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YES, YOU CAN PRODUCE MEASURABLE CHANGE WITH FEEDBACK AND TRAINING

IF YOU USE SOUNDLY DEVELOPED NEEDS ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

If you don’t demonstrate that your present programs improve skills and attributes, you can do it with our instruments and by adapting our cost-effective off-the-shelf training modules. Use these instruments to focus on relevant needs and establish baseline data to improve programs and show accountability.

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP For top managers to enhance strategy development, organization oversight, and their impact on organization culture. 13 dimensions including Strategic Vision, Values, Venturesomeness, Situation Analysis, Managing Managers, and others. This instrument is restricted to professionals with substantial experience, special workshop required.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES For all levels, especially managers/supervisors serving for promotion. Assess skills and attributes that keep an organization responsive to changing times. 18 dimensions: Vision, Self-Confidence, Creativity, Risk-taking, Resourcefulness, Innovating, Expectations of Excellence, Persua
diveness, Charm, Integrity, and others.

MANAGEMENT PRACTICES Basic skills for effective continuous goal-seeking performance; the underpinnings for leadership. 15 dimensions including Goal Clarification, Encouraging Participation, Orderly Work Planning, Coaching, Control, Teambuilding, Trust, etc. Has shown validity for 15 years; ask for studies of changed managerial behavior over periods of from five weeks to one year.

PLUS DEVELOPMENT FEEDBACK FOR THESE KEY ROLES

PEER RELATIONS Organization skills for professionals/technicians.

TEAMING Teambuilding for project teams, intact work groups, task forces.

SALES RELATIONS Skills for feedback from customers/prospects on sales skills. Forms adapted for Business, Securities, Insurance, general use.

GROUPS For quick probe of organization climate, quality of life, etc. Available in combination with management practices or peer relations.

WHY OUR PROGRAMS WORK WHEN OTHERS DON’T

THEY ARE BASED ON AN OPERATIONAL MODEL AND ARE WORDED IN PRACTICAL TERMS
Participants understand feedback and analyze it, making it easy to alter their behavior.

THEY ARE USER-CENTERED By design, the format and questions in each module are straightforward, making it easy to use without prior experience.

THEIR MEASUREMENT TOOLS ARE RELIABLE RELIABILITY up to 90% over 90 items, with the same results secured in different situations.

THEY ARE MANAGED TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS OF THE BUSINESS They help identify needs and achieve measurable change.

CLARK WILSON PUBLISHING Co. Box 471 New Canaan CT 06840
LEADING PUBLISHER OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS SINCE 1973

[Contact information]
Now available . . .
An empirically based narrative report
for the
CALIFORNIA
PSYCHOLOGICAL
INVENTORY
by Harrison G. Gough

Featuring:
- A five-part CPI Narrative Report that provides a thorough explanation of an individual's CPI results
- Section 1 contains a validity check
- Section 2 explains the type and level classification
- Section 3 provides an interpretation of each of the 20 profile or "folk" scales, organized in four sectors
- Section 4 describes the individual's scores on two special purpose scales — Managerial Potential and Work Orientation
- Section 5 is a fully individualized description of the respondent

For complete information on the CPI revision write to:
Consulting Psychologists Press
Box CPI-R
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94306
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American corporations have recently undergone massive downsizings, resulting, in part, in temporary or contingency managers. Little is known about ad-hoc managers except that they are being hired to fill operational holes left in the organization. This new breed of managers is troublesome from a human resource point of view. What exactly do they do? What are the guidelines for hiring and terminating them? What benefits and compensation do they receive? What legal liabilities does the hiring company have? What exactly is their status? Consultants are easy to understand, use their services, pay them, and call them again when you want them. But what about contingency managers? Their status and use is decidedly unclear.

To help us understand this new phenomenon, we invite you, as a human resource executive, to participate in our nationwide survey of ad-hoc managers. Please send your business card and we’ll send you the survey. The results will be shared with all participants and your views will help clarify a muddy and worrisome issue.

The Ad-Hoc Manager may well be here to stay. But just where and how does he or she fit in?

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

The Message from Your President

Daniel R. Ilgen
August 1988

My first order of business in this, my last “message,” is to thank all of you who have contributed so much to the Society over the last year. In particular, the Executive Committee and the committee chairs and members have devoted a great deal of time and effort to making this a better Society for all of us. In addition to those on committees or in elected offices are many members who have willingly volunteered to help when they were needed. Just this week I spoke with someone who had accepted the extra task of calling forty Society members regarding the APA By-laws vote on reorganization. Now, that is dedication! The exciting part of it is that such dedication is the rule, not the exception.

By the time that this message reaches you, the results of the By-laws vote on reorganization of APA will be known to you so specific comments about reorganization issues that I could say at this writing will be dated or, worse, incorrect. Therefore, rather than comment on specifics, I would like to reflect a little on what I’ve learned and what I think that the Society has learned over the last year from the “reorganization experience,” an experience that none of us anticipated would demand so much of our attention.

The reorganization of APA has pointed out more clearly how well science and practice coexist in industrial-organizational psychology. We have managed not only to minimize the tension between science and practice, but also to create and maintain a discipline that integrates the two. In APA, the division between the two tears it apart.

There appear to me to be at least two reasons for our success. The first of these is that, in many respects, we practice a scientific process; for us, practice is often the practice of science. Our practice demands the knowledge and application of scientific principles to solve problems and to evaluate the effectiveness of our practices. As a result, those who practice I-O psychology are aware of the need to stay current with the knowledge generated by the science and to use the tools of science in practice. Second, a large number of persons in the field do both science and practice. As a society, we have less differentiation of science and
practice between people than is true in many disciplines. Therefore, not only do those who concentrate on the science understand those who concentrate on practice and vice versa, both often have self-interests in the other area and, thus, are not neutral observers of issues in either the science or the practice domain. Whatever the reason, the mix that we have been able to sustain is unique and worth the effort to maintain.

The reorganization experience has done a great deal for improving perceptions of industrial-organizational psychology among other psychologists. Many of us who have held positions in psychology departments are accustomed to defending our field against the pressure of those who consider their disciplines more “mainstream” psychology than ours. In contrast to the outsider role often experienced, SIOP and its representatives have played a major role among the non-health care providers in psychology expressing and shaping the goals and objectives of the science and practice of psychology as issues of a reorganized professional association are raised and debated. Much credit for this goes to Milt Hakel whose candidacy for the APA presidency has cogently articulated a view of psychology that both the scientists and many practitioners find attractive. Richard Campbell, Paul Thayer, Kitty Katzell, and others have also been very helpful in expressing the values of our field and gaining the respect of other psychologists for industrial-organizational psychology as a field and SIOP as an organization representing the field. In an unintentional manner, reorganization has provided a forum for making others more aware of what we do and what we value and gaining their respect for both.

Finally, we have learned something about ourselves from the reorganization process. First, we learned that we have means of addressing issues facing the Society and for personally contacting the membership to do this. In particular, the State Affairs committee, chaired by Vicki Vandaveer, was able to accomplish the momentous task of mobilizing a network of members who placed telephone calls to all active members of the Society. Without a stimulus for developing such a system, we would never have believed that we could accomplish a task as large as this in so little time. We also involved a large proportion of the membership in discussions about our identity, survival as a science, and survival as a practice. These are exactly the topics that Shelly Zedeck had urged the Society to address in his message for this column one year ago. Without the reorganization issue we would have gotten to these issues but much more slowly and, I would suspect, with far less input from the membership at large.

Between the time of writing this message and the time that it appears in print, we will continue to address the issues of the last paragraph. There will be two meetings of a subcommittee formed to consider possible alternative courses of future actions for the Society with respect to APA; one will occur before the result of the By-laws vote is known and one after. These meetings will be both the start and the continuation of a careful consideration of the goals and objectives of the Society. The discussion will continue on into the fall. With Ann Howard’s thorough knowledge of the issues involved, the Society itself, and dedicated effort in its behalf, and with the continued support and involvement of all of you, I think there are some exciting options for maintaining the Society’s link to the science and practice of psychology as we believe it should be and for playing a major role in that association.
Effects of SPC on Employee Selection

Comments by Tom Ramsay, Human Resource Psychologist

Some organizations have used SPC (statistical process control) to improve their productivity. Others have been maced by their customers in order to continue supplying their products to those customers. It means pushing quality responsibility down to the level of the employee (producer). SPC started in electronics, moved to automotive, and now is part of nearly every industry.

It's a great approach to expect a degree of arithmetic sophistication from production workers. The problems arise when we encounter nearly 40 percent of employees who lack either reading or arithmetic skills at the ninth grade level.

For several clients we have developed reading tests based upon the level of training program content. For others we have established standards of arithmetic skill to ensure that a person can participate profitably in an SPC program.

The tests include:

Arithmetic
Addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of whole numbers and decimals. Tables, graphs, and simple word problems.

Reading
A range of passages from 9-12 readability (SMOG) written on subjects included in training programs such as safety, maintenance, equipment and processes.

Our procedures are so recent that we do not know the efficacy of our intervention. But we do know that eliminating the lower tail of the skills distribution has enabled the successful conduct of startup training and the subsequent effective startup of a dozen new facilities staffed from the ranks of unskilled and semiskilled candidates.

Ramsay Corporation
Boyce Station Offices
1050 Boyce Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15241-3907
(412) 257-0732

SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, INC.
APA CONVENTION PROGRAM

Friday, August 12–Tuesday, August 16, 1988

*This is not an official program. Only the APA-published program is official. In cases where discrepancies occur, the APA program supersedes this schedule.

PROGRAM PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE
Elaine D. Pulakos (Chair)
Terry A. Bechr
Jeffrey J. McHenry
Ann M. Morrison
Raymond A. Noe
M. Susan Taylor

PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Ralph A. Alexander
Steven D. Ashworth
Linda N. Bodnar
Charles P. Bird
Georgia T. Chao
Donald D. Davis
Angelo S. DiNisi
Dennis L. Dossett
Ronald G. Downey
Robert Dugan
Jack M. Feldman
Roseanne J. Foti
Donald G. Gardner
George Graen
Thomas Hilton
Lawrence R. James
Ruth Kanfer
Deirdre J. Knapp
Steven W. J. Kozlowski
Gary J. Lautenschlager
James Ledvinka
Robert G. Lord
Wayne R. McCullough
Joe A. Orban
Lawrence H. Peters
William Schiemann
Hilda Wing
Gary Yukl

FACILITIES: Atlanta Hilton (H); Marriott Marquis (M)
FRIDAY, 9:00--10:50  Int'l Salon B/F (M)
SYMPOSIUM: RESEARCH ON EMPLOYEE TURNOVER AND ITS MANAGEMENT
Ramon M. Henson, Avon Products, NY, NY
Donna E. Thompson, Graduate School of Management, Rutgers-The State University. How Human Resource Practices Affect Employees' Intentions To Quit.

FRIDAY, 11:00--12:50  Grand Salon E (H)
SYMPOSIUM: COGNITIVE AND NON-COGNITIVE THEORIES OF WORK MOTIVATION: REVIEW AND INTEGRATION
Donald G. Gardner, College of Business and Administration, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
William E. Scott, Jr., Graduate School of Business, Indiana University. Radical Behaviorism and Activation Theory.
Terence R. Mitchell, Department of Management and Organization, University of Washington, and Gerald R. Ferris, Department of Management, Texas A&M University. Indirect Social Cues and Motivation.
P. Christopher Earley, College of Business and Public Administration, University of Arizona. Recent Trends in Goal Setting Research.
Eugene F. Stone, Bowling Green State University (Discussant).
Gary R. Freeman, College of Business and Administration, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (Discussant).

FRIDAY, 1:00--1:50  Grand Ballroom D (H)
DISCUSSION SESSION: EXECUTIVES IN CRISIS: HOW CAN SIOP MEMBERS RESPOND?
Robert S. Mayer, Nationwide Insurance Companies, Columbus, OH
Jeffrey Lynn Speller, Institute of Leadership, Harvard University. Executives in Crisis.
Daniel R. Ilgen, Michigan State University (Discussant).

FRIDAY, 2:00--2:50  Marquis IV (M)
INVITED ADDRESS
Raymond A. Katzell, New York University
Frank J. Landy, Pennsylvania State University. Job Satisfaction from 1880--1940: Disinterring the Bones.

FRIDAY, 3:00--4:50  Int'l Salon A/E (M)
PANEL DISCUSSION: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LEVELS OF ANALYSIS ISSUES IN ORGANIZATIONAL DATA
Abraham Wandersman, University of South Carolina, and Benjamin Schneider, University of Maryland
Fred Dansereau, State University of New York at Albany.
Paul Florin, University of Rhode Island.
Rosalie Hall, University of Maryland.
Katherine Klein, University of Maryland.
Dennis Perkins, Syncretics, Branford, CT.

FRIDAY, 5:00--8:50  Amsterdam (M)
OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Daniel R. Ilgen, Michigan State University

SATURDAY, 9:00--9:50  Int'l South (M)
POSTER SESSION: I
Donald D. Davis, Old Dominion University
AJZEN'S THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR: AN APPLICATION TO GOAL SETTING. Mark E. Tubbs and James G. Dahl, University of Missouri, St. Louis.
ORGANIZATIONAL POWER: THE CASE FOR COGNITIVE CONTROL. Aglaja I. Hartmann and Michael D. Mumford, Georgia Institute of Technology.
A MIXED STANDARD RATING SCALE FOR ARMY CIVILIAN FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS. Wayne J. Camara, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, and Douglas Kuhn, Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, VA.
TESTS OF THREE LATENT VARIABLE MODELS OF MEMORY-JUDGMENT RELATIONS. David J. Woehr, Georgia Institute of Technology, and Charles E. Lance, University of Georgia.
THE EFFECTS OF RATeR FAMILIARITY ON THE RATING PROCESS. Neil M. A. Hauenstein, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and Robert Kovach, Radford University.
SENSE OF COMPETENCE AND SELF-EFFICACY: CORRELATES AND MODERATOR EFFECTS. Phyllis P. Tharenou, University of Queensland.

A STRUCTURAL MODEL OF JOB ADAPTATION. John E. Sawyer, Texas A&M University.

JOB INVOLVEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: AN EMPIRICAL COMPARISON. Louis C. Buffardi and Karen Y. Niebisch, George Mason University.


BIOGRAPHICAL CONSTRUCTS FOR PREDICTING PERSONNEL RELIABILITY. Michael A. McDaniel, Personnel Security Research and Education Center, Monterey, CA.

INFLUENCES ON EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN RATES. Michael T. Roberson, College of Business, Eastern Kentucky University, and Eric Sundstrom, University of Tennessee.

THE EFFECT OF PRIMING IN A SIMULATED ASSESSMENT CENTER ENVIRONMENT. Robert M. McIntyre and Eric J. Venetti, Old Dominion University.

TASK COMPLEXITY IN THE ASSESSMENT CENTER. Barbara B. Gaugler, Rice University, and George C. Thornton, III, Colorado State University.

CAN QUESTIONNAIRES MEASURE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: FIVE EXTENDED FIELD STUDIES. Robert W. Tucker, College of Business Administration, University of Phoenix, and Walt J. McCoy, Department of Management and Organizational Behavior, University of Nebraska, Omaha.

CONVERGENT AND DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY OF THE MULTIMETHOD JOB DESIGN QUESTIONNAIRE. Michael A. Campion, Paula L. Koskiak, and Beth A. Langford, Krannert School of Management, Purdue University.

GROUP DEVELOPMENT, TEAMWORK SKILLS AND TRAINING. Eduardo Salas, Naval Trainings Systems Center, Orlando, FL, R. Craig Montero and Albert S. Glickman, Old Dominion University, and Ben B. Morgan, Jr., University of Central Florida.

LEARNING-BASED EXPLANATION OF ESCALATION OF COMMITMENT, SUNK COST, AND ENTRAPMENT. Sonia M. Goltz, Department of Management, University of Notre Dame.


THE IMPACT OF STATUS AND AFFECT ON SUPERVISOR-SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIPS. Anthony F. Grasha and Jan Salzman Volkerding, University of Cincinnati.

TOP-, MIDDLE-, AND LOWER-MANAGEMENT ATTENDANCE AND QUALITY CIRCLE EFFECTIVENESS. Thomas L. Tang, Middle Tennessee State University, Peggy S. Tollison, Vanderbilt University, and Harold D. Whiteside, Middle Tennessee State University.

EXPERT JUDGMENT OF EMPLOYMENT TEST VALIDITIES: STUDY OF INFORMATION USE. Karen Weinberg, New York State Unified Court System, New York, NY.

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF META-ANALYTIC STUDIES FROM I/O PSYCHOLOGY. John M. Cornell, Tulane University.


DISTINCTIONS AMONG SUBTYPES OF PERCEIVED DELEGATION AND LEADERSHIP DECISION-MAKING. Chester A. Schriesheim and Linda L. Neider, Department of Management, University of Miami.

PLANNED COMPARISON PROCEDURES AS TESTS OF MODERATING EFFECTS. Eugene F. Stone and Raymond O’Connor, Bowling Green State University.

SATURDAY, 10:00–10:50

POSTER SESSION: II

Int'l South (M)

Thomas Hilton, Naval School of Health Sciences, Bethesda, MD


LPC AS SITUATIONALLY-INFLUENCED RATER LENIENCY: A FIELD INVESTIGATION. Chester A. Schriesheim and Donna K. Cooke, University of Miami, and Brendan D. Bannister, Northeastern University.

MAPPING COGNITIVE PROCESSES IN PERFORMANCE EVALUATION USING VERBAL PROTOCOL ANALYSIS. Scott L. Martin, Applied Personnel Strategies, Chicago, IL, and Richard J. Klimoski, Ohio State University.

THE SATISFACTION-PERFORMANCE RELATIONSHIP: NEW ANSWERS TO AN OLD QUESTION. Charles E. Lance, University of Georgia, John M. Cornwell, Tulane University, and Gerald R. Land on, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, TN.

VALIDATING MEASURES OF JOB COMMITMENT, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS. Paul D. Geyer, Department of Management, Appalachian State University, and Samuel B. Pond, III, North Carolina State University.

THE EFFECTS OF TASK COMPLEXITY, EXPERIENCE AND GOALS ON PERFORMANCE. Debra L. Steele, University of Houston, and Ruth Kanfer, University of Minnesota.

THE MEASUREMENT OF JOB COMPLEXITY: DISCREPANCIES IN SUPERVISOR-SUBORDINATE RATINGS. Ruth E. Joffe, Institute for Consultation and Training, University of Cincinnati.

WORK STRESS-OUTCOME RELATIONSHIP: THE BUFFERING EFFECT OF MODERATE DRINKING. M. Lynne Cooper, Marcia Russell, and Michael R. Frone, Research Institute on Alcoholism, Buffalo, NY.

CHRONIC OCCUPATIONAL STRESSORS, SELF-FOCUSED ATTENTION, AND WELL-BEING. Michael R. Frone, State University of New York at Buffalo, and Dean B. McFarlin, Marquette University.

THE TRAIT VS. SITUATIONAL APPROACH OF COPING WITH JOB STRESS. Carla S. Smith, Lorne Sulsky, Bob Hayes, John Tisak, and Matt McMullen, Bowling Green State.

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF TWO INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT LIABILITY MEASURES. Curtiss P. Hansen, Humber, Mundie & McClary, Milwaukee, WI.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN GRADUATE I/O PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR PROGRAMS. Donald D. Davis, Old Dominion University, Janet Barnes-Farrell, University of Connecticut, and Eric J. Vanetti, Old Dominion University.

ROLE OF SELF-ESTEEM AND SELF-PRESENTATION IN REACTIONS TO PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK. Joanne E. Mac, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and Ann H. Baumgardner, Michigan State University.

THE MEASUREMENT OF JOB SATISFACTION IN KOREA. Ronald G. Downey and Jinkook Tak, Kansas State University.

WORK VALUES STABILITY: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AND RELATIONSHIP WITH DECISION-MAKING. Elizabeth C. Ravlin, Bruce M. Meglino, and Cheryl L. Adkins, College of Business Administration, University of South Carolina.

ARTIFACTS OF IRT PARAMETER LINKING METHODS AND ITEM BIAS DETECTION. Gary J. Lautenschlager and Dong-Gun Park, University of Georgia.


THE EMPLOYMENT DECISION: JOB FEATURES, COMPANY IMAGE, AND RECRUITING PRACTICES. Kenneth W. Kerber and James P. Campbell, Data General Corporation, Westboro, MA.

REDUCTIONS IN FORCE: RIF IS NOT RIFE WITH AGE DISCRIMINATION. David E. Drehmer and Cosimo A. Carlucci, Department of Management, DePaul University, and James E. Bordieri, Southern Illinois University.

A TYPOLOGY OF COUPLES BASED ON MEMBER'S PERCEPTION OF CAREER. genie M. Kromm, Georgia Institute of Technology.

HONESTY TESTING FOR PERSONNEL SELECTION: A QUANTITATIVE REVIEW. Michael A. McDaniel, Personnel Security Research and Education Center, Monterey, CA, and John W. Jones, St. Paul Insurance Companies, St. Paul, MN.

THE EFFECT OF A SUPERVISORY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ON LEADERSHIP STYLE. Phyllis P. Tharenou and John Lyndon, University of Queensland.

SATURDAY, 11:00–12:50

Int'l Salon B/F (M)

SYMPOSIUM: MODERATOR VARIABLES: CONCEPTUAL AND STATISTICAL ISSUES

Raymond A. Katzell, New York University


Lawrence R. James, Georgia Institute of Technology. The Accuracy of Validity Generalization Models as Tests of Moderation.

John Tisak, Bowling Green State University. On the Stochastics of Moderated Regression.

Lois A. James, Georgia Institute of Technology. Segmented Regression.

Raymond A. Katzell, New York University (Discusant).

SATURDAY, 11:00–12:50

Grand A (H)

PANEL DISCUSSION: AN OPEN FORUM WITH EDITORS OF I/O PSYCHOLOGY JOURNALS

Elaine D. Pulakos, American Institutes for Research, Washington, DC
SATURDAY, 1:00–1:50

Marquis III (M)

INVITED ADDRESS: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AWARD
Harry Laurent, Hendersonville, NC
Paul Sparks, Serendipity Unlimited, Houston, TX. My Love Affair with Biodata: A Defense of Empiricism.

SATURDAY, 2:00–3:50

Marquis III (M)

SYMPOSIUM: NONTRADITIONAL APPLICATIONS OF ASSESSMENT CENTERS
Beverly A. Dugan, New York Telephone, New York, NY
Sarah Henry, TPF & C/DSM Assessment Center, Normal, IL. Use of Assessment for Staffing Plant Start-ups.
Alan D. Wolfson, IBM, Purchase, NY. Correlates of Assessment Performance and Errors of Prediction.
Robert M. Guion, Bowling Green State University (Discussant).

SATURDAY, 2:00–3:50

Marquis IV (M)

PANEL DISCUSSION: TRAINING NEEDS FOR I/O PSYCHOLOGISTS FOR PERSONNEL RESEARCH WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS
Paul W. Thayer, North Carolina State University
Newell K. Eaton, U.S. Army Research Institute, Alexandria, VA.
Nita R. French, BellSouth Corporation, Atlanta, GA.
Susan N. Palmer, Wells Fargo Bank, San Francisco, CA.
Mary L. Tenopyr, AT&T, Short Hills, NJ.
Paul R. Sackett, University of Illinois-Chicago (Discussant).

SATURDAY, 4:00–4:50

Marquis III (M)

DIVISION 14 BUSINESS MEETING
Daniel R. Ilgen, Michigan State University

SATURDAY, 5:00–5:50

Marquis III (M)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS
Ann Howard, Leadership Research Institute, New York, NY

SATURDAY, 6:00–7:50

Imperial Salon B (M)

DIVISION 14 SOCIAL HOUR
NO-HOST BAR

SUNDAY, 8:00–8:50

Fulton/Cobb (H)

CONVERSATION HOUR
Ann M. Morrison, Center for Creative Leadership, LaJolla, CA
Magoroh Maruyama, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo, Japan. Multicultural Management: Frictions Resulting from Cultural and Psychological Differences.

SUNDAY, 9:00–10:50

Grand Salon D (H)

OPEN FORUM: LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Richard J. Klimoski, Ohio State University

SUNDAY, 11:00–11:50

Marquis I (M)

INVITED ADDRESS
Ann M. Morrison, Center for Creative Leadership, LaJolla, CA
Richard J. Campbell, New York University. The Scientist-Practitioner in an Age of Organizational Turbulence.

SUNDAY, 12:00–12:50

Int'l Salon C/G (M)

INVITED ADDRESS: S. RAINS WALLACE DISSERTATION AWARD
Paul Sparks, Serendipity Unlimited, Houston, TX

SUNDAY, 12:00–12:50

Int'l Salon D/H (M)

SYMPOSIUM: WELL-BEING AT WORK: PROFITS, PROGRAMS AND PREVENTION
Karl W. Kuhnert, University of Georgia
Robert J. Vance, Ohio State University, and Karl W. Kuhnert, University of Georgia. Job Insecurity and Employee Well-Being.
Mary Roznowski, Ohio State University. Behavioral Manifestations of Employee Commitment and Withdrawal.
Leonard A. Doerrfler, Marian Gurry, and Alice Shakman, Center for Health and Fitness and Division of Preventative and Behavioral Medicine, University of Massachusetts. Issues in Promoting Well-Being in the Workplace.
Robert Feltner, University of Illinois-Champaign (Discussant).

SUNDAY, 1:00-4:50
EMBASSY (H)
INCOMING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Ann Howard, Leadership Research Institute, New York, NY

SUNDAY, 1:00-2:50
Int'l Salon C/G (M)
PANEL DISCUSSION: PART-TIME WORK: EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE EXPECTATIONS—CAN THEY CONVERGE?
Ronald G. Downey, Kansas State University
Ben E. Dowell, Pizza Hut, Inc., Wichita, KS.
Ronald G. Downey, Kansas State University.
Patrick A. Knight, Kansas State University.
Nancy A. Kluge, Bell Atlantic, Arlington, VA.
Jeanne Phelps, Kansas State University.

SUNDAY, 3:00-4:50
Int'l Salon B/F (M)
SYMPOSIUM: FACTORS INFLUENCING RATINGS AND THE APPRAISAL PROCESS: NEW RESEARCH DIRECTIONS
Angelo S. DiNisi, College of Business Administration, University of South Carolina
Walter C. Borman and Glenn L. Hallam, Personnel Decisions Research Institute, Minneapolis, MN. Individual Correlates of Observational Accuracy in Evaluating Mechanic Performance.
Dirk D. Steiner and Jeffrey S. Rain, Louisiana State University. Rating Variable Performance.
Steven B. Woods, American Express TRS, New York, NY, and Terry L. Dickinson, Old Dominion University. Influence of Training, Scale Format, and Justification on Rater Sources.
Lawrence H. Peters, Department of Management, Texas Christian University, and Angelo S. DiNisi, College of Business Administration, University of South Carolina. Information Processing Effects Due to Appraisal Purpose and Job Type.
Jack M. Feldman, Georgia Institute of Technology (Discussant).

SUNDAY, 5:00-5:50
Grand Salon D (H)
INVITED ADDRESS: DISTINGUISHED SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION AWARD
Eugene F. Stone, Bowling Green State University
Robert M. Guion, Bowling Green State University. Pratfalls in the March of Science.

SUNDAY, 6:00-7:50
Grand Salon C (II)
DIVISION 14 SOCIAL HOUR
NO-HOST BAR

MONDAY, 9:00-10:50
Int'l Salon A (M)
SYMPOSIUM: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES TO TRADITIONAL ABILITY TESTING
James C. Sharf, Office of Personnel Management, Washington, DC
Charles N. MacLane and Brian S. O'Leary, Office of Personnel Management, Washington, DC. Job Specific Tests and an Overview of Research on Alternatives.
Richard D. Arvey, University of Minnesota (Discussant).

MONDAY, 9:00-9:50
Int'l Salon E (M)
SYMPOSIUM: THE INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONAL/O.B. GRADUATE STUDENT CONVENTION
Barbara A. Reilly, Bowling Green State University
Recipient of R. J. Wherry Award: To Be Announced
MONDAY, 11:00–12:50
SYMPOSIUM: ARE PEOPLE PRETTY GOOD JUDGES OF OTHERS AFTER ALL?
Charles E. Lance, University of Georgia
Jerry W. Hedge and Frances J. Laue, Universal Energy Systems, San Antonio, TX. Can Appraisers Rate Work Performance Accurately?
Robert J. Vance and Scott L. Martin, Ohio State University. Another Perspective on the Validity of Ratings.
Karl W. Kuhner, University of Georgia. Seeing is Believing. A Developmental/Integrative Perspective on Judging Others.
Craig Russell, Institute for Management & Labor Relations, Rutgers University. What are Assessors Assessing: On the Validity of Management Assessment.
Terry L. Dickinson, Old Dominion University (Discussant).

MONDAY, 1:00–1:50
CONVERSATION HOUR: ANNUAL REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY AUTHORS
Terry A. Beehr, Central Michigan University
Daniel R. Ilgen, Michigan State University, and Howard H. Klein, Ohio State University. Organizational Behavior.

MONDAY, 2:00–3:50
SYMPOSIUM: PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLICE SELECTION AND ASSESSMENT
Philip Ash, London House, Inc., Park Ridge, IL
Frank J. Landy, Pennsylvania State University. Predictors of Police Officer Performance.
Eric Ostrov, Michael Reese Hospital and Medical Center, Chicago, IL. Psychological and Psychiatric Issues in Police Assessment.
James L. Farr, Pennsylvania State University (Discussant).

MONDAY, 4:00–5:50
SYMPOSIUM: LEGAL ISSUES AND THE PRACTICE OF I/O PSYCHOLOGY
Vicki V. Vandaveer, Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, St. Louis, MO
Ronald G. Downey, Kansas State University. Overview of Regulation and Legalization of the Practice of I/O Psychology.
Val H. Markos, BellSouth Corporation, Atlanta, GA. Non-uniform Guidelines for Selection of I/O Psychologists.
Gary K. Burger, University of Missouri-St. Louis. The Politics of I/O Psychology.
William C. Howell, Rice University (Discussant).

TUESDAY, 9:00–10:50
SYMPOSIUM: OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS AND THE DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES
John Hawk, United States Employment Service, Washington, DC
Paul D. Geyer, Department of Management, Appalachian State University. Reliabilities of Ratings Available from the Dictionary of Occupational TItles.
Joseph W. Cunningham, North Carolina State University. Relationships Between OAI and USES Job Variables and Groups.
Edward L. Levine, University of South Florida (Discussant).

TUESDAY, 9:00–9:50
SYMPOSIUM: WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE FUTURE
Barri A. Braddy, Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC
Michael T. Wood, Industrial Technology Institute, Ann Arbor, MI. Private Sector Training for Workforce Development.
Patricia Flynn, Bentley College. The Role of Public Policy in Workforce Development.
John Lawrence, Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC. Occupational Information and Workforce Development.

TUESDAY, 10:00–10:50
CONVERSATION HOUR: TOWARD TRAINING GUIDELINES FOR MASTER'S PROGRAMS IN I/O PSYCHOLOGY
Lilly M. Berry, San Francisco State University
Michael P. Cook, Quaker Oats Company, Chicago, IL. Using Job Analysis to Develop Academic Training Programs.
Loriann Roberson, New York University. Work and Practice with a Master's in I/O Psychology.

TUESDAY, 11:00–12:50
SYMPOSIUM: THE SETTING OF CUTTING SCORES: TECHNICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVES
S. Morton McPhail, Jeanneret and Associates, Inc., Houston, TX
Michael Maughan, University of Houston-University Park. Statistical Considerations in the Setting of Cutting Scores.
Pamela Skyrme, Florida Power Corporation, St. Petersburg, FL. Organizational Perspectives on the Setting of Test Cutting Scores.
Chris Holmes, Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, St. Louis, MO. Employee Perspectives on the Setting of Test Cutting Scores.
Vicki V. Vandaveer, Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, St. Louis, MO (Discussant).

TUESDAY, 1:00–2:50
SYMPOSIUM: ORGANIZATIONS, PEOPLE AND AUTOMATION—AN EXAMINATION OF RELATIONSHIPS
Louis G. Tornatzky, Industrial Technology Institute, Ann Arbor, MI
Jonathan A. Morell, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. Organizational Consequences of Managing Information Resources.
David Sutherland, University of Maryland, Baltimore County. The Third Era of Computing—A Social Action Perspective.
Mitchell Fleischer, Industrial Technology Institute, Ann Arbor, MI. Work Organization and Advanced Technology in Manufacturing.

SESSIONS CO-SPONSORED WITH OTHER DIVISIONS

FACILITIES: Atlanta Market Center (C); Atlanta Hilton (H); Marriott Marquis (M); Westin Peachtree Plaza (W)

Division 24
FRIDAY, 10:00–11:50
SYMPOSIUM: "CRISIS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY" REVISITED: UNIT COHESION IN DIFFERENT ARMIES
James Griffith, Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD
Mark Vaitkus, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Washington, DC. The Entrenched Value of Individualism in the U.S. Military Institution.
Gwyn Harry-Jenkins, University of Hull. The Regimental System and Cohesion in the English Army.
Xiaolin Li, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland. Military Cohesion in the Chinese People's Liberation Army.
David H. Marlowe, Department of Military Psychology, Walter Reed Army Institute for Research, Washington, DC (Discussant).

Division 25
FRIDAY, 11:00–11:50
INVITED ADDRESS
David L. Meyers, Department of Mental Health and Human Services, Georgia State University
Michael B. Cantor, Training Solutions Incorporated, Atlanta, GA. Performance Improvement in Air Traffic Control.

Committee on Employment and Human Resources
SATURDAY, 9:00–10:50
SYMPOSIUM: MANAGING PSYCHOLOGICAL ENTERPRISES
Laurel W. Oliver, Army Research Institute, Alexandria, VA
Anthony T. Broskowski, Preferred Health Care Ltd., Wilton, CT. Directing Health Services.
Arthur Constantini, Guilford County Schools, Greensboro, NC. Operating a School System.
Ann Howard, Leadership Research Institute, New York, NY. Administering Large Scale Research Projects.
Division 19

SATURDAY, 11:00-12:50

SYMPOSIUM: DEFINING PROFICIENCY IN MILITARY JOBS: TWO APPROACHES
Barbara M. Means, HumRRO, Alexandria, VA

James H. Harris and John P. Campbell, HumRRO, Alexandria, VA. The Project A Approach to Describing Job Proficiency.


Anne Anastasi, Fordham University (Discussant).

Division 35

SATURDAY, 12:00-12:50

INVITED ADDRESS
Barbara A. Gutke, Claremont Graduate School

Jean Lipman-Blumen, Claremont Graduate School. Connective Leadership: A Female Perspective for an Independent World.
Interorganizational Development of a Mental Health System: A Retrospective.
Alan M. Orenstein, Region 4 Community Mental Health Center, Washington, DC. Planning the Consolidation of Mental Health Services: Interorganizational Perspective.
Ruby Jones Wright, Gretchen G. Chase, & Roberta R. New, Region 4 Community Mental Health Center, Washington, DC. Mental Health System's Transition: Reflections Through a Group Relations Conference.

Division 35

Crystal Parlor (H)

SUNDAY, 11:00–12:50
PAPER SESSION: WORK, FAMILY, AND GENDER ROLES
Esther Diamond, Chicago, IL
Jeanne Brett, Sarah Yoge, and Barbara Dornbush, Northwestern University. Restructuring Work for Family.
Kathleen D. Hulbert, University of Lowell. Having It All: The Impossible Dream for Young Professional Women.
Hale C. Bolak, University of California, Santa Cruz. Role-sharing Expectations of Working Women in Turkish Blue-collar Marriages.

Division 22

Crystal Parlor G (H)

SUNDAY, 3:00–4:50
PANEL PRESENTATION: PREVENTION, EARLY INTERVENTION, AND DISABILITY MANAGEMENT WITHIN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY
Susanne M. Bruere, Cornell University
Rochelle V. Habek, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Washington. Findings from a Study of Disability Management Approaches Among Three Major Employers in Michigan.
Donald E. Shrey, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Cincinnati Medical Center. Managing the Psycho-Social, Physical and Economic Impact of Injury and Disability in the Work Place.
Thomas E. Backer, Human Interaction Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA. AIDS and Drug Abuse in the Work Place: New Challenges for Psychology.
Michael E. Scofield, AT&T, Morristown, NJ. Use of Health Audit Data for Health Promotion Program Planning and Evaluation.

Nancy M. Crewe, School of Health, Education, Counseling Psychology and Human Performance, Michigan State University (Discussant).

Division 13

SUNDAY, 3:00–3:50
SYMPOSIUM: EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS: PRESENT STATUS AND PROSPECTS
Sharon Robinson, Arizona State University
Dale Fuga, Department of Applied Behavioral Studies, Oklahoma State University. Consulting Psychologists' View on Certification Standards.
DeWayne J. Kurpius, Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology, Indiana University. Directions for Renewal in Education and Training Programs for Consulting Psychologists.

Division 41

SUNDAY, 3:00–3:50
CONSULAR (M) ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION: FEDERAL JUDGES' PERSPECTIVES: USING SOCIAL SCIENCE EVIDENCE TO PROVE DISCRIMINATION
Alan J. Tomkins, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Judge J. Owen Forrester, United States District Court of Northern Georgia, Atlanta, GA.
Judge James C. Will, United States Court of Appeals, 11th Circuit Atlanta, GA.
Judge Albert P. Tuttle, United States Court of Appeals, 11th Circuit, Atlanta, GA.
Additional Judges TBA

Division 35

CRYSTAL PARLOR C (H)

MONDAY, 12:00–12:50
SYMPOSIUM: WOMEN AND MEN IN PSYCHOLOGY: CAREER SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES
Virginia O'Leary, Radcliffe College
## APA Division 14 Program Schedule

### Monday, 2:00-2:50

**Symposium: The Role of Significant Others in the Adjustment of Working Women**

- **Panelists:**
  - Carol-Ann Emmons, NORC, Chicago, IL
  - Ellen Gammelby, Bank Street College
  - Marjorie Phillips, Ability to Balance Work, Family, Responsibilities
  - Harriet Blum, Praxis Training Group, Los Angeles, CA

**Discussion:**
- **Chair:** Caryl Travis, University of Tennessee (Discussed)

### Division 35

**Symposium: Career Development and Intimate Relationships**

- **Panelists:**
  - Carol-Ann Emmons, NORC, Chicago, IL
  - Elise C. Reaburn, Career Development and Intimate Relationships
  - Andrew A. Gutek, Career Development and Intimate Relationships
  - Kaye Travis, Counseling and Intimate Relationships

**Discussion:**
- **Chair:** Caryl Travis, University of Tennessee (Discussed)

### Division 35

**Symposium: Work and Family Relationships**

- **Panelists:**
  - Carol-Ann Emmons, NORC, Chicago, IL
  - Andrew A. Gutek, Career Development and Intimate Relationships
  - Kaye Travis, Counseling and Intimate Relationships

**Discussion:**
- **Chair:** Caryl Travis, University of Tennessee (Discussed)

### Division 35

**Symposium: Retirement, Career, and Family Relationships**

- **Panelists:**
  - Carol-Ann Emmons, NORC, Chicago, IL
  - Andrew A. Gutek, Career Development and Intimate Relationships
  - Kaye Travis, Counseling and Intimate Relationships

**Discussion:**
- **Chair:** Caryl Travis, University of Tennessee (Discussed)

### APA Division 14 Program Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Hour (Grand Salon C—H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:50</td>
<td>Research on Employee Turnover and Its Management (Inn Salon B/F—M)</td>
<td>Conventions Hall: Multicultural Management (Paragon Cobb—H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poster Session I (Inn Salon B—M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:50</td>
<td>Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Theories of Work Motivation: Review and Integration (Grand Salon E—H)</td>
<td>Invited Address: My Love Affair with Blode—Sparks (Marquis III—M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited Address: My Love Affair with Blode—Sparks (Marquis III—M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:50</td>
<td>Par-Time Work (Inn Salon C/G—M)</td>
<td>Annual Review of Psychology Authors (Grand D—H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:50</td>
<td>National Council (Marquis IV—M)</td>
<td>Psychological Contributions to Police Assessment (Inn Salon A—M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:50</td>
<td>Business Meeting (Marquis III—M)</td>
<td>Factors Influencing Ratings and Appraisals (Inn Salon B/F—M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Issues and the Practice of 1/O Psychology (Cherokee—H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-5:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited Address: Praudlos in the March of Science (Grand Salon D—H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-6:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Hour (Inn Salon B—M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Hour (Grand Salon C—H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Hour (Grand Salon C—H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Along with each portion title is the room in which it will take place.
- H = Atlanta Hilton
- M = Marriott Marquis
The Test Validity Yearbook: Organizational

Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates is proud to announce that the TEST VALIDITY YEARBOOK: ORGANIZATIONAL will begin publication in 1988. The YEARBOOK will publish criterion-related validity studies conducted in public and private sector settings in the United States and throughout the world.

* The YEARBOOK will be directed toward professionals and students interested in personnel selection and personnel decision making.

* The YEARBOOK will contain approximately 100 studies per volume.

* The YEARBOOK will publish studies that provide technical details about the predictors, criteria, sample and job or job family under investigation.

* The YEARBOOK will be guided by an international advisory board featuring selection and measurement specialists from around the world.

* The YEARBOOK will publish studies in a consistent format with most studies running a total of five pages.

* The YEARBOOK will be edited by Frank J. Landy with offices located at The Pennsylvania State University.

Validity reports are currently being solicited for the 1988 volume. Authors interested in submitting studies should contact the editorial offices for information regarding format requirements. Additionally, anyone wishing to be placed on our mailing list to receive information about the review should contact the editorial offices. Please write to:

Frank J. Landy
Department of Psychology
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Survey of Personnel Research Departments

Sarah E. Rassenfoss and Allen I. Kraut
IBM Corporation

"What exactly does an I/O psychologist do?" is a question with which many of us are familiar. We are asked it by students, friends, coworkers, and families. Academia is, of course, one answer. Many other I/O psychologists work in corporate personnel departments, often in personnel research. But what exactly is personnel research?

In an effort to answer that question for ourselves, we developed a short survey, and distributed it to a number of personnel research departments. We found the results useful and enlightening. We share it here, so you, too, may better answer the question "what does an I/O psychologist do?"

Method

The Survey of Personnel Research Departments was conducted in October, 1987. The survey was distributed to individuals engaged in personnel research in 35 U.S. corporations. This was by no means a random or representative sample. The participants were colleagues, and known to us through professional groups. While this was certainly a sample of convenience, we think that it provides an interesting and useful insight into personnel research. Twenty-one companies participated in the survey, for a response rate of 60%. The companies are named in Table 1.

The instrument was short, and focused on three major issues: 1. Composition of personnel research staffs, such as size and education of members; 2. Activities of personnel research departments; and 3. Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>21 Participating Companies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLSTATE INSURANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL ATLANTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNING GLASS WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUITABLE INSURANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXXON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ELECTRIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL MOTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONEYWELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of personnel research activities. There was a balance of open- and closed-ended questions. The surveys were returned directly to us in stamped, self-addressed envelopes which we had enclosed.

**Composition of Personnel Research Departments**

We found interesting similarities and differences in the composition of the participating departments. Department size tended to be small (mode = 4 staff members, although the range was from 1 to 25 staff members). Eighty-seven percent of the departments were on the corporate staff, 8% were on division/operating unit staffs, and 5% were elsewhere in the organization.

There was also a great deal of similarity in the degree and type of training staff members had. Most staff members had a graduate degree (53% had a Ph.D., 28% more had completed some graduate work). A smaller percentage, 14%, had a bachelor’s degree, and 5% had completed some college. The majority had had training in psychology (69%), with smaller percentages having had training in management (14%), education (6%), or some other field (11%).

Despite the similarity in make-up of the departments, we found some interesting differences in the titles of the departments. These are listed in Table 2.

**Personnel Research Department Activities**

Respondents were presented with a list of common personnel research activities, and were asked to indicate the extent to which their department participated in each of the activities. These activities, presented in Figure 1, were ranked by percentage responding they did “a great deal” of the particular activity.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles of Personnel Research Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT AND CAREER SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPORATE HR SYSTEMS &amp; ASSESSMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPORATE RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE RELATIONS PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE RELATIONS RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH AND PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT (3 departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL RESEARCH (4 departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL RESEARCH &amp; DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECTION AND RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF SURVEYS RESEARCH AND PERSONNEL RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1. PERSONNEL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITTLE OR NONE</th>
<th>A GREAT DEAL</th>
<th>CHANGES FROM TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SURVEYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PERF APPRAISALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TEST VALIDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NONEXEMPT SELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPECIAL ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most common activity was opinion surveying. This is not surprising or particularly enlightening, given the basis on which the sample was selected (primarily companies known to us because of their employee survey programs). The next most common activities centered on performance appraisals; employee selection and evaluation, such as test development and validation; job analysis; and selection systems. Less common activities were management/employee development; succession planning; and organizational development activities, such as team building.

Respondents were also asked to indicate, via an open-ended question, the personnel research activities that were becoming more and less common in their departments. These responses were content coded; results are represented in the far right columns on Figure 1. These results indicate the number of departments that indicated they were doing more or less of an activity; i.e., four departments indicated they were moving away from surveys in one form or another, one company was moving away from performance appraisal, one department was doing more manager selection, and so forth. It appears that to some extent the departments are moving away from traditional “industrial psychology” topics, such as selection and testing, and doing more “organizational psychology” work, such as strategic studies, organizational development and design, and succession planning.

The results of another question in the survey suggest a similar pattern. When asked to characterize the work currently done by personnel research as primarily strategic or operational, 30% of respondents indicated that their work was primarily strategic, and 60% indicated their work was primarily operational. However, when asked to characterize changes in personnel research activities, 60% indicated that activities had become more strategic in recent years (see Table 3 for more details).

Figure 2 summarizes the differences in activities between departments characterizing themselves as becoming “more strategic” or “more operational.” Although the limited sample sizes don’t allow meaningful tests for statistical significance, there are some interesting differences between the two groups. While surveys and selection activities remain most common, “operational” departments devote more of their time to performance appraisal, test development, validation, selection systems, and team building. “Strategic” departments spend more time on activities such as surveys, strategic studies, organizational development, and succession planning than do the “operational” departments.

The key difference between the two groups, operational vs. strategic, may be the purposes to which an activity is put, and not the activity itself. Thus, activities such as job analysis and compensation research may be very operational in focus or may have a more strategic purpose. The end, and not the means, of this activity is what distinguishes them.

Forty-five percent of the respondents indicated that consultants had primary responsibility for at least one activity in the department. The most common activities in which consultants were involved were traditional “I” topics, such as test development (5 companies used consultants), test validation (3), compensation research (3), manager selection (2), nonexempt selection (2), and job analysis (2).

Impact of Personnel Research

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the results of personnel research were used to create or modify personnel programs and policies. Forty percent indicated that results of personnel research were used to a great or very great extent, and 60% stated results were used to some extent. (None chose “to little or no extent.”) Much of this use may not be open to public view, thus obscuring the work done by I/O psychologists in corporations.

Most departments (65%) indicated that at least some support was available for publishing research results (35% indicated that their organization provided almost no support). On the other hand, fewer departments reported that research had in fact been published in professional journals or presented at professional meetings. Only one company (5 percent) reported that results are frequently published, 45% reported that results are sometimes published, and 50% indicated that results are seldom published.

Summary and Conclusions

While this small survey cannot be easily generalized to all personnel research departments, it does present an interesting picture of personnel research as it is currently practiced in some leading corporations. These activities make up the core curriculum in most I/O graduate programs. A notable exception is the high use of opinion surveys. Relatively few
schools have in-depth offerings on opinion survey research or practice. Even though our sample was skewed toward opinion survey use, the role of surveys in strategic research suggests a need to provide future "personnel researchers" with more training in this area.

The most common activities focus on employee selection, and there appears to be some movement toward more strategic research. This shift may be a reflection of human resource reductions in many companies. As many companies are hiring fewer new employees than in the past, they must make the most of the employees currently on board. In addition, companies are operating in a world that is fast changing, fueled by deregulation, global competition, and new technologies, among other forces. Consequently, there may need to be greater emphasis on issues such as employee and management development, and succession planning. It will be interesting to see if personnel research continues to move in this direction.
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A New Application for Industrial Psychology: Sports

Jed Friend and Arnold Leunes
Texas A&M University

The industrial psychologist has traditionally been employed in a wide variety of organizations that may benefit from his or her services. The transportability of the individual from one corporation or industry to another is indicative of the field's flexibility.

Problems within the organization are often complex and an array of diverse procedures can be used by the psychologist to address a particular problem. Personnel specialists, in the past few years, have borrowed an application that has origins in social psychology and is derived from systems theory. This application, dubbed the systems approach, has become an important procedure for the industrial practitioner.

The systems template allows organizations of varying size and purpose to efficiently carry out its personnel related functions. Moreover, the implementation of the approach proves to be as flexible as the field itself. These general industrial principles should also be applicable to the recently burgeoning area of sport management and specifically to personnel issues within sport management.

Sport management has quietly been developing in the last several years. It has a unique and diverse background, to include business, journalism, law, marketing, physical education, public relations, and sport administration. There seems to be a rising need for sport management programs (Parkhouse and Ulrich, 1979). In fact, there are now several graduate level programs. Most of these programs have curricula with content courses in the above areas. Related topics to the discipline, such as labor relations, arbitration, and agenting are also covered over the duration of the program or through a practicum or internship. Lopiano (1984) and Parkhouse (1980) discuss the methods and procedures for establishing careers in sport management, based on formal undergraduate and graduate specializations. Although such issues as care of sporting equipment and maintenance of swimming pools and golf courses come under the sport management umbrella, these topics or methods are obviously not in the domain of psychological approaches to management. A perusal through several sport management program curricula reveals that behavioral skills, knowledge, and approaches are not formally instructed. They may, perhaps, be embedded either in the internship phase of the training or within the content courses themselves.
There are several areas from applied psychology that can be easily extended into the sport management arena. Experimental methodology, statistics, and psychometrics have previously demonstrated their importance and usefulness in both psychology and management. This fundamental knowledge furnishes the sports management consultant with the instruments and tools necessary to establish data bases for research, development, analysis, and decision making. The overall assistance and benefits of a quantitative approach to decision making speaks for itself. Too, there is substantial potential for top and middle level managements of collegiate, Olympic, and especially, professional sports organizations to invoke one or more of these behavioral techniques, such as an element from, or the entire, systems approach. Athletic directors and sport executives might summon a procedure for a certain use; an example would be an assessment of current athletes’ talent.

Parkhouse and Ulrich (1979) and Ziegler (1973) note that theoretical constructs and empirical data are severely lacking in sport management. Friend and LeUnes (1987) have composed one such paradigm for sport management, based on the systems approach. Many derivations are possible, as are the potential uses. One such use, the construction, validation, and overall utility of a selection system for professional or Olympic baseball, is a direct outgrowth of the systems concept. This research by Friend (1987) established a psychological and physical model for the prediction of athlete performance that lends empirical support for the use of the systems paradigm. Although this was directed toward professional baseball, the model is adaptable for any team sport.

Over and beyond this venture, the systems model is driving other sport research. Anshel, Housner, and Cryns (in press) have constructed a behaviorally anchored rating system (BARS) performance appraisal procedure that evaluates the competency and effectiveness of high school football coaches. Gould, Simons, and Petlichkoff’s (1986) outcome evaluation research, which was concerned with the efficacy of a sport psychology skills training program, is another such study derived from the model. Teed (1987) investigated student perceptions in terms of operative goals as they pertain to an intercollegiate athletic program. The assessment of training programs (such as the minor league farm system), the performance appraisal subsystem for players, and the selection, training, and evaluation of scouts are but a few of the ideas that need exploration in order to examine the use of the systems approach as a sport management model.

The individual employed to plan, implement, and evaluate these and other techniques will be what is referred to as the industrial sports psychologist, the sports organization specialist, or the sports management consultant. Having the background in industrial, human factors, sport management, and sport psychology, this new-wave, hybrid consultant is likely to roost in sport management, but must keep up with recent developments in applied psychology and management.

Many of the same difficulties that we often face in industry are present in sport. Although the behavioral measures are substantially more objective in sport than those normally found in industry, the criterion issue is alive and well. The fine science of criterion development and validation beckons the sport psychometrician.

There is a small but growing number of opportunities for research, development, teaching, and practicing in sport management psychology. At last count, there were very few if any individuals addressing the concept of applied psychology in sport management. The potential employment that exists is in academia (sport management, sport administration, sport sciences, physical education, management, and psychology departments), and in the not too distant future, as a consultant and/or practitioner in the front office of a professional sports franchise, an Olympic National Governing Body, or perhaps at the collegiate level. Due to the youthfulness of sport management, there can only be one direction, and with less than a handful of psychologists in the field, awareness and curiosity is needed. Moreover, this new and dynamic discipline allows for the arousal of skepticism among our more conventional I/O cohorts. The opportunities await. Lest thee not venture, lest thee not gain.
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Research in Personnel Psychology in West Germany

Heinz Schuler
Universitat Hohenheim, Stuttgart

Personnel psychology is not a common field in German psychology, at least not as a scientific discipline. Although practical interest is rapidly growing, there are only a few groups actively doing research in this field.

One of them is the psychology work group in Stuttgart-Hohenheim, integrated in the School of Economics and Social Sciences (Fakultät für Wirtschafts- and Sozialwissenschaften). Heinz Schuler is professor of psychology, the other members of his small team are Michael Donat, Rüdiger Fruhner, Uwe Funke, Klaus Moser and Horst Zimmermann. As there are no psychology majors in Stuttgart, they offer psychology to students of economic sciences, especially business administration. While courses were mostly restricted to undergraduate education until this year, starting next winter term there will be a program in organizational psychology for graduate students. Then, students for the diploma and doctoral degrees will no longer be restricted to those coming from other universities.

In research, Heinz Schuler and his assistants are doing work in the fields of personnel and occupational psychology, especially personnel selection and performance assessment. One project recently finished was a study on females in traditionally male dominated technical occupations. Included in this longitudinal study were not only measures of aptitudes and performance, but also of well being and social integration. Among the more interesting results were that job relevant aptitudes were improved, but initial differences between males and females were not diminished; path analysis showed that females' self concepts were highly influenced by performance feedback while the males' were not. A meta-analysis including this and 62 other studies resulted in a validity coefficient of .37 for school grades to predict final apprenticeship examination scores (for the prediction of success at a university, a value of .46 was found).

Currently the Hohenheim group is especially busy with a large-scale program on the prediction of performance in industrial research and development units. This program is run in cooperation with six high tech companies located in southern Germany, among them two very well known car manufacturers. The first step was the development of an R&D-specific instrument for job analysis. The next one will be the construction of different selection methods including interview components,
tests, work samples, a biographical questionnaire, and probably a complex problem-solving computer simulation. A variety of performance indicators will be collected for validation in the cooperating companies. The study will be followed by a test for generalizability with a different set of firms. In this context a meta-analysis was conducted integrating 50 mostly older, mostly American studies which resulted in a mean validity of .38 for the prediction of scientific success, biodata being the best single predictor.

As a third program, research on the “social quality” of selection situations can be mentioned. In a simulation, parameters that may change the social context of selection were specified in order to investigate experimentally the importance of these variables and their interactions with performance. One of the first results was that, when subjects believed union members had participated in the construction of the selection instruments, their performance diminished. Still in planning is an assessment center experiment investigating changes in the self concepts of participants when exposed to diagnostic information and social comparisons.

Among the publications of the Hohenheim group is a series of books on special topics in organizational psychology (published by Hogrefe), which increasingly include chapters from American authors. On a two year cycle, conferences are held at Hohenheim in the former castle where now the university is located. The next one of these conferences will be dedicated to the topic of selection and assessment from both the individual and organizational perspectives. It will be held in May, 1989, and, for the first time, the conference language will be English. James L. Farr, TIP editor, will be the American co-organizer of this small conference and will be glad to provide further information.

Another international congress activity is a symposium on construct validity in personnel selection Heinz Schuler has organized together with Neal Schmitt for the International Congress of Psychology in Sydney this year.

Needless to say, Heinz Schuler and his group are very interested in cooperation with and learning from American colleagues. American guests are very welcome at the Hohenheim research castle!

Work and Organizations in the 1990s: What’s a Union To Do?

Mary D. Zalesny
University of Missouri, St. Louis

Editor's Note: A summary of a symposium held at the 1988 SIOP Annual Conference in Dallas, written by Mary D. Zalesny, symposium chair. Stuart Youngblood was the discussant at the symposium.

Since the turn of the century, organizations and work have undergone profound changes. Technological innovations have created highly automated factories. Once valued skills have become redundant or automated; new and different skills related to the development and maintenance of sophisticated equipment are in demand. Organizations have experimented with different philosophies and structures. Unions often appear to be reluctant passengers accompanying these changes. Although unions are likely to retain their role as guardians of employee rights and sometime skeptics of change, they have been and will continue to be affected by organizational change, both in their relationships with management and their own membership.

This symposium explored some of the issues facing unions, organizations, and union-management relations in the next century. The participants offered three diverse perspectives: an industrial relations/organizational behavior view of local union leadership; an arbitrator’s view of evolving union-management relations; and a sociological view of worker participation in organizational decision making.

Industrial Relations View

The paper presented by Tove Hammer (Steven Currall, co-author), Cornell University, focused on the need for a new model of leadership and specification of leadership effectiveness in response to changing political and economic environments of unions and their associated organizations. An obstacle to the specification of the components of effective leadership in a changing union environment is a complete lack of information about what constitutes effective leadership in a traditional industrial relations environment. Although there is no research available which has clearly defined the local union leader’s (i.e., primarily local union presidents) role, there exist theoretical frameworks from the organizational literature that can be used to identify how demands and constraints in the environment both shape the union leader’s role and
determine under what circumstances different knowledges, skills, and abilities will be effective. Specifically, the models underlying the new model of leadership are (a) the resource-dependence model (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and (b) the demand-constraints-choices model of management (Stewart, 1982).

Local union effectiveness is defined as the extent to which the local, as an organization, responds correctly to the demands placed on it by different groups and organizations (Daft, 1983; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). For the new model of local union leadership, there are three definitions of organizational effectiveness from the perspectives of three groups: local union members, the employer, and the national union. Each group places specific demands on local leadership that reflect their own needs and concerns and will evaluate the effectiveness of the leadership based on the extent to which the local can satisfy their requirements. It is these requirements that help shape the leader’s role and partly dictate his or her activities (Stewart, 1982).

It is argued that the environment in which the local leader operates to a large extent creates or defines the leader role, and that it is possible to identify a number of important leader activities, knowledge, and skills that will be necessary to fulfill the role obligations. These role obligations will determine the dimensions of responsive leadership for the local union leader. From the small body of knowledge available from case studies of local unions and employers who have reached solutions to the challenges of plant closure threats, high labor costs, inflexible job control rules, unmotivating wage and benefit packages, and worker preferences for increased participation, a preliminary list of responsive leader activities, knowledges, and skills emerges. These include: (a) long-range planning and establishing networks and communication links with resources on which the union is dependent, (b) conflict resolution between the national and local union, or between factions within the local, (c) financial expertise, (d) technical skills, (e) knowledge of the production process, (f) awareness of the economic and employment prospects of the firm, (g) legal knowledges (of union and worker rights), (h) communication skills, and (i) interpersonal competence. The interesting feature of this list is its similarity to requirements for effectiveness in executive management positions (Kotter, 1982).

Based on the available data from cases on union-management cooperation, the basic hypothesis from the model is: the dimensions of effective local union leadership will be the same regardless of the environment in which the union operates, but some of these dimensions will be more critical in an environment that demands organizational change than in an environment where there are few pressures for change. In a traditional industrial relations environment, acceptable levels of union effectiveness can be attained without these behaviors and skills; they are dimensions of discretionary leadership. But in an environment where the demands on union leaders are different (the "new" IR model), these dimensions become requirements for effectiveness; they are necessary elements of the leader’s role; they are dimensions of responsive leadership.

An Arbitrator’s View

Gary C. Raffaele (University of Texas at San Antonio) suggested that the result of changes in the 1980s, such as rapid deregulation of industries, dismantling or major restructuring of many basic industries, and a major swing in how our labor laws are interpreted and enforced, has been a drop in labor union membership and a more aggressive approach of management toward unions. Additionally, the traditional adversarial roles of the two parties may no longer be viable for either side as evidenced by numerous labor-management cooperative programs ranging from new or modified bargaining systems to various forms of employee ownership. Although the shift toward greater cooperation between companies and unions has been noted (Fulmer, 1988), no one really knows what the results of this change will be. What is offered is one perspective from which to view the complex multiple relationships defining union-management relations and its likely impact on arbitration.

We begin by noting that the system of industrial relations in the U.S. encompasses four separate sectors with separate problems requiring separate analysis (Kerr, 1986). These are: (a) “safe islands”—local crafts and services and manufacturing where unions have fully organized the labor markets; (b) “contested territories”—sectors of deregulation and competition between unionized and nonunion areas where demands can be found for givebacks, outsourcing of supplies, location of new operations in nonunion areas, strikebreaking, and union-busting; (c) “partnership areas”—sectors seeking mutual ways of improving quality, productivity, and worklife in order to survive international competition; and (d) “third-party arenas”—government employment where political power, public and political authorities, etc., may be involved in labor conflict resolution rather than economic power as is the case in the private sector.

Cooperative efforts are not confined to one sector. Rather, each sector is likely to approach cooperation differently and with their own unique set of hidden agendas. Five approaches are offered: (1) “go-for-it”—based on the view that industrial relations has entered a new era and past relationship patterns simply do not fit a world economy approach to business or the new workers who want more out of a job than just a paycheck. With this approach, cooperative success has been a great benefit to all parties. (2) “never”—belief that traditional adver-
sarial approach of collective bargaining has worked well and is adaptive to change. This view sees cooperation as a ploy to get something out of a contract or beat the union into cooperation under threat of closure or decertification. (3) "be careful"—attempts to walk the line between the pros and cons. This view accepts the idea that the time has come to enter into new forms of cooperation, but stops short of universal recommendations or endorsements. The need for genuineness and stability of both parties are seen as crucial for success. (4) "what's new"—points out the fact that the "new" cooperative arrangements and "unique" approaches have been around for years (e.g., Scanlon Plan has existed for almost 50 years). This view concludes that the system works well and adapts over the years. (5) "is it legal?"—notes that our industrial relations laws are based on an adversarial system and that some cooperative arrangements have come close to crossing the line of management domination of a union or the union's getting into a position of violating its duty to represent.

Putting all of these sectors and views together makes for a wide variety of possible combinations. Add to that differences in personalities, in some internal and external politics, and the combinations are limited only by one's imagination. If we also consider arbitration, then it is doubtful that the arbitration behavior of those found in the "contested territories" and "third party" sectors can change significantly toward greater cooperation. Arbitration in contested areas tends to be an additional arena of battle and, without any external pressure, the parties should continue their current behavior. In addition, "safe islands" can be expected to come under pressure, which often causes the parties to revert back to more negative behavior even though they are uncomfortable with it. Even so, negative relations can change and move toward limited cooperation. This can be expected in some of the public arenas where, over time, the parties tend to get comfortable with dealing with one another and become better trained and more professional. It is possible that the Federal sector will be where we shall see more moves toward cooperation. Any progress here will continue to be dependent on the attitude and political security of the union leadership and the training of management. Preliminary studies have shown that the stability and security of union and management leadership is one of the prime predictors of the ability of a cooperative program to succeed (Voos, 1985).

In conclusion, it would be nice to give some glowing picture of a cooperative future, but that simply is not realistic. Experimentation will continue and pockets of success will be found in a number of areas. Unfortunately, people are people and have a weakness for power and many will continue either to oppose cooperative efforts as a way of maintaining power or to use the cooperative mode as a way of momentary advantage. Still, the world has changed to the point where the parties cannot go back to the totally adversarial practices of the past. Technology, world competition, and employee expectations will continue to drive the parties in the direction of cooperation. It will be a slow evolutionary process, not a revolutionary one.

A Sociological View

Daniel B. Cornfield, Vanderbilt University, began with the observation that union-management relations in the U.S. have diverged during the 1970s and 1980s. The naming of union representatives to company boards in the automobile and airline industries illustrates cases where unionized workers have gained substantial representation and participation in major managerial decision making. In other industries, such as newspaper printing and longshoring, management has attained greater control of work through the adoption of new technologies, thereby gaining greater control over worker productivity. These trends imply a dualism in union-management relations in which organizational authority has been redistributed between labor and management in different ways in different industries.

This dualism is relevant for sociological theories of workplace control which attempt to explain how social, economic, technological, and political variables affect the ability of labor and management to control the implementation and outcomes of production. For our purposes, worker participation in managerial decision making, as one aspect of the emerging dualism in industrial relations, is defined as formal, joint labor-management bodies (e.g., committees) which address issues at the company or industry decision making levels other than those that pertain directly to the employment relationship. These would include union representation on company boards and joint committees on long-range planning to increase competitiveness. It would exclude participation at the shop-floor level of decision making (e.g., quality circles).

Worker participation schemes have been established in only a tiny fraction of business enterprises and they have developed unevenly among U.S. industries. They are often assumed to be the antithesis of adversarial, collective bargaining relationships. It is argued, however, that unionization has been a necessary prerequisite for the development of worker participation in the U.S. A recent survey shows that unionized workers are more likely than nonunion workers to favor participation programs (Fenwick & Olson, 1986). On the basis of a comparison of seven industries with increasing worker participation (i.e., auto, steel, aircraft, construction equipment, coal mining, public sanitation, and telecommunications) with seven industries with increasing unilateral managerial control (i.e., agriculture, air traffic control, public educa-
tion, newspaper printing, longshoring, insurance, and the U.S. Postal Service), it appears that unionization is related to three industry characteristics which, jointly, increase the likelihood of worker participation: (a) worker interest vested in the survival of the employer, (b) worker bargaining strength, and (c) an external threat to industry.

First, due to the nontransferability of seniority rights, the level and accumulation of wages, benefits, and retirement pensions for workers became tied to the survival of one's employer and one's continued organizational membership. Also, because local unions represent specific shops rather than serving as a hiring hall for craft workers, the survival of the local came to depend on that of the employer (Cornfield, 1986). For the seven industries with increasing worker participation examined, the rate of quitting was below average and/or the median job tenure was above average. The reverse was found for the seven industries with increasing managerial control.

Second, with increased bargaining strength from strike threats, unionized workers have been able to demand participation in managerial decision making. At no time during the 20th century has worker participation in managerial decision making been implemented in nonunion industries (Cornfield, 1987). Moreover, the percentage of unionized workers in the seven industries with increasing worker participation was above average, while it was below average in most of the other industries examined.

Third, labor and management's overcoming their adversarial relationship or sharing decision making within an adversarial context was made possible by the existence of an external threat to organizational profits and job security. The recent major threats have included internationalization of capital and government deregulation, both of which occurred in highly unionized industries with long histories of collective bargaining. All of the seven industries with increasing worker participation are experiencing one or more of these threats including increased competition (international, domestic, or nonunion), declining product demand, or declining government support and protection. All of the seven industries with increasing managerial control have not experienced these threats and have maintained high growth.

In conclusion, although this sample of 14 industries is not representative of the U.S. economy, it suggests that the likelihood of worker participation varies directly with the vesting of worker interest in the employer, the degree of unionization, and the extent of adversity in the market. The likelihood of increasing managerial control also varies inversely with these factors.
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Manuel London
CHANGE AGENTS
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FORECASTING FINANCIAL BENEFITS OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
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The authors offer step-by-step guidelines for calculating the return on HRD investment in measurable units of work—and provide illustrative in-depth case examples from different types of organizations.
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San Francisco 94104 • (415) 433-1767
The Early Years of I/O: 
Hugo Munsterberg and the Polygraph*

Frank J. Landy
Penn State University

*Editor’s Note: “The Early Years of I/O” will feature brief accounts of the lives of the pioneers of the application of psychology to work and organizations. Please send such accounts to the Editor.

Hugo Munsterberg was a classically trained German scholar, having received a Ph.D. in physiology with Wundt in 1885 and an MD several years later. Just prior to the turn of the century, Munsterberg was invited to Harvard by William James and remained there for the rest of his career. He died in 1916.

Munsterberg was a lightening rod for applied psychology. He was convinced not only that applied psychology could positively influence the conduct of human affairs, but he boasted publicly that the behavioral sciences had solved most of the problems that had vexed society for centuries. Critics such as Walter Lippmann were skeptical of Munsterberg’s enthusiasm, questioning whether psychology was even a science at this early stage of development. Lippmann said Munsterberg’s book (entitled “Psychology and Industrial Efficiency”) “. . . has a false immediacy; it is too eager to prove the present usefulness of a science which hardly exists.”

Munsterberg was convinced of the value of scientific management and praised this technique at any opportunity. He was also a staunch advocate of testing and the use of individual difference information for making industrial decisions. His work with the Boston motor car operators was one of the first full scale work sample projects. He tended to be dogmatic and rigid in his statements and generated a good deal of antagonism among his peers. Many of the leading industrial psychologists of the generation that followed Munsterberg (e.g., Viteles and Kornhauser) were unimpressed with his experimental rigor and credited him more for his proseletyzing effort than his scientific contribution.

Munsterberg was quite interested in psychology and the law. In particular, he was interested in truthfulness. By 1907, he had developed a form of polygraph for detecting lies. The polygraph had four measures associated with it. The first two measures were predictable—breathing rate/depth and heart rate. The other two measures were unique. The first of these was a free association latency test. The subject was asked to produce an associate word for each target word presented. Some of the target words were neutral, but others were salient to the event that led to the interview (e.g., murder, robbery). The latency between the salient target word and the production of the associate word was the measure of truthfulness—the longer the latency, the more likely that the person was telling a lie. The fourth measure was even more unusual. It was called an “automatograph.” It consisted of a sling that was suspended by a wire. The individual placed her arm in the sling and grasped a pencil in such a way that the point of the pencil was resting on a piece of blank paper. The arm would then naturally “trace” a pattern on the paper as a function of various involuntary muscular movements (like saccades). Munsterberg contended that the pattern traced by a liar was unique and could be distinguished from the pattern traced by a truthful subject. As a result of Munsterberg’s pronouncements, the New York Times published an article in 1907 announcing that a machine had been invented that was a “cure of liars.” Others referred to the device as a “truth compelling” machine. The Times article went on to assure the reader that “The effect of emotional stress upon the rate of breathing is common knowledge, but the reduction of the characteristic of each breath is a matter of very recent scientific research. Every breath writes its own history and thoughts of the mind are easily uncovered by reference to the chart.” It appears as if “Psychology Today” had its beginnings at the offices of the Times.

True to his style, Munsterberg said “To deny that the experimental psychologist has the possibility of determining truth-telling powers is as absurd as to deny that the chemical expert can find out whether there is arsenic in the stomach.” Munsterberg’s confidence in the ultimate value of the “truth compelling” machine was characteristic of his approach to most areas of psychology—unbridled confidence in the probable contribution. It was this characteristic that was most discomforting to many of his applied colleagues at the time.

Submit 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
The Minnesota Clerical Assessment Battery

*It's not just another typing test — It's complete clerical testing on your personal computer.*

A typing test administered on a personal computer can be a great time saver. But not when it's only part of your clerical testing program and you have to administer the rest of the tests yourself.

The MCAB contains a typing test — a very good one. It also contains five additional tests to assess other important clerical skills.

**Typing** assesses how fast and accurately an examinee can type straight copy. It displays both the passage to be typed and the examinee's progress on the screen (no paper documents to keep track of). The test contains two passages and computes three scores: gross typing speed, typing accuracy, and net speed. It also computes an individualized standard error of measurement for each examinee.

**Proofreading** assesses an examinee's ability to detect and correct spelling, punctuation, and other typographical errors in three test passages.

**Filing** assesses an examinee's ability to file materials alphabetically and numerically. It reports separate scores for alphabetical, numerical, and overall filing ability.

**Business Vocabulary** assesses an examinee's knowledge of business terms selected from glossaries and indices of standard secretarial and clerical reference books.

**Business Math** assesses an examinee's skill in using percentages, decimals, and fractions to solve problems that are similar to those encountered in business.

**Clerical Knowledge** assesses an examinee's knowledge of topics such as formatting correspondence, operating office equipment, making travel arrangements, posting mail, and performing simple bookkeeping tasks.

Computerized testing is a significant advance in personnel selection. Don't do it just part way. Write or call Assessment Systems and ask for a free information packet to learn more about the MCAB. Or order the test manual and demonstration diskette for $15.00 to learn all about it.

Notes: All payments in U.S. funds, MN residents add 6% tax, outside North America add $10.00 for shipping. Please specify 5½” or 3½” diskette. The MCAB will run on any IBM PC or 100% compatible computer. IBM is a registered trademark of International Business Machines Corporation. Minnesota Clerical Assessment Battery and MCAB are trademarks of Assessment Systems Corporation. Distributor inquiries invited.

---

Senate Approves Bill to Ban Polygraph Testing in the Workplace

Wayne J. Camara
Science Directorate, APA

On March 4, 1988, the U.S. Senate approved legislation that prohibits the use of polygraph testing in pre-employment screening by a 69-27 vote. S. 1904 prohibits private employers from using polygraph testing with job applicants or for general screening purposes with incumbents. A similar measure (H.R. 1212) was passed by the House of Representatives in November, 1987. Differences between the Senate and the House bills are currently being addressed by a conference committee. Final action on this legislation is expected by mid-summer.

The Senate bill allows an employer to request that an employee submit to a polygraph test in connection with an investigation of a "specific incident." The employer must first establish that: (1) the employee had access to the property, (2) the employer has reasonable suspicion that the employee was involved in the incident under investigation, (3) the employee suffered an economic loss (theft, embezzlement, espionage, sabotage), and (4) the employer must file a report of the incident (police report, insurance claim, or written statement that employees may request).

Unlike the Senate bill, H.R. 1212 does not contain a general exemption for ongoing investigations. Amendments to H.R. 1212 exempt employers handling controlled substances and security personnel engaged in protecting public health, safety, transportation, utilities and currency/securities. The Senate bill also includes the amendment to exempt security personnel, as well as an exemption for nuclear power plants. The Senate defeated amendments to exempt railways, truckers, and airlines, and an amendment to permit employee requested testing.

Industry-wide exemptions, exceptions for investigations of "specific incidents," and definitions of polygraph testing and lie-detectors are the primary differences between the two bills. Passage of a final compromise bill to come from the conference is required by the Senate and the House of Representatives before a bill is forwarded to the President. APA Science Directorate staff have continued to work with key House and Senate staff charged with drafting the final wording on the compromise bill to reduce abuses in any remaining polygraph testing. The American Polygraph Association has noted that the White House has indicated
that possibly a modified bill, similar to S. 1904, may be acceptable (correspondence to members from S. Sturm, 3/10/88).

In 1987, the American Psychological Association Council of Representatives passed a resolution noting that "... despite many years of development of the polygraph, the scientific evidence is still unsatisfactory for the validity of psychophysiological indicators to infer deceptive behavior. Such evidence is particularly poor concerning the polygraph use in employment screening ..." For further information contact the author at APA, 1200 Seventeenth St., NW, Washington, DC 20036.

IOTAS

James L. Farr

An honorary Doctor of Science degree was presented to Ann Howard, SIOP's President-Elect, by her undergraduate alma mater, Goucher College, at graduation exercises in May. The degree was awarded in recognition of Ann's distinguished research and professional contributions in psychology. Congratulations, Ann, on this well deserved honor!

There are a few job changes to report. Two SIOP members are leaving Georgia Tech. Larry James is joining the University of Tennessee as the holder of the Haslam Chair of Excellence in Management for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Ed O'Connor has completed his year as a visiting faculty member in the College of Management and has accepted a position in the Department of Management at the University of Colorado at Denver.

John K. (Jack) Kennedy, Jr. has joined Management Decisions Systems, Inc. as a project manager after spending five years on the faculty at New York University. F. Jay Breyer is now a Senior Measurement Statistician at ETS's Center for Occupational and Professional Assessment in Newtown, PA.

Daniel Feldman has been named the Outstanding Teacher of the Year at the University of Florida College of Business Administration. At the University of South Florida Paul Spector has been promoted to full professor. USF doctoral student Juan Sanchez' paper on the application of policy capturing to job analysis was named the recipient of the International Personnel Management Association Assessment Council's (IPMAAC) award for research. Juan gave an address on his research at the June IPMAAC conference.

Congratulations to all.
AOCF '88
"Advancing the State-of-the-Art of Outplacement in the '90s"

A Major National Conference on Outplacement
St. Louis, Missouri
October 16-18, 1988

In the 1980s, outplacement became a big issue for American corporations, and a big business for practitioners. Every indicator says the trend will continue.

What have we learned?
What can we become more effective?
What research needs to be done?
Who is getting served and how?
Can we bring more science to the art?

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS
Margaret Magnus,
Editor and Associate Publisher of Personnel Journal.

Baila Zeitz, Ph.D.,
author of the newly released
The Best Companies for Women from Simon and Schuster.

• Outstanding technical papers presenting research from corporations, universities and professional practitioners.
• Panels and Workshops to advance the state-of-the-art.

For registration information call or write:
Jeanne O'Donnell
Executive Director, AOCF,
364 Parsippany Road
Parsippany, NJ 07054
(201) 887-6667

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!

JOB OPENINGS?
Contact the Business Manager to advertise in TIP.
Rick Jacobs, 520 Moore Building, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802 (814-863-1867 or 814-237-5997).

Committees

Education and Training (E & T) Committee

Edward L. Levine

The E & T Committee has been actively pursuing its agenda on a number of fronts. The doctoral students' consortium, scheduled in conjunction with the APA convention, includes as featured speakers Michael Campion, Anne Marie Carlini, Daniel Ilgen, Abraham Korman, and Joel Lefkowitz. Please get any last minute nominations for the consortium to Dennis Doverspike, Consortium Chair, Department of Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, 44325.

We are compiling results of our survey of graduate programs in I/O Psychology and OB. The SIOP booklet containing information from this survey is widely distributed to potential applicants to graduate programs. If your program has not been contacted or if you have not yet returned the questionnaire, immediately contact Janet Barnes-Farrell, Survey Chair, Department of Psychology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

Lilly Berry is leading a session on guidelines for master's level training in I/O at the APA convention. If you cannot attend that session and want to contribute information or opinion on this issue, contact Lilly Berry, Master's Guidelines Chair, Department of Psychology, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132.

The agenda for the E & T Committee for next year will include an examination of possible guidelines for I/O internships and the collection of information about the teaching of I/O psychology to undergraduate students.
Frontiers Series

Raymond A. Katzell

The big news is the August publication of the second volume of the SIOP series on Frontiers of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. This volume is entitled Productivity in Organizations: New Perspectives from Industrial and Organizational Psychology and is edited by John P. Campbell and Richard J. Campbell. Among its many notable contributors are SIOP members Paul Banas, Mike Burke, Bill Glick, Rick Guzzo, Tove Hammer, Dan Ilgen, Ed Lawler and Ken Pearlman in addition to the co-editors. The Editorial Board under which the book was prepared included John Campbell, Richard Campbell, Ed Fleishman, Irv Goldstein, Richard Hackman, Lyman Porter, Vic Vroom, and Ray Katzell, the Series Editor.

The book’s fifteen chapters are organized into four sections: Productivity Concepts and Issues; Individual Differences, Motivation, Learning, and Productivity; Multifaceted Interventions for Influencing Productivity; and Implementing Organization-Wide Productivity Innovations. In sum, it furnishes striking testimony to the many ways in which our field can contribute to this crucial topic.

Order information can be found in this issue of TIP. You will also be able to place orders for it at the Jossey-Bass exhibit at the forthcoming APA convention in Atlanta. They will also take orders for the initial volume, Careers in Organizations, edited by Tim Hall; that book continues to sell well, for, as was stated in a recent review, “There really is something here for everyone interested in the field of organizational career development.”

Meetings

Official Delegation to China
October 30–November 14, 1988
San Francisco—Beijing—Hangzhou—Shanghai—Manilla
8th O.D. World Congress
November 15–20, 1988
The Phillipines

Information on both of the above can be obtained from Dr. Donald Cole, Organization Development Institute, 11234 Walnut Ridge Road, Chesterland, Ohio 44026.

Everything You Always Wanted To Know About JOB ANALYSIS
Explained by Edward L. Levine, Ph.D.
And more! . . . A Job Analysis Primer

A brief, basic (and lighthearted) introduction to the topic, this book is intended for managers, personnel specialists and as a supplementary text for business and I/O psychology students. The book is approximately 100 pages (illustrated), sells for $7.95, and is packed with “how-to” information. Ordering information: Make checks for $7.95 + $1.50 shipping charges, payable to WORKFORCE DYNAMICS, P.O. Box 291335, Tampa, FL 33687. Allow 3 weeks for delivery. Sorry, no exam copies available. Florida residents add 5% sales tax.
Evaluate Typing Skills on a PC!

Speed & Accuracy Typing Test

- administered, timed, and scored by the computer.
- gross words, errors, and net words per minute immediately available.
- each typist's results stored for later retrieval.
- automatic comparison (percentile ranks) of each typist's scores to a norm group from your company and a norm group from several other companies.
- means, standard deviations, and standard errors of measurement for each norm group.
- each typing error is marked and explained allowing you to evaluate the integrity of the scoring.

Don't Pay For Each Test
Administer an Unlimited Number of Tests for Only $149 (US)

R.D. Craig Assessments Inc.
P.O. Box 607, Snowdon Station
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H3X 3X8

(514) 483-1901
Mon-Fri 1-5 pm Eastern Time

Call or write for free demo disk!
Includes complete test program (set to administer 10 tests) and manual.

Available to Corporations Only
Not Copy Protected!

Requires IBM-PC (tm) or compatible with minimum 256K and 2 disk drives. Available on 5.25 or 3.5 inch floppy disk.

Conduct I/O Reference Searches On Your Own PC!

Fast and Flexible Search of the References to More Than 9000 Journal Articles and Books

References to all articles since 1970 from:
- Journal of Applied Psychology
- Personnel Psychology
- Academy of Management Journal
- Academy of Management Review (since Vol. 1)
- Administrative Science Quarterly
- Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (since Vol. 1)

References to all I/O Psychology and quantitative articles since 1970 from:
- Psychological Bulletin
- American Psychologist
- Annual Review of Psychology
- Human Relations (NEW)

References to all books reviewed in Personnel Psychology since 1975 (more than 1400).

Only $99 (US)

Updates containing the latest references available at any time for $20 (US).

R.D. Craig Assessments Inc.
P.O. Box 607, Snowdon Station
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H3X 3X8

(514) 483-1901
Mon-Fri 1-5 pm Eastern Time

Call or write for free demo disk!
Requires IBM-PC (tm) or compatible with minimum 256K. Available on five 5.25 inch 360K or three 3.5 inch 720K disk drives.
Positions Available

Rick Jacobs

INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST: The Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association (LIMRA) is seeking a Ph.D. Psychologist to perform creative research in the area of personnel selection and recruiting. Candidates should have an interest and thorough background in research design and statistical procedures. LIMRA is an international marketing research association serving the insurance industry. For over 50 years, LIMRA has been providing selection testing services to its member companies and strives to maintain a supportive environment for innovative research in the areas of selection and recruiting. We offer a competitive salary and benefit package that includes medical, dental, vision care, company paid pension plan and 401K. Interested candidates should submit vitae, copies of research papers, and list of references to: Paul D. Martin, Employment Coordinator, LIMRA, 8 Farm Springs, Farmington, CT 06032. An Equal Opportunity Employer/M/F/H/V.

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS TO MANAGEMENT. Rohrer, Hibler & Replogle, Inc., is seeking doctoral, licensed (or eligible) psychologists for full-time career positions with our 40-year-old firm, in the San Francisco Bay and Los Angeles offices. Candidates should enjoy collegial affiliation, team work, and contributing to the growth of the firm. Candidates must be able to establish effective rapport with senior business executives, assisting them with innovative, practical, and psychologically sound solutions to complex problems of people and organizations. Responsibilities include executive assessment, manager development, organization analysis, organizational development, and business development. Successful candidates will be experienced and mature psychologists with the technical and personal qualities needed to work effectively in a corporate environment with senior executives. Business training, experience in business consultation, and/or experience in management desirable. Positions open until filled. Send cover letter and résumé to J. G. Blanche, Ph.D., Manager, Rohrer, Hibler & Replogle, Inc., 800 So. Figueroa St., Suite 1120, Los Angeles, California 90017.

INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST: One tenure track (open rank) position beginning Fall, 1989 in the Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park. Salary is competitive. Preference for a person with excellent research credentials who complements current faculty competencies, who conducts research in organizational settings, and who integrates research and teaching through work with graduate students. The University of Maryland actively subscribes to a policy of equal employment and educational opportunities. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Applicants are invited to send a vita and at least three letters of reference to: Benjamin Schneider, Chair, I/O Search Committee, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. For best consideration, application materials should be received by November 1, 1988.

MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT. Due to our continued growth, Frito-Lay’s Management Development Department has an immediate opening for a manager. Key responsibilities include staffing and manpower utilization, assessment of managerial potential, organizational design and development, team building and change management, and research for assigned client groups.

The ideal candidate will have a Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology or a related discipline and three to five years of 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 résumé along with salary history to John Beeson; Director, Management Development; Frito-Lay, Inc.; 7701 Legacy Drive; Plano, Texas 75024-4099. Frito-Lay, Inc. is an Equal Opportunity Employer M/F/V/V.
INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST: The Department of Psychology, University at Albany, State University of New York, is seeking an I/O Psychologist for the fall of 1989. The recruitment is one of several allocated as part of a University-wide initiative in Management of Human Systems. The individual filling this position will also have the opportunity to participate in the interdisciplinary doctoral program in Organizational Studies in the School of Business. Preference will be given to a candidate at the Associate level, although applications for a Full Professorship or for a tenure-track position as Assistant Professor will also be considered. Emphasis is on productivity in scholarly research centering on industrial/organizational issues. Salary is competitive. To apply, please send a cover letter indicating the level for which you are applying and a current Vita by October 1, 1988 to: Donn Byrne, Chair of the I/O Search Committee, Department of Psychology, University of Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY 12222. The University at Albany is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Applications from women, minority persons, handicapped persons, and special disabled or Vietnam era veterans are especially welcome.

The faculty member may obtain a special license restricting the use of MCPS to the aforementioned purpose by writing on university letterhead requesting the license and specifying whether the use is for research, classroom demonstration or for a graduate student’s thesis or dissertation research (also providing that student’s name). Requests should be sent to Dr. Erich P. Prien, Performance Management Associates, Poplar Towers, Suite 1103, 6263 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee 38119.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL RELEASES OUTLOOK STUDY ON BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

The National Research Council has released its long-awaited study of the future of the behavioral and social sciences. Entitled The Behavioral and Social Sciences: Achievements and Opportunities, the study is expected to be a key influence on federal policies with respect to research in these sciences. The report is meant to be neither an exhaustive inventory of disciplines nor of all cutting-edge research in each discipline. Instead, the report describes the path of change in the relevant sciences and suggests how research support policies should be adjusted to derive the most useful knowledge from the social and behavioral sciences.

The central theme of the report is that if the social and behavioral sciences are to significantly advance knowledge, the work of scientists must no longer be discrete within disciplines but must routinely be integrated across disciplinary boundaries. It suggests that resources in support of the behavioral and social sciences should be increased significantly, and that they should be marshaled in support not of individual disciplines but rather areas of inquiry whose understanding requires interactive effort from many disciplines.

Accordingly, the chapters are arranged by topical groupings rather than by disciplines. The first chapter, “Behavior, Mind, and Brain,” for example, describes the contributions neurobiology, developmental psychology, perception, memory and cognition, linguistics, and artificial intelligence research should be able to make to understanding the interaction of behavior, mind and brain. Reflecting the authors’ cognizance of policy implications, this chapter, like the other four dealing with topical groupings, ends with a discussion of opportunities and needs. The remaining four chapters grouped in this way are, “Motivational and Social Contexts of Behavior,” “Choice and Allocation,” “Institutions and Cultures,” and “Methods of Data Collection, Representation, and Analysis.” The report concludes with a chapter on human, technological, data, and funding resource needs and a chapter on raising the yield of knowledge from the behavioral and social sciences.

Federation President R. Duncan Luce of Harvard and Neil J. Smelser of the University of California at Berkeley jointly chair the National

MIXED STANDARD SCALE SOFTWARE

A IBM PC software package (MCPS) has been available for some time for the Mixed Standard Scale performance appraisal format. This particular commercial package is available with a set of job duty modules for clerical work and for general managerial work. Both the clerical and the management taxonomies are the results of extensive work in job analysis. The performance appraisal content, however, represents a general solution. The complete MCPS package is available at no cost to Society members in teaching positions for self sponsored research or for classroom demonstration (undergraduate or graduate) or to graduate students who wish to conduct research for their thesis or dissertation.
Research Council's Committee on Basic Research in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, which is responsible for the report. Thirty-one papers were commissioned to provide background information as the Committee prepared this report. Those papers are to be published by the Russell Sage Foundation.

Copies of the report itself may be purchased for $29.50 from the National Academy Press; 2101 Constitution Ave., NW; Washington, DC 20418. When placing your order, identify the report's code "BESOC."

THE 1989-90 FULBRIGHT SCHOLAR-IN-RESIDENCE PROGRAM

Opportunities for American colleges and universities to host a visiting scholar from abroad for all or part of the 1989-90 academic year are available through the Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence Program. Institutions are invited to submit proposals for visiting scholars in the humanities and social sciences, or in scientific or professional specializations with a strong international focus. Of particular interest for the 1989-90 program year will be proposals to bring scholars in American literature, history, or politics; professionals from the media or government; or specialists in constitutional law or politics.

A Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence may teach regular courses from a foreign area perspective, serve as a resource person in interdisciplinary courses, assist in developing new courses, or participate in special seminars. An institution hosting a scholar-in-residence would be expected to share the scholar's expertise with a wide range of departments and with neighboring institutions, involve him/her in community activities and professional organizations, and provide opportunities for the visitor to pursue personal research interests.

The program provides roundtrip travel for the grantee and, for full-year awards, one accompanying dependent; a monthly maintenance allowance; and incidental allowances for travel, books, and services essential to the assignment. The host institution is expected to share some costs in the form of supplementary funding and in-kind support such as housing.


PSYCHOLOGISTS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Members of Division 14 of the American Psychology Association are invited to join the Psychologists for Social Responsibility, a national organization with a number of state and local chapters which serves to give focus to psychologists' concerns with avoiding nuclear war and promoting peace. Beyond the serious issues of reducing the risks of nuclear war, whether by accident or design, psychologists are particularly aware of the budgetary squeeze wherein military spending limits resources that might otherwise be more available for psychological research, education, and professional services.

Since we participate in the Professionals Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control, our members receive from the Coalition prompt information about legislative and other issues on which our members need timely input. We maintain a Washington Office (Suite 209, 1841 Columbia Road, NW, Washington, DC 20009—phone 202-745-7084) where our very effective coordinator, Anne Anderson, links us together and makes things happen. We have Task Forces to prepare psychological briefing papers for work with other peace-oriented organizations, especially SANE (by present agreement), on Peace Studies curricula, on legislative action, and on research. We expect to become more active in developing foundation funding for activities to make an impact in the media. We run an active hospitality suite at APA conventions. Regular dues are $35.00, but for students and the retired or unemployed, we ask only $15.00, and we'd like more from the affluent—it is expensive to run an office.

For more information, contact: Anne Anderson, Coordinator, National Office, 1841 Columbia Road, NW, Suite 209, Washington, DC 20009, (202) 745-7084.

University of Southern California announces a degree program of special interest to Industrial - Organizational Psychologists

The Master of Science in Human Factors program prepares students for a human factors role in the micro- and macro-design of systems. The behavioral, analytical and research skills and concepts needed by professionals for interfacing people, technology and organizations are emphasized.

The degree requires completion of 30 units plus a thesis, or 36 units plus a comprehensive examination. The program offers flexibility in choosing areas of concentration within the field, and an opportunity for credit through field (internship) study.

Human Factors Department
Institute of Safety and Systems Management
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0521
(213) 745-9045
ADVERTISE IN TIP

The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist is the official newsletter of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., Division 14 of the American Psychological Association. TIP is distributed four times a year to the more than 2500 Society members. Membership includes academicians and professional practitioners in the field. In addition, TIP is distributed to foreign affiliates, graduate students, leaders of the American Psychological Association, and individual and institutional subscribers. Current circulation is 4000 copies per issue.

Advertising may be purchased in TIP in units as large as two pages and as small as a half-page spread. In addition, "Position Available" ads can be obtained at a charge of $50.00 per position. For information or placement of ads, write to Rick Jacobs, Department of Psychology, 520 Moore Building, Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802.
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