomination. Deadline: April 1, 1987. Send three copies of each submission to: Ken Bradt, Chair, APA Div. 13 Awards Committee, 1911 Rain Forest Trail, Sarasota, Florida 34240, or call Ken for more information: 813-371-6582.

JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY ARTICLE DATABASE

A 1980 to 1986 JAP database of articles categorized by Title, Author(s), Citation, Content and Method keywords is available. The database is stored on 1-360kb diskette suitable for use with Professional File, PFS File, or IBM Filing Assistant. For more information, contact: Hubert S. Feild, Department of Management, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849.

CALL FOR AWARD NOMINATIONS

The Organizational Behavior Division of the Academy of Management announces its annual call for nominations for its "Scholarly Contribution to Organizational Behavior Award." The award will be presented to a publication appearing in recognized periodical outlets such as journals and research annuals that are generally available to division members, with a publication date of 1986. Recipients of the award need not belong to the Academy of Management.

The Scholarly Contribution to Organizational Behavior Award is given for the most significant empirically or non-empirically based publication, on issues of importance in organizational behavior. Papers nominated for this award will be judged with regard to their extent of contribution to the advancement of the field of organizational behavior.

Each Academy of Management member may nominate one publication for the award. Nominations should be written by letter and include (a) a rationale justifying receipt of the award by the nominee(s), and (b) a full bibliographic citation of the nominated work. Self-nominations will not be accepted.

The award winner will be announced at the August 1987 National Academy meeting in New Orleans during the OB Division's business meeting and will be presented a certificate of recognition.

All nominations should be sent to: Cynthia V. Fukami, Department of Management, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208. To receive consideration, material must be postmarked no later than March 31, 1987.

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

A new journal will appear in the spring of 1987. The journal is called Human Performance and is dedicated to the presentation of original research, theory and instrumentation devoted to understanding human performance. The journal will be published by Erlbaum and Associates and will be a quarterly journal.
By using the term "performance" in the title, the implication is that the behavior in question will have a goal directed character to it. This is intended to distinguish between the broader and more generic use of the term performance to imply any action, whether reflexive, spontaneous or directed, and the narrower use defined by the presence of a goal or expected level for the behavior in question. Thus, a study of the effects of teacher style on classroom behavior would not be appropriate for the journal, but a study of the effect of teacher style on reading comprehension test scores would be appropriate. Similarly, a study of the effect of a new aerobic training method on VO2 would not be appropriate, but a study describing the effects of the same training program on work or athletic performance would be appropriate.

We would expect the journal to publish manuscripts in a wide variety of areas including industrial and organizational psychology, educational psychology, sports psychology, human factors, cognitive psychology, and military psychology—any manuscript that addresses the circumstances of some clearly defined aspect of human cognitive, perceptual-motor or motor performance.

The editorial board is a good one, including the following individuals: Earl Alluisi, Ed Fleishman, Bob Glaser, Joyce Hogan, Dan Landers, Bill Morgan, Larry James, Bob Linn, Neal Schmitt, Zur Shapira, Joyce Shields and Bob Sternberg. The Associate Editor is Shelly Zedeck.

We would like to receive manuscripts from you for review and possible publication. The manuscripts should be prepared in APA format. Forward three copies of the manuscript to the following address for review:

Frank Landy
Editor: Human Performance
Dept. of Psychology
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

SPIN ON BITNET AND USENET

Hall P. Beck and Michael P. Cook announce that the Social Psychology Information Network (SPIN) is now available to subscribers of BITNET and USENET. SPIN provides social scientists with a public forum for sending and receiving announcements, and discussing research and other issues related to their discipline.

SPIN is compiling a mailing list of social scientists who have access to BITNET or USENET. Electronic messages addresses to SPIN@ECSVAX will automatically be distributed to all addresses on the mailing list. You are encouraged to send any messages or announcements that you believe would be of interest to your colleagues.

SPIN is dedicated to the free exchange of ideas and information between social scientists. There is no charge for sending or receiving SPIN messages or announcements if you have access to BITNET or USENET. Check with your local computer center to find out more about local access to BITNET or USENET.

You must provide your name and BITNET or USENET address to be added to the mailing list. You may send this information to HPBECK@ECSVAX (via Bitnet or USENET), leave a message on SPIN's electronic bulletin board at 704-262-6032 (300/1200/2400 baud), or mail it to SPIN, Psychology Department, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608.

WILLIAM JAMES AWARD COMPETITION

Division 1 is sponsoring the second annual competition for the William James Award, to be presented to an author or authors of a recent article or book that best provides a conceptual framework that brings coherence among subfields and subspecialties of psychology. The award, which carries with it a prize of $1,000, is presented at the APA Convention. Only works published within the past five years are eligible. The first award was presented to George Mandler in August for his book Mind and Body. Deadline for submission of nominations for this year's award is March 1, 1987. For more information contact: C. Alan Boneau, Department of Psychology, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia 22030 (703/323-2203).

Work, Employment and Society is the title of a new journal to be published quarterly from March 1987 by the British Sociological Association. It will be edited by Richard Brown, Durham University.

The new journal will cover a wide range of topics including:
- the division of labour in all its forms—international, national, industrial, regional, workplace, household, gender, occupational * the economy, both 'formal' and 'informal' * employment, unpaid work and unemployment—the changing nature of work, the impact of new technology, the restructuring of industry, the consequences of mass unemployment * the state, public policy and work and industry * work organizations and bureaucracy * the labour process and the management of work * labour markets * occupations, professions, occupational associations, trade unions * employer-employee relations and industrial conflict * class, gender, race and age in relation to employment and unemployment.
For further information please write to: Work, Employment and Society, British Sociological Association, 10 Portugal Street, London WC2A 2HU, England.

Manuscripts should be sent to: Professor Richard Brown, Editor, Work, Employment and Society, Department of Sociology, University of Durham, Durham DH1 3JT, England.

MASTER'S PROGRAM AT CAL STATE, SAN BERNARDINO

California State University, San Bernardino has begun its second year of an interdisciplinary master's program with a concentration in I/O. For further information, contact Janet L. Kottke, Department of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407.

TRAINING DIRECTORS

DO YOU WANT TO

Speed up training?
Have employees like it?
Try accelerative learning techniques?

Proven in: Foreign languages, Academic subjects, Computer programming. Widely adaptable to industrial training.
Add spice to your training program: train your trainers in a SALT workshop!

Contact: RIM, D.H. Schuster, Ph.D., Box 8987 Welch Station, Ames, IA 50010 Telephone: 515*292-1555

Committees

State Affairs

Bill Howell
Rice University
Ron Downey
Kansas State University

As we have pointed out in numerous past reports, SIOP members tend to focus their attention and effort on professional affairs at the national level, while regulations that control the practice of psychology are promulgated and enforced at the state level. Still, according to a survey of the SIOP membership reported by DeGregorio and Schmitt in the November TIP, nearly half the respondents are licensed, most believe that some licensing should be required, but over half feel the existing regulations and regulators pose a "significant problem" for the I/O practitioner. An earlier survey of our committee suggested that very few of our members choose to get involved in—or even familiarize themselves with—the process by which these "problematic" regulations are established.

And regulation of practice is not the only state-level problem. Bills are frequently introduced in state legislatures, often with the support and encouragement of health-care professionals, that have an indirect bearing on I/O practice (e.g. thorough testing regulations, confidentiality provisions, etc.). State psychological associations are usually well informed on all these matters; in fact, they tend to be very active in shaping and promoting their positions. With the monies available through the new APA Office of Professional Practice, they promise to be even more so in the future.

Obviously, the most direct way for I/O to protect its interests in the face of these developments is for some of its members to get personally involved in the activities of the two most salient bodies in each state: the
State Board of Examiners, and the State Psychological Association. In a
dozens, if not all states, we have an influential SIOP member or two, and the
reports suggest that such individuals can have a profound impact (just as
SIOP has had in APA despite its comparably small numbers). Naturally
we encourage more of this personal involvement—it is costly to the in-
dividual in time and effort, but offers by far the greatest payoff for the
I/O specialty.

One of the functions of the SIOP State Affairs Committee is to pro-
mote such involvement, and we are presently developing a roster of in-
dividuals and groups who are currently active in their respective states.
Another is to monitor regulatory activities in each state for the benefit of
the SIOP leadership and you, its members. We are now doing this on a
regular basis through both the State Boards and the Association. The
former is a source of “official” information on regulatory matters (what
has happened or is scheduled to) and is accessed through periodic mail
contact with the Board’s secretary. (We maintain current information
presently at Kansas State University.) The Associations, on the other
hand, can, if they’re so inclined, give us “early warning,” interpretive,
and other useful predictive information. This can only be accomplished
through personal contact with some individual in the association (who
usually changes annually), and even then with some difficulty. Where
possible, we try to get included on association newsletter and other mail-
ing lists.

It is our intention to report summaries or highlights from these various
information-gathering efforts on a fairly regular basis in TIP. What
follows is a report of some particularly salient facts gleaned from the 40
Boards (plus seven Canadian provinces) and 37 State Associations that
responded to our latest inquiries.

Regulatory Summary

Only one state (Connecticut) and one province (Newfoundland)
reported having no current licensing/certification regulations. (The
former probably has a new one at this writing.) In most of the rest, the
current laws and/or rules affecting practice are either in the process of be-
ing changed or soon will be. When this happens, it is critical that the
proposals be reviewed to ensure that the changes do not impose unrea-
sonable burdens, or worse, on the I/O constituency. Or, viewed more
positively, the change process offers an opportunity for the existing
situation to be improved.

Here, for your consideration, is a listing of the states we have so far
identified in which some form of review is (or soon will be) in progress.
Those followed by dates are subject to “sunsetting” provisions that
cause the existing law to expire as indicated; a committee of the State
Association generally initiates an intensive review, leading to change
recommendations, well in advance of the expiration date. Those
designated by asterisks are undergoing some other form of review or
change, generally under the aegis of a standing “legislative oversight”
committee of the Association. In most of the larger states (19 out of the
37 in the Association survey) a paid lobbyist is instrumental in this
process as well.

Alabama 1988    Maine 1986    New York*
Arizona*        Massachusetts*    Oklahoma 1991
California*     Minnesota*        Pennsylvania* 1996
Connecticut*    Missouri*        Tennessee 1991
Florida 1988    Montana*         Utah* 1988
Georgia* 1992   Nebraska*        Vermont*
Kansas*         New Hampshire* 1987    W. Virginia 1992
Kentucky*       New Jersey* 1988    Alberta*
Louisiana* 1987 New Mexico* 1992    Manitoba*

A few imminent changes were identified by the Boards or Associations
as having a direct bearing on I/O (of course, there are probably also
others that were not explicitly identified). These included:

1. Florida’s plan to add a one-year internship requirement.
2. Mississippi’s effort to develop explicit training standards for I/O
   psychologists.
3. New York’s attempt to define what constitutes an acceptable site for
   I/O experience.
4. South Dakota’s proposed requirement that we represent ourselves as
   I/O consultants, not psychologists.
5. Texas’ adoption of specialty oral exams as part of the licensing pro-
   cedure (as is now done in California).

Issues Under Debate

The range of issues being discussed currently in the various state
associations is broad and ever changing. By far the most ubiquitous are
health-care-provider (HCP) ones, most of which have little or no direct
relevance for us. Next most common are licensing/certification/regula-
tion issues which we have just explored. Third on the list (about 25% of
the respondents) is confidentiality, which can be a problem for us. Finally,
about 10% are discussing testing issues (computerization, school-
related matters, “truth in testing,” and others), honesty/polygraph
testing in employment settings, and continuing education requirements.
A more complete and detailed account of what’s happening on these issues will be presented in a future report.

Overview of Trends

It is clear from a review of the actual changes that have been implemented as well as the ongoing discussions that our fears regarding the trend towards tighter and more health-care oriented regulation in the states are well founded. The I/O and other non-HCP specialties (which, incidentally, make up less than 5% of the total population seeking licensure each year) are being subjugated increasingly to the health-care model of training and practice. Thus it is incumbent upon all of us—not just the State Affairs Committee—to consider getting involved.

A new (11th draft) of a Model Licensing Law is making the rounds of APA governance review. In our view (although we do not presume to speak for SIOP generally), this version, should it pass, would promise considerable relief from the current trend. It would grant exemptions to those I/O practitioners not engaged in providing direct services to individuals within groups or organizations, to researchers, and to academicians. But it would permit those who wish to be licensed to do so based on criteria appropriate to the specialty (rather than the health-care model for all). Since the State Boards’ own association will push this model, should it pass, the impact could be felt fairly rapidly. Of course it isn’t perfect; it hasn’t completed its governance rounds yet; and it may not pass (many HCP’s are strongly opposed). In any case, it’s something to watch.

Please feel free to contact either of us (Bill Howell at Rice University, Houston, TX; Ron Downey at Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS) if you have questions, need more information, or want help finding the right person or office to contact in your state.

Professional Affairs Committee

Hannah Rothstein Hirsh, Chair

The various subcommittees of the Professional Affairs Committee have been hard at work this fall and winter. We are making steady progress towards the goals we set at the beginning of the year.

The Professional Responsibilities subcommittee, chaired by Dan Lupton, is formulating a definition of “I/O Psychologist.” The draft defini-
tion will soon be circulated to a panel of experts; additionally, any Society member who wishes to receive and comment upon the draft definition is encouraged to write to Dan at Towers, Perrin, Forster & Crosby, 245 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10167-0128.

The Innovations in Practice subcommittee, chaired by Elaine Pulakos, has generated three possible topics for the proposed Innovations in Practice conference. The first topic is “Self-help, Self-management and Taking the Initiative,” reflecting three important aspects of employee development and management improvement. The second topic is “Hands-on Experience for New Practitioners,” whose target audience would be upper-level graduate students, new Ph.D.’s and others with relatively little practical experience. Such nuts and bolts issues as how to develop a content valid test, how to construct an assessment center exercise, etc. would be taught at this conference. The third option is to focus the conference on applied areas in need of some innovative thought, such as job evaluation, utility measurement, etc. The committee is in the process of contacting individuals who might be potential participants or sponsors, and of evaluating the three alternatives. Society members who wish to make suggestions should contact Elaine at Personnel Decisions Research Institute, 43 Main Street, SE, Riverplace Suite 405, Minneapolis, MN 55414.

The APA Liaison subcommittee, headed by Bob Boldt, has been monitoring APA activities of interest to Society members. They report that the General Guidelines for Providers of Psychological Services (formerly the Standards for Providers of Psychological Services) and the Model State Licensure Guidelines have passed through BPA and will have been voted on by Council by the time you read this. We are pleased to report that we were able to effect some substantial changes in both of these documents; nevertheless, they each contain some troubling wording. Another item of interest is APA’s proposed expansion of the continuing education certification program to include activities engaged in by academicians and other non-health care practitioners. While we laud the expansion of creditable CE activities, we are concerned with their potential use as a basis of re-licensure. Because of our concerns about licensure, we are also concerned about facilitating relicensure efforts. This subcommittee is also producing its own version of I/O Specialty Guidelines, so that if APA continues with its plan to revise this document, we will be ready. Contact Bob at Educational Testing Service, Rosedale Road, Princeton, NJ, if you have comments.

The Professional Services subcommittee, chaired by Bob Billings, is moving ahead with its work on consultants. Two case histories are complete and will be published in future issues of TIP.
Assessment Centers: What are they?
A video production by:
Dennis A. Joiner & Associates
A video tape introduction to the Assessment Center Process
 Ideal for:
• Classroom Instructions
• Candidate Orientation Sessions
• An Overview for Novice Assessors

This 50-minute videotape allows viewers to follow a group of candidates through four of the most common assessment center exercises. The commentary provides information on the rationale behind the use of each exercise, how the actual content of the exercises is determined and why assessment centers are such valuable management tools for making selection, promotion and career development decisions.

SPECIAL OFFER: In order to allow individuals and organizations to take advantage of this video production, the low price of $155 has been established which includes shipping and handling. Three day previews are available for a $35 fee, which is applied to the purchase price.

TO ORDER: PHOTO COPY OR DETACH FORM

VIDEOTAPE ORDER FORM:

NAME 

TITLE 

ORGANIZATION 

SHIPPING ADDRESS 

CITY STATE ZIP CODE TELEPHONE EXTENSION

VIDEO FORMAT REQUESTED (Check One): □ VHS □ BETA □ 3/4-INCH

COST INFORMATION:
Videotape (includes shipping) $155.00
Sales tax 8% (CA residents only) (11.70)
Preview (applied toward purchase) $35

□ Send Free Brochure □ Payment Enclosed
□ Send Invoice □ Purchase Order Enclosed

Make check payable to: Dennis A. Joiner and Associates

MAIL FORM TO: Videotape, Dennis A. Joiner & Associates, P.O. Box 2341, Sacramento, CA 95811-2341 or call (916) 338-3131
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APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP
SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, INC.
DIVISION 14 OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
(Please Type)

Name and address

Current

☐ Member

Year................................ List memberships in other divisions

☐ APA status &

Year

☐ Associate

year elected:

☐ Student affiliate

Year................................ List associate status in other divisions

................................

☐ Foreign affiliate

Year................................

Check status in Division 14 for which you are applying:

☐ Member

☐ Associate

☐ Student affiliate

☐ Foreign affiliate

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND (Show undergraduate and graduate education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Major area of specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Master’s thesis title

Advisor(s)

Ph.D. thesis title

Advisor(s)

PUBLICATIONS (List your two most significant publications, if applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Publication</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (List present position first and then list earlier positions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUTIES: On a separate page describe briefly the duties of each job. Identify by the above numbers.

Show any additional information to support your application on the reverse side of this form or a separate page.

I certify the above information is correct. I authorize investigation of all statements contained in this application. I subscribe to and will support the purpose of the Society, "to promote human welfare through the various applications of psychology to all types of organizations providing goods or services, such as manufacturing concerns, commercial enterprises, labor unions or trade association, and public agencies."

Date

Signature of Applicant
b. It would be helpful to the Membership Committee if individuals who did not receive a Ph.D. in I/O psychology, or the equivalent thereof (e.g., Ph.D. in organizational behavior from a business school), supported their statement that they are engaged in professional activities related to the purpose of the Division by submitting one of the following: (a) two articles published in I/O related journals, (b) two letters of recommendation written by current members of the Society of I/O Psychology, (c) name of I/O related courses taught, or (d) copies of unpublished research or evaluation reports in the I/O area.

3. Applications must be approved by both the Membership Committee and the Executive Committee of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc.

Qualifications for Associate Status:

1. Associates must meet the standards for Associates in APA:
   a. The person must have completed two years of graduate work in psychology at a recognized graduate school.
   b. The person must have a Master's degree in psychology (or related area) from a recognized graduate school and, in addition, must have completed one full year of professional work in psychology.

2. Presently must be engaged primarily in professional or graduate work related to the purpose of the Society as stated in Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws.

Qualifications for Student Affiliate Status:

Must be students presently engaged primarily in formal study related to the purpose of the Society as stated in Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws.

Qualifications for Foreign Affiliate Status:

Must be Foreign Affiliates of APA.

*From Society Bylaws

Completed applications should be returned to:
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

OHRC VIEWPOINT: Corporate loyalty: A new definition

by Adela Oliver, Ph.D.
President
Oliver Human Resource Consultants, Inc.

The restructuring of corporate America has made a casualty of the old code of corporate loyalty. The wave of mergers and acquisitions has cut huge swaths through management ranks and left the survivors wondering whether loyalty has any part in the relationship between manager and corporation. It has also left human resource management with a serious dilemma — the redefinition of that loyalty. The blind unquestioning faith in the relationship has been badly shaken. The unwritten contract is gone. It used to read as follows — "I, the manager, will act as the steward of the corporation and protect its interests at virtually any cost. For its part, the corporation will take care of me, offer me virtual lifetime job security and provide the opportunity to reach new heights via promotions."

Managers need to understand that their companies do realize that a shift has occurred and lifetime job security is unlikely. But the company will act to protect its employees from the worst effects of this.

A few years ago outplacement counseling was the response of only the most progressive companies. But today virtually all major U.S. companies offer it. They cannot protect managers from corporate restructurings but can minimize the worst effects. Outplacement counseling was the major human resource tool of the late '80s.

Oliver Human Resource Consultants is an executive outplacement and organization development consulting firm based in New York.

Oliver Human Resource Consultants, Inc.
1290 Avenue of the Americas, NYC10104
212 307-5740
ADVERTISE IN TIP
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