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A Niche In Time
Comments by Tom Ramsay

Through a strange combination of chance and planning we have discovered a niche in the maintenance area of employee selection.

This has enabled our completion of the following projects in the past year.

- Development of C, B, & A Electrical tests for an aluminum melting and manufacturing company (used for a pay for knowledge program).
- Development of Instrument Technician and Electrical Technician tests for training and upgrading Instrument and Electrical Repair employees in a midwestern paper plant (used with a competency-based training program).
- Development of an electrical and mechanical job knowledge test for diagnostic evaluation of 200 maintenance employees at a large number of remote service facilities.
- Development of Mechanic and System Technician test for a large mining company in the Midwest.

If you require quick, economical and high quality paper-and-pencil or performance tests for maintenance employee selection, we would be happy to discuss our mutual interests.

RAMSAY CORPORATION
Boyce Station Offices
1030 Boyce Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15241-3907
(412) 257-0732
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A Message From Your President

Wayne Cascio

It’s getting to be a habit. The 7th annual convention of the Society, held in Montreal from May 1-3, was another smash hit. Attendance was a solid 1,250 registrations, including a growing number of overseas colleagues, and the program was packed with enticing sessions that offered something for almost every inquiring mind in the broad field of I/O psychology. As usual, Ron Johnson and his staff did a superb job in handling the administrative details of the convention. We even got fresh salmon as the main dish at our luncheon! (Ron ought to teach a course on negotiation skills.) Nevertheless, after four years of dedicated service to the Society, Ron will be leaving as conference chair, to be replaced by Bill Macey. During this next year, Ron and Bill will work closely together to assure a smooth transition as we gear up for our 8th annual Society conference in San Francisco. Thanks Ron; good luck Bill.

The Society also owes a considerable debt of gratitude to its outgoing committee chairs and elected officers: Katherine Klein (SIOP program), Margaret Ingate (Professional Affairs), Allen Kraut (Committee on Committees), Steve Kozlowski (editor of TIP), Paul Sackett (Scientific Affairs), Susan Jackson (member-at-large of the Executive Committee), and Shelly Zedeck (APA Council representative). These individuals have served diligently over the past several years, volunteering their time in an effort to make our Society ever better. Please accept our heartfelt thanks for all that you have done for us.

We also would like to welcome all of our new incoming chairs and elected officers: Jeff McHenry (APA program), Ron Johnson (Professional Affairs), Nancy Tippins (Committee on Committees), Kurt Kraiger (editor of TIP), Kevin Murphy (Scientific Affairs), Susan Palmer (member-at-large of the Executive Committee), and Cathy Higgs (Chair-designate of the Continuing Education and Workshop committee). Cathy will “learn the ropes” during the final year of service of co-chairs Georgia Chao and Craig Williams. As of this writing we do not yet know who our elected representative to APA Council will be (Jim Farr, Jay Thomas, or Katherine Klein). That result will be reported in the next issue of TIP.

We have several new initiatives that you should know about. First, the subcommittee concerned with the attraction and retention of minority-group members to SIOP (co-chaired by Loriann Roberson and Jeff McHenry),
hosted a well-attended session at the SIOP convention. Some excellent ideas
emerged from that session, and as the subcommittee submits action-oriented
suggestions over time, we will share them with you.

Second, beginning with the next edition of TIP, we will start a new column
entitled, "How Our Society Works." To get the most out of our Society, it's
important that all of our members understand what the various committees do,
and how we are governed by our bylaws and administrative procedures. Our
first column will focus on the elections process, and how it works.

Two other initiatives include a project by the Professional Affairs
Committee to identify for our members various reference materials on the
Americans With Disabilities Act and how to order them, and second, a charge
to the Long Range Planning Committee to examine the current SIOP elections
process in an effort to ensure democracy and fairness. We will keep you
informed of progress on all of these fronts.

Regarding SIOP's contribution to APA's amicus curiae brief in Soroka v.
Dayton Hudson Corporation, a subcommittee including Frank Landy, Mary
Tenopyr, Bob Ramos, Dave Kleinke, Jerry Barrett, Leaetta Hough, and
me met at the SIOP conference in Montreal to identify key scientific issues
that SIOP might address in this case. Wayne Camara and Dianne Brown
of APA's Science Directorate have been most helpful to the committee,
particularly in providing relevant background materials (about six inches
thick!). The subcommittee expects to submit its report by late July, and we
will keep you informed of progress.

Finally, it is customary for an incoming president to describe his or her
vision for the Society over the next year. I would like to take just a few words
to describe mine. My theme for the coming year will be I/O Psychology in a
Changing World. I believe that I/O psychologists can and should play an
ever-more visible role in enhancing national competitiveness. To do that we need
to communicate the value of what we do to public and private-sector decision
makers. We need to make our voices heard in national debates (in the U. S.
and elsewhere) on proposals for increasing the quality of the workforce, as
well as the quality of the goods and services our organizations produce. For far
too long, this debate has been dominated by individuals outside our field—and
yet we have so much to contribute. We are uniquely qualified through training
and experience to do so, because our focus has always been on understanding
and predicting the behavior of men and women at work. Given the growing
recognition that the quality of a nation's labor force is critical to its
competitiveness in international markets and to its standard of living, I/O
psychologists need to take a more active role—and we will.

SIOP's APA CONVENTION PROGRAM
WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 14-17, 1992
Lynn R. Offerman, Program Chair

Here is a listing of SIOP's full program at the upcoming APA Convention in Washington D.C.
The Convention runs from Friday, August 14, 1992 through Monday, August 17, 1992. My thanks
to all the program participants and to those who served on SIOP's Program Committee for the
APA Convention. The program looks terrific. Hope to see you at the Convention!

************
FRIDAY, August 14, 1992
9-10:50 a.m.
SYMPOSIUM: WORK KEYS: SUPPORTING THE TRANSITION
FROM SCHOOL TO WORK
Chair: Joel D. West, American College Testing, Inc.
Participants:
* Joel D. West, American College Testing, Inc. Work keys: Connections to support the school to
  work transition.
* Joyce R. McIary, American College Testing, Inc. Work Keys: Developing the Assessments
* Timothy R. Vansickle, American College Testing, Inc. Work Keys: Developing a Usable Scale
  for Multi-Level, Criterion-Referenced Assessments
* Anthony Biscigl, Kenosha Unified School District. Work Keys: Integrating Work Keys into
  the School
  Environment
Discussant:
Irwin L. Goldstein, University of Maryland

11:00 - 12:50
SYMPOSIUM: PREDICTORS, CONSEQUENCES AND STABILITY OF
SELF-OTHER RATING DISCREPANCIES
Chair: David P. Campbell, Center for Creative Leadership
Participants:
* David B. Peterson, Personnel Decisions, Inc. Personality Predictors of Correspondence Between
  Self-Report and Observer Ratings
* Joy Fisher Hazucha, Personnel Decisions, Inc, Charles S. Szymaniak, Macalester College, and
  Scott Birkland, St. Olaf College. Effects of Confidentiality and Gender on Self-Boss
  Rating Congruence
* Ellen Van Velsor, Center for Creative Leadership. Personality. Self-Rater Perspective
  Differences and Leadership Effectiveness
* Dianne Nilsen, Center for Creative Leadership, David Campbell, Center for Creative
  Leadership. Self-Observer Agreement: Fleeting Phenomenon or Meaningful Construct?
Discussant:
Clark Wilson, Clark Wilson Publishing Co.
1:00 - 2:50 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM: COMPUTER ASSISTED TELEPHONE INTERVIEW (CATI) TECHNOLOGY
Chair: Paul J. Cook, US Air Force

Participants:
* Judy D. Roomburg, US Air Force. Protection of Survey Data
* Shirley M. Ross, US Air Force. CATI Technology in Support of Policy Development

Discussant:
William Derrick, SRA Corporation

2:00 - 2:50 p.m.

INVITED ADDRESS: GROUPS, ORGANIZATIONS, AND DUAL ALIENATIONS OF PSYCHOLOGY
Chair: Eduardo Salas, Naval Training Systems Center

Participants:
Richard A. Guzzo, University of Maryland

3:00 - 4:50 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM: UNIFORM GUIDELINES REVISITED: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE PAST, PRESENT, & FUTURE
Chair: Malcolm C. McCulloch, IBM Corporation

Participants:
* Frank W. Erwin Richardson, Bellows, Henry, & Co., Inc. Guidelines, Guidelines, Wherefore Art Thou From?: Perspective on the Past
* Patricia J. Dyer, IBM Corporation. The Uniform Guidelines: Practical Problems of Unresolved Conflicts
* Richard L. Seymour, Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights under Law. The Past, Present, and Future of the Uniformed Guidelines
* Mary L. Tenopyr, At & T. Guidelines as a Necessary Evil

Discussant:
Wayne F. Cascio, University of Colorado

3:00 - 4:50 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM: CONFRONTING NEW CHALLENGES FOR LEADERSHIP AND FOLLOWERSHIP
Chair: Donna E. Thompson, CUNY, Baruch College and University Graduate Center

Participants:
* Edwin P. Hollander, CUNY Baruch College and University Graduate Center. Leadership-Followership: A centennial perspective
* James R. Meindl, State University of New York at Buffalo. The romance of leadership: Prospects for a follower-centric theory
* Lynn R. Offermann, George Washington University. Leading a diverse workforce: The challenges ahead
* Henry P. Sines, University of Maryland, Charles C. Manz, Arizona State University. Focus on the follower: Leading others to lead themselves

Discussant:
Ann Howard, The Leadership Research Institute

5:00 - 5:50 p.m.
INVITED ADDRESS: THE CHANGING WORLD OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE
Chair: Ellen A. Fagenson, George Mason University

Participant:
W. Warner Burke, Teachers College, Columbia University

6:00 p.m.
Social Hour, The Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology

SATURDAY, AUGUST 15, 1992

8:00 - 8:50 a.m.
CONVERSATION HOUR: INCREASING ETHNIC MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY CAREERS
Chair: Richard J. Klionski, Ohio State University

Participants:
* Roseanne Foti, Virginia Tech. Education and Training Opportunities in Industrial/ Organizational Psychology
* Marcia M. Andberg, American Guidance Service. Membership in the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology

9:00 - 10:50 a.m.
SYMPOSIUM: RACIAL IDENTITY THEORY: A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING DIVERSITY IN ORGANIZATIONS
Chair: Janet E. Helms, University of Maryland

Participants:
* Janet E. Helms, University of Maryland. Overview of racial identity theory
* Roderick J. Watts, DePaul University. Racial identity and organizational interventions
* Robert T. Carter, Teachers College, Columbia University. White racial identity as a vehicle for diversity training
* Caryn J. Block, Teachers College, Columbia University, Robert T. Carter, Teachers College, Columbia University. The influence of white racial identity on personnel selection decisions

Discussant:
Clayton Alderfer, Yale University

9:00 - 10:50 a.m.
SYMPOSIUM: DIFFERENTIAL ASSIGNMENT: THE CLASSIFICATION—EFFICIENT JOB MARKETING TECHNOLOGY
Chair: Joseph Zedner, The George Washington University

Participants:
* Theodora M. Scholarios, University of Strathclyde. Predictor Selection Techniques for Maximizing Potential Classification Efficiency
* Mary Ann Stetman, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Factor Composites for Making Job Assignments and for Vocational Counseling
* Deborah L. Whetzel, American Institutes for Research Multidimensional Screening. Comparison of Personnel Selection/Classification Strategies
* Julia A. Leeman, US Office of Personnel Management. Restructuring Job Families to Improve Classification Efficiency

Discussant:
Cecil D. Johnson, The George Washington University
Wayne P. Cascio, University of Colorado, Graduate School of Business Administration
11:00 - 11:50 a.m.
SYMPOSIUM: FUNCTIONAL JOB ANALYSIS/JOE ELEMENT METHOD:
HISTORICAL ROOTS, CONTEMPORARY USES
Chair: Edwin A. Fleishman, George Mason University

Participants:
* Sidney A. Fine, Sidney A Fine Associates. The Origin and Nature of Functional Job Analysis
  Building the Criteria into Assessment Procedures: The Job Element Method

12:00 - 12:50
SYMPOSIUM: PUTTING PSYCHOLOGY TO WORK ON TOTAL
QUALITY MANAGEMENT
Chair: Marc B. Sokol, AT & T, Bell Laboratories

Participants:
* Marc B. Sokol, AT & T Bell Laboratories. Total Quality Management: From Messiah to False-
  Prophet and Back
* Pamela Kicder, San Diego State University. Why TQM Works: An Underlying Model

1:00 - 2:50 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM: INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AS SCIENCE:
PAST, PRESENT & FUTURE
Chair: Marvin D. Dunnette, University of Minnesota

Participants:
* Robert M. Guion, Bowling Green State University. Science, Pseudoscience and Silly Science in
  Applied Psychology
* Lyman W. Porter, University of California. Irvine Tales of O in I/O Psychology: A Quarter
  Century Perspective
* John P. Campbell, University of Minnesota. What Could the Science of I/O Psychology be
  Like?
Discussant:
  Raymond A. Katzell, New York University

3:00 - 4:50 p.m.
DISCUSSION: INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
PRACTICE THROUGH TIME
Chair: Douglas W. Bray, Development Dimensions International

Participants:
* William C. Byham, Development Dimensions International
* Edwin A. Fleishman, George Mason University
* Paul R. Jeanneret, Jeanneret & Associates
* Robert H. Meyer, University of South Florida
* Mary L. Tenopyr, AT & T
* Paul W. Thayer, North Carolina State University

5:00 - 5:50 p.m.
INVITED ADDRESS: BEIDES, IN 100 YEARS WHAT THE HECK
DIFFERENCE WILL IT MAKE?
Chair: Vicki V. Vandaveer, Jeanneret & Associates, Inc.

Participant:
Robert M. Guion, Bowling Green State University

6:00 p.m.
SOCIAL HOUR
In Honor of Division 14 Presidents, Past and Present

SUNDAY, AUGUST 16, 1992

9:00 - 10:50 a.m.
SYMPOSIUM: NEW APPROACHES TO ASSESSING MANAGERIAL POTENTIAL
Chair: Philip M. Lewis, Auburn University

Participants:
* Michael D. Mumford, George Mason University. Leaders as Creators: Measurement
  Implications and Findings Using Background Data
* T. Owen Jacobs, U.S. Army Research Institute. The Conceptual Demands of Executive
  Leadership: Findings and Implications
* Philip M. Lewis, Auburn University. Developmental Level and Managerial Work Capacity
* Robert Hogan, University of Tulsa. Failure to Achieve Managerial Potential: The Role of
  Personality Disorders
* Siegfried Streufert, Penn State College of Medicine. Managerial Competence: Insights Gained
  Through Quasi-Experimental Simulations

9:00 - 10:50 a.m.
DISCUSSION: PROPOSED REVISION OF THE 1985 STANDARDS FOR
EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING
Chair: Paul R. Sackett, University of Minnesota

Participants:
* Frank J. Landy, Pennsylvania State University, Center for Applied Behavioral Science
* Richard E. Snow, Stanford University, School of Education
* Carol Tittle, City University of New York, School of Education

11:00 - 11:50 a.m.
POSTER SESSION: INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH
Chair: Christopher E. Sager, George Washington University

An Empirical Investigation of Job Performance Ratings with Self Estimations of Worth.
Patrick W. Giannetto, California School of Professional Psychology, John J. Cesare,
County of San Diego, M.H. Blankenship, County of San Diego, Mark Z. Mandel,
California School of Professional Psychology.

Management-Type Ethical Decisions: Effects of Social Cues, Framing, and Justice. Jeffrey J.
Bailey, University of Idaho, Ralph A. Alexander, The University of Akron.
Comparing Different Background Data Scaling Procedures Using Triple Cross Validation. Timothy C. Clifton, George Mason University, Robert N. Kilcullen, Army Research Institute, Roni Reiter-Palmon, George Mason University, Michael D. Mummford, George Mason University.

The Role of Multiple Target Applicants on the Degree of Contrast Effect Error. Steven J. Cesare, Department of Human Resources, County of San Diego, Anthony T. Dallessio, Limra International, Colleen Thornton, University of Central Florida.

Quality of the Supervisor—Subordinate Relationship and Perceptions of Equity. Pamela J. Kidder, San Diego State University, Diane E. Segal, San Diego State University, Kyle Lautby, San Diego State University.

Cognitive and Academic Factors in Screening Interviews: A Field Study. Camille S. DaBell, Texas Tech University, Patricia R. McCarthy, University of Minnesota.

Redundancy Among Ability Requirement Scales with Different Types of Anchors. Scott A. Goodman, The University of Akron, Daniel T. Svyantek, The University of Akron, Margaret M. Matyuf, George Mason University, Lee Friedman, George Mason University.

Individual, Organizational, and Community Characteristics as Predicators of Job Satisfaction. William K. Balzer, Bowling Green State University, Kenneth E. Sumner, Bowling Green State University.


What do Managerial Potential Scales Measure? Robert D. Smither, Rollins College, John M. Houston, Rollins College.

Three Faces of Affect: Their Relationship with Evaluations and Satisfaction. Todd J. Maurer, Georgia Tech, Mark A. Gilbert, Georgia Tech, Thomas Wicker, Georgia Tech.

New Measures for Organizational Commitment. Sally J. Czaja, State University of New York at Buffalo.

A Model to Guide the Management of Creativity. Gordon R. Simerson, University of New Haven, Christopher J. Brown, University of New Haven, Kevin W. Cook, University of New Haven.


Examining the Generalizability of Field Performance Ratings. David V. Day, Pennsylvania State University, Stanley B. Silverman, University of Akron.


Different Forms of Cohesiveness as Substitutes for Leadership. Janelle A. Gilbert, George Mason University, Stephen J. Zaccaro, George Mason University, Michelle Zanazis, George Mason University, Gwen DeMiranda, George Mason University.

Test Scoring in Personnel Selection: Number-Correct Scores vs. “PolyScores.” Mark H. Blankenship, Human Resources Department, County of San Diego, Steven J. Cesare, County of San Diego, J. Bradford Symson, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Cultural Self-Representations: A New Model of Cross Cultural I/O Psychology. Miream Erez, Technion—Israel Institute of Technology.

When a Little Bias Hurts Women A Lot. Richard F. Martell, Rice University, David Lane, Rice University, Cynthia Willis, Rice University.


Personality Characteristics of Managers Who Deliberately Inflate Written Performance Appraisals. Yitzhak Fried, Wayne State University, Haim A. Ben-David, Wayne State University, Robert B. Teig, Wayne State University.

On the Choice of Scales for Task Analysis. Juan I. Sanchez, Florida International University, Scott L. Fraser, Florida International University.

Predicting Relocation Intentions of Culturally Different Nursing Professionals. Juan I. Sanchez, Florida International University.


The Effects of Dispositional Affectivity on Work Attitudes and Behavior. Joseph M. Czajka, University of South Carolina, Thomas M. Begley, Northeastern University.


The Effects of Hispanic Origin on Assessment Center Ratings. Anne M. Fiedler, Florida International University, K. Galen Kroeck, Florida International University.

The Effects of Sex-Based Preferential Selection. Stella R. Kaplow, New York University, Madeline E. Heilman, New York University.


Family Support Inventory for Workers: Reliability and Validity Analyses. Lynda A. King, Central Michigan University, Laura K. Matterno, Bowling Green State University, Daniel W. King, Central Michigan University.

Evidence for Trait Based Cross-Situational Leadership. Mary Shane Connolly, George Mason University, Stephen J. Zaccaro, George Mason University, Michael D. Mummford, George Mason University.


12:00 - 1:50 p.m.

DISCUSSION: THE RELATIONSHIP OF I/O SCIENCE AND PRACTICE: CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES

Chairs: Vicki V. Vandaveer, Jeanneret and Associates, Inc.

Lynn R. Offermann, George Washington University

Participants:
* Wayne F. Cascio, University of Colorado, Graduate School of Business Administration
* Nancy T. Tippins, Bell Atlantic
* Paul R. Jeanneret, Jeanneret & Associates, Inc.
* Irwin L. Goldstein, University of Maryland
2:00 - 2:50 p.m.
INVITED ADDRESS: BALANCING WORK AND FAMILY: CHANGING THE RULES OF THE GAME
Chair: Marilyn K. Gowing, U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Participant:
Jeanne M. Brett, Northwestern University

2:00 p.m.
INVITED ADDRESS: QUALITY CONCEPTS TO SOLVE SOCIETAL CRISIS: PROFOUND KNOWLEDGE FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS
Chair: E. Scott Geller, Virginia Polytechnic University

Participant:
W. Edwards Deming

3:00 - 4:50 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM: RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INNOVATIONS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Chair: Marilyn K. Gowing, U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Participants:
* John D. Kraft, US Office of Personnel Management. Programs in the Assessment Services Division
* Sandra S. Payne, US Office of Personnel Management. Programs in the Organizational Analysis and Effectiveness Division

Discussant:
John P. Campbell, University of Minnesota

10:00 - 10:50 a.m.
SYMPOSIUM: THE FATE OF PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT IN EMPLOYMENT SCREENING
Chair: Diane C. Brown, American Psychological Association

Participants:
* Douglas N. Jackson, University of Western Ontario. Personality Questionnaires in Selection: Privacy Issues and the Soroka Decision
* Catherine L. Flanagan, Psychological Consultants for Management. Implications of EEOC's ADA Guidelines for Personality Assessment

Discussant:
Richard J. Klimoski, Ohio State University

11:00 - 11:50 a.m.
DISCUSSION: THE POTENTIAL FOR JOINT RESEARCH EFFORTS AMONG FEDERAL TESTING PROGRAMS
Chair: Deborah L. Whetzel, American Institutes for Research

Participants:
* John Hawk, U.S. Department of Labor
* Laurens Wise, Defense Manpower Data Center
* Richard Toonowski, U.S. Postal Service
* Magda Colberg, U.S. Office of Personnel Management

12:00 - 12:50 p.m.
INVITED ADDRESS: REACHING ACROSS BOUNDARIES: GLOBALIZATION'S IMPACT ON COUNTRIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND OURSELVES
Chair: Ellen A. Fagenson, George Mason University

Participants:
Rosalind Moss Kaster, Harvard University

1:00 - 2:50 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM: THE EFFECTS OF MULTIPLE GOAL SYSTEMS IN WORK SETTINGS
Chair: Jeffrey B. Vancouver, New York University

Participants:
* Eric A. Waxman, New York University, Joanna Rock, New York University, Jeffrey B. Vancouver, New York University. Identification and Advantage of Multiple Control Systems in Task Performance
* Mark S. Urban, The Ohio State University, Robert J. Vance, Pennsylvania State University. The Influence of Motivational Processes on Multiple Goal Attainment
* Paula Larson, New York University, Donna McDonald, New York University, Jeffrey B. Vancouver, New York University. Feedback Timing Effects on the Performance of Two Goals
* Christopher J.R. Roney, Columbia University, E. Tory Higgins, Columbia University. The Importance of Feedback Orientation for Defining a Goal Situation
* Margaret Diddams, New York University. Understanding the Effects of Employees' Self-Concepts via Control Theory

Discussant:
Charles S. Carver, University of Miami

MONDAY, AUGUST 17, 1992

9:00 - 9:50 a.m.
SYMPOSIUM: IMPlicit Performance RATING Theory
Chair: Christopher E. Sager, George Washington University

Participants:
* Christopher E. Sager and Timothy A. Nitti, George Washington University, Joy Fisher Hazucha, Personnel Decisions Inc. Performance Ratings Across Perspectives: Univariate Comparisons and Their Interpretation
* Jeff W. Johnson, University of Minnesota. The Influence of Implicit Theories on Job Performance Ratings
* Scott H. Oppler, American Institutes for Research. Relationships among Rated Dimensions of Performance: Consistency across Organizational levels

Discussant:
John P. Campbell, University of Minnesota
3:00 - 4:50 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM: FEDERAL WORKFORCE ISSUES AND SURVEY RESEARCH

Participants:
* Katherine C. Neff, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, View of the Glass Ceiling in Federal Employment

Discussant:
Robert D. Caplan, The George Washington University

1992 SIOP Awards Citations

Wayne J. Camara

Robert S. Wherry Award for the Best Paper at the 1991 I-O/OB Graduate Student Convention

We are pleased to present a certificate for the Robert S. Wherry Best Paper at the 1991 I-O/OB Graduate Student Convention to Paul VanKatwyk of the University of Guelph. His paper was entitled “Using facet theory to clarify content and conceptual confusion between self-report measures of job satisfaction and job characteristics.”

S. Rains Wallace Dissertation Award

Honorable mention for the 1992 S. Rains Wallace Dissertation Award is given to Scott Oppler, Ph.D. for his dissertation entitled, “Three Approaches to the Investigation of Subgroup Bias in Performance Measurement.” We are pleased to present Dr. Oppler with a certificate of honorable mention for his dissertation, which was completed at the University of Minnesota under the direction of John Campbell, Ph.D.

The 1992 S. Rains Wallace Dissertation Award is given to Elizabeth Wolfe Morrison, Ph.D. in recognition of the best doctoral dissertation in the field of industrial and organizational psychology. Dr. Morrison’s dissertation, entitled “Overcoming Newness: Proactive Information Seeking by Organizational Newcomers,” was completed at Northwestern University under the direction of Robert Bies, Ph.D. We are pleased to present Dr. Morrison with a certificate and a check for $500. Dr. Morrison has been invited to present an address at next year’s Conference based on her award winning dissertation.

Edwin E. Ghiselli Award for Research Design

The Society is pleased to present the 1992 Edwin E. Ghiselli Award for Research Design in the field of industrial and organizational psychology to Julie Olson, Ph.D. and Peter Carnevale, Ph.D. of the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. The title of their research proposal was “Grievance Systems in Organizations: An Examination of the Behavior and Post-Appeal Consequences of Grievance Filers.” Dr. Olson and Dr. Carnevale will each be provided with a certificate and will share a cash prize of $500. They are also invited to present an address at the 1993 Conference based on the award winning research proposal.

Ernest J. McCormick Award for Distinguished Early Career Contributions

The 1992 Ernest J. McCormick Award for Distinguished Early Career Contributions is given to John R. Hollenbeck, Ph.D. in recognition of his contributions to the science of industrial and organizational psychology. These contributions span several facets of the field of industrial and organizational psychology, including goal-setting, job and role design, and statistical analysis. He has contributed to all these areas as indicated by his publications and by citations to his work.

Primarily, Dr. Hollenbeck has extended the goal-setting paradigm in several novel ways. One is his use of control theory to conceptualize goal-setting in a manner that contrasts with other approaches that predominate in the area. A second extension of standard goal-setting logic is evident in his definitional and measurement work on the construct of goal commitment. Attesting to the programmatic nature of his research on goal-setting are a preliminary review of the concept that used expectancy theory concepts to specify a model, a review of evidence for the construct validity of a measure of goal commitment, and several empirical studies using that goal commitment measure.

A second facet of Dr. Hollenbeck’s work involves his collaboration with Daniel Ilgen, Ph.D. in successfully merging job characteristics and role approaches to jobs. Their idea of Job-Role Differentiation (JRD) is innovative, integrative, and will be helpful in guiding research over the coming years. This work helps to demonstrate his interest and ability in bringing diverse areas of social science together to address the problems of organizational behavior.

Another facet of his contributions to the field is statistical in nature and consists of work done with Eugene F. Stone, Ph.D. on hierarchical moderated regression analysis as compared with alternatives for detecting interaction
effects. In this program of research, Stone and Hollenbeck have criticized the alternative techniques on logical and statistical grounds. They have conducted several studies to compare the performance of moderated regression and alternatives.

Dr. Hollenbeck has also received major grants within the last three years, the first to investigate remediation of lower back disability through testing, training, and job design and the second to examine goal-setting and decision-making in tactical command teams. This work attests to Dr. Hollenbeck’s skills and interest in the application of basic I-O research to applied problems.

In view of these superb contributions, the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology is pleased to present its 1992 Ernest J. McCormick Award for Distinguished Early Career Contributions to John R. Hollenbeck, Ph.D. We are pleased to present Dr. Hollenbeck with a certificate, a check for $500, and an invitation to present an address at the next SIOP conference that relates to his contributions.

1992 SIOP Distinguished Service Award

The 1992 Distinguished Service Award is given to Irwin L. Goldstein, Ph.D. in recognition of his sustained, significant, and outstanding service to the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

As an elected officer of the Society, Dr. Goldstein has served as Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee, Representative to the APA Council of Representatives, and President-Elect, President, and Past-President. He has also served as chair of the Education and Training Committee, the Continuing Education Committee, the Fellowship Committee, and Committee on Committees, and the Society Conference Committee. He now serves as Series Editor of the Frontier Series.

In those various roles, he has done a number of remarkable things for the Society. Among many achievements, he:

- created the individual continuing education plan that expanded the scope of activities that SIOP members could engage in for continuing education credit
- designed and played a major role in implementing the Society mid-year conference
- edited the volume, Training and Development in Organizations, a part of the Frontier Series.
- chaired the Long Range Planning Committee that arranged for the incorporation of the Society
- was instrumental in sponsoring the first doctoral consortium
- represented the views of the Society to APA with regard to education, designation, accreditation, and licensing

He has also served I/O psychology in a number of other ways, as a member and chair of the Executive Committee of the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology, associate editor of the Journal of Applied Psychology, member of the Education and Training Committee of APA, associate editor of Human Factors, and service on the editorial boards of Human Performance and Organizational Behavior and Human Performance.

In serving in all these positions and accomplishing these and other goals, Dr. Goldstein has not only led, he has inspired. Those who have served with him point to his thoroughness, his fairness, his ability to understand the viewpoints of others, his keen insight into the essential issues, and his ability to clearly point to the directions to be taken.

In recognition of his many and important service contributions, the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology is pleased to present its 1992 Distinguished Service Award to Irwin L. Goldstein. We are pleased to recognize him with a certificate and a check for $500.

1992 SIOP Distinguished Professional Contribution Award

In 1992, the Distinguished Professional Contribution Award is given to Gerald V. Barrett, Ph.D. in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the practice of industrial and organizational psychology.

Throughout his career, Dr. Barrett has emphasized both scholarly research and the application of research knowledge to professional practice, often contradicting the conventional wisdom in the field. His works on dynamic criteria (Barrett & Alexander, 1989) and conceptual issues in construct
validity are especially influential.

Dr. Barrett is unique in our field by having both a Ph.D. in Psychology and a J.D. degree in Law. He has combined this dual psychological and legal orientation to make numerous contributions to the practice of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. He has helped articulate the evolving legal requirements in personal psychology in a number of areas by serving as an expert witness in over 80 court cases, by being an active practitioner, and by conducting scholarly research in such areas as:

1. age discrimination (Snyder & Barrett, 1988)
2. salary discrimination and comparable worth (Barrett & Sansonetti, 1988)
3. cutoff scores (Cascio, Alexander, & Barrett, 1988)
4. performance appraisal and terminations (Barrett & Kernan, 1987)
5. validation models (Doverspike, Barrett, & Alexander, 1985).

Dr. Barrett is also notable for his entrepreneurial activities—both in the academic and business fields. During the past two decades, his academic leadership helped build one of the largest and most widely recognized graduate programs in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. His I/O group in the psychology department at the University of Akron now includes 9 faculty members and over 50 graduate students. During the last decade his consulting group, Barrett & Associates, has expanded to include four full- and 20 part-time employees. His clients have included a number of Fortune 500 companies and government agencies.

In view of these exceptional contributions, the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology is pleased to present its 1992 Distinguished Professional Contribution Award to Dr. Gerald V. Barrett. We recognize him with a certificate, a check for $500, and an invitation to present an address that relates to his professional contributions at the next SIOP conference.

**1992 SIOP Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award**

The Society has the honor of presenting the 1992 Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award to J. Richard Hackman, Ph.D.

Dr. Richard Hackman's scientific contributions, both empirical and theoretical, have consistently demonstrated rigorous standards of excellence. At the same time, he has emphasized applicability, using application as a springboard for innovation. He has led the discipline both in research and in communicating the results of research to the public.

No industrial or social psychologist can ignore Dr. Richard Hackman's key contributions on two topics:

- how job design affects motivation, and
- what makes work groups effective or ineffective.

Dr. Richard Hackman co-authored one of the most used and debated theoretical contributions in I/O psychology, the Hackman-Oldham job characteristics theory.

Griffin (1987) observed:

"The job characteristics theory was one of the most widely studied and debated models in the entire field during the late 1970's. Perhaps the reasons behind its popularity are that it provided an academically sound model, a packaged and easily used diagnostic instrument, a set of practitioner-oriented implementation guidelines, and an initial body of empirical support, all within a relatively narrow span of time."

The 1976 article is the most-cited work ever published by Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (OBHDP), and the 1975 article is the second-most-cited study ever published by the Journal of Applied Psychology (JAP).

The writings associated with this theory have been cited so many times that the Institute for Scientific Information classifies three of them as "citation classics."


Dr. Richard Hackman also co-authored the most-cited study ever published by JAP. Indeed, Hackman and Lawler's "Employee reactions to job characteristics" (JAP Monograph, 1971) is one of the most cited works in an social science. This prominence likely results from Hackman-Lawler's concern for practical measurement and from their integration of three streams:

- (a) motivation theory,
- (b) task characteristics research by industrial psychologists, and
- (c) a business perspective.

Through the foregoing works, Dr. Richard Hackman and his colleagues were directly responsible for shifting early and over-simplified approaches to job design to much more comprehensive and useful ways to understand the complex issues.

Dr. Richard Hackman has also contributed to almost every important aspect of the design and functioning of groups: task performance, the effects of size, group effectiveness, self-managing groups, group processes, and work group motivation. His early studies of group tasks:

- "Effects of task characteristics on group products" (JESP, 1968)
- "Effects of size and task type on group performance and member reactions," with N. J. Vidmar (Sociometry, 1970),
- "Group influences on individuals in organizations," (Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1976)

have each been influential with social and industrial psychologists.
Dr. Richard Hackman’s research on groups continues. His 1989 book, *Groups That Work*, is a pace setter for others, as well as a forerunner of his own work to come.

We are pleased to present J. Richard Hackman with a certificate, a check for $500, and an invitation address to the Society’s 1993 annual meeting.

**PUBLICATION SCHEDULE FOR TIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Month</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>August 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>November 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>February 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manuscripts, news items, or other submissions to TIP should be sent to:

**Kurt Kraiger**
Department of Psychology
University of Colorado at Denver
Campus Box 173
P.O. Box 173364
Denver, CO 80217-3364

Phone: 303-556-2965
FAX: 303-556-3520

---

**FIRST ANNUAL SIOP ROAD RACE**

Frank J. Landy
Penn State University

The first Annual SIOP Conference Road Race is history. By all accounts, it seems to have been a success. The winning time was quite respectable by race standards. Kevin Williams blistered a challenging 5 K (3.1 mile) course in 16:45. This time would have won the APA 5 K race for the last several years. The category winners and their times appear below. Next year’s race will be in San Francisco. If all goes well, it will be in Golden Gate Park, The Presidio, or along the Embarcadero. Again, it will be 5 K and will be on Saturday morning. Information and registration material will go out with conference material. Start training now!

Thanks to all who ran and made the first race a success.

**WINNERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 1. Patricia Peters 21:02</td>
<td>20-29 1. Wayne Hall 18:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ginger Gregory</td>
<td>2. Pat Raymark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cheryl Ross</td>
<td>3. Paul Tealuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marcia Systsme</td>
<td>2. Gerry Brandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pat Sackett</td>
<td>3. Paul Sackett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nancy Billings</td>
<td>2. Dan O'Fallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rick Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Richard Campbell</td>
<td>3. Richard Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Charles Lance</td>
<td>2. Charles Lance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Craig Russell</td>
<td>3. Craig Russell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Mixed Doubles 22:40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State #1</td>
<td>Pat and Paul Sackett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Hall</td>
<td>Steve Ederman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Tealuk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Ederman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penn State #2</th>
<th>Science/Practice 23:19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Brandon</td>
<td>Tom Borker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hofmann</td>
<td>Scott Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Landy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Houston</th>
<th>Advisor/Advisees 19:49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Campion</td>
<td>Rick Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Hudson</td>
<td>Gerry Brandon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can We Learn From History?

Robert M. Guion
Bowling Green State University (Retired)

I-O psychology, and applied psychology in general, has a history. We can learn from it, but I'm afraid those who either don't know or can't be bothered with history really are condemned to repeat it.

I won't look up dates, but the sequence goes like this: (1) A hundred years ago, APA was founded. (2) Applied psychologists were upset because APA ignored their interests; a few years after World War I (I think), they formed the American Association for Applied Psychology as a breakaway institution. (3) Early in the 1940s there was great spirit of forgiveness all around, and the AAAP and APA remarried; one of the progeny was Division 14. (4) All of psychology grew, but especially applied psychology, and among the applications, especially clinical and the other "health service providers." (5) Scientific and academic psychology began to grumble that their interests were not being attended to; attempts were made—over and over again—to restructure APA to stop the academic exodus and "provide a home" for scientific psychology; health care providers couldn't care less about caring for homeless psychologists. (6) APS was founded as an alternative home for scientific psychology. Nowadays, to find the address of someone you want to write to, you need directories of members of both APA and APS.

Now comes the mea culpa. When I began my professional life, applied psychology in general and industrial psychology specifically were highly pragmatic affairs; if we had enjoyed heraldry, the motto on our shields would have read, "If it works, use it." I thought people ought to try to understand why "it works," and that academics should be teaching for understanding. In the summer of 1965, in a fit of frustration, I wrote a paper titled "Industrial Psychology as an Academic Discipline." Most students who took an industrial psychology course, no matter what its name, were not interested in making the field their life work; all they wanted was three hours of credit toward some graduation requirement. The thrust of my argument was that such courses should contribute toward a general liberal arts education by teaching those students about work in modern society. But some of my friends and acquaintances carried the idea further; they saw their life work in industrial and organizational psychology as an academic discipline. Their goal was to develop ever stronger theories about the psychology of work. And that was good; we had worked too long with ad hoc findings we couldn't or wouldn't bother to explain.

But somewhere a good idea went sour. The motto for some shields became "Who Cares If It Works If It Will Get Me Tenure." Those on the academic
career track began to follow the time-honored path of learning more and more about less and less, spent their time on their own “programmatic research,” talked mainly to others pursuing similar programs, and lost track of organizations where people were employed to produce goods and services—and where research subjects were less certain and less tractable than college sophomores. Those who worked in these “real” organizations had their own career problems; they had to convince bosses that their work contributed to organizational success, sometimes even if they weren’t sure it did, they had to worry about courts and threats of going to court, they had to avoid or reduce or solve grievances—and they talked to each other. The academics didn’t seem to have much to say to them, and what the academics said was often in an esoteric language they didn’t follow.

And here we are, two societies, separate and unequal, and unaware of their common professional history. To split into separate entities, as psychology at large has done twice, is particularly stupid for a field of applied psychology. After all, such a field must apply psychology to something; psychology is a research field, a science, and an academic discipline. The applier who does no research, and especially one who does not know the research relevant to the applications, is at best half a psychologist (you can rephrase that into plainer if cruder English). But the researcher-academic who forgets why the research is applicable is also a half-...psychologist, a half-applied-psychologist with a diminishing breadth of psychology to apply. Industrial and organizational psychology exists to be applied to the problems of work, organizations, and workers.

In my address to SIOP in 1988 (“Pratfalls in the March of Science”), I tried to make the point. In my valedictory editorial in 1988, as outgoing editor of the Journal of Applied Psychology, I tried to make the point again in ending my final volume with a section of papers “from psychologists in organizations.” Here I try once more, with politeness abandoned: I-O psychologists in full time practice in organizations and consulting firms, and I-O psychologists in full-time work in universities and university-based research programs, need each other and it is just plain stupid for people in either group to go it alone. Our history tells us that when the academics and nonacademics among us split into an “us” and “them” game, psychology is the loser.

Some academics are also practical practitioners; I pride myself on having played that role. It is a “we” role. It is, not, however, the only way to go. Better research will get done by people who focus on the requirements of good research. Better practice will be done by people who attend to the intricacies of organizational life. But still better research and better practice will get done by people who see the whole research-and-practice picture as an integrated whole.

What brings on this outburst is word I get from friends about the nominations process followed for the most recent set of SIOP elections. Rumors abound with regard to academic vs. practitioner machinations. All this further attests to the climate of mistrust that appears to exist among some subgroups of the Society. It is not important whether the rumors are true or are widespread. What is important is the existence of the “us” and “them” distinction they feed on.

Is it possible to learn from the past? Is it possible that those in practice outside of academic centers will accept their professional responsibilities to their profession, write more, publish more, serve on more committees, and more frequently nominate people for office? Is it possible that those in academic centers will recognize that they, too, have professional responsibilities to study and to understand the work and work related problems of people—in context—and to share what they learn? Is it possible that they will come to recognize students of all kinds—those on campus in their classes, their colleagues who left graduate school years before, the decision makers in organizations who should also be applying what we know? Is it possible that they can present their knowledge to those students in language the students can follow, without obfuscation?

Is it possible that I-O psychologists will continually strive to see each other as “we”—not as “us” or “them”—even those who work in a different setting? Lord, I hope so.

The TIP Business Office

The TIP Business Office has moved to the SIOP Administrative Office. All advertising and positions available listings should be directed to:

SIOP Administrative Office
657 East Golf Road, Suite 309
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Phone: 708-640-0068
Soroka v. Dayton Hudson

Dianne C. Brown
Science Directorate, APA

The California Supreme Court decided that it will review Soroka v. Dayton Hudson, a case that went through California Appeals Court in October 1991. A contractor for Target Stores, owned by Dayton Hudson, was using a psychological test that contained questions about religious beliefs and sexual preference (the Rodgers Condensed CPI-MMPI). Soroka and others who applied for security guard positions with Target Stores, brought suit against the parent company, Dayton Hudson, for invasion of privacy. The California Appeals court, First Appellate District, Division Four, ruled that the administration of certain portions of the test were invasive, according to California’s Privacy Act.

The court’s ruling included several statements about employment testing that industrial psychologists found contrary to accepted practice in test development and use. One issue of particular importance was the Court’s misconception that individual test items should be related to job performance. After careful review and consideration of the case by APA’s Committee on Legal Issues (COLI) and Board of Directors, it was agreed unanimously that the case is of significant importance to industrial psychologists to warrant APA’s development of an amicus brief.

SIOP has convened a panel of I/O psychologists to research and draft sections of the brief. Chaired by Wayne Cascio, some of the issues that will be addressed include onsite validation, validity generalization, the role of job analysis and the use of objectionable items in the context of personnel selection. Members of the panel include Gerald Barrett, Leatta Hough, David Kleinke, Frank Landy, Bob Ramos and Mary Tenopyr.

The focus of the brief will be to educate the courts on scientifically sound and professionally accepted test development and practice. APA also respects the privacy rights of individuals and agrees that employers can usually assess characteristics through alternate means that avoid invasive inquiry about religious beliefs and sexual preference. Statements regarding the merits of either side of the case will be avoided. The California Supreme Court published no brief schedule but it is anticipated that the case will be heard in the fall of this year.

You Say Job, I’ll Say Position

Wayne J. Camara
APA Science Directorate

The Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) both state that personnel selection techniques having a disparate impact must be “job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity...” That may be the extent of similarity between these laws when it comes to selection.

The emphasis of ADA is on the individual worker or job applicant. The Civil Rights Act of 1991, much like Title VII (of the Civil Rights Act of 1964), is generally perceived as applying to parties on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Of course, individuals who are members of one of the above protected classes most often seek to bring action under the Civil Rights Act.

Foremost among the many sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 that have caused anxiety to human resource professionals and industrial-organizational psychologists is Section 105 (burden of proof in disparate impact cases) which invokes the phrase “job related for the position in question.” Two op-ed pieces that appeared in the Washington Post (and were also reprinted in TIP) immediately after signing of the law highlight some of the arguments about the use and meaning of the word “position.” On November 14, C. Boyden Gray, Counsel to the President, argued that this language codifies the law as it stood prior to Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio 490 U.S. 642 (1989). A few days later William T. Coleman Jr. and Vernon E. Jordan Jr. rebutted this argument stating that the final law “requires that selection criteria be related to the ‘position’ in question, not any one of a ‘class of jobs’ to which an employee may be moved or promoted (Washington Post, 11/18/91).”

That debate illustrates the degree of concern and confusion among employers, psychologists, and federal agencies responsible for the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act and ADA about the interpretation of “position.” Much of the argument may rest in Title I, Section 102b (6) of ADA which defines discrimination, in part, as: “using qualification standards, employment tests or other selection criteria that screen out or tend to screen out an individual with a disability or a class of individuals with disabilities unless the standard, test, or other selection criteria, as used by the covered entity is shown to be job-related for the position in question (emphasis added) and consistent with business necessity...”

The concept of business necessity in the ADA is taken from Section 504 in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Thus, the intent of ADA is to address the
specific disabilities of an individual and the specific accommodations required for a position. Civil rights proponents have used this to argue that disparate impact language in Section 105 imposes an even greater burden than Griggs v. Duke Power, insisting that the nature of relationship between the challenged practice and business necessity must be a substantial one.

In March, the APA Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment (CPTA) examined this issue and submitted an interpretative memorandum to the Administration and Secretaries of relevant federal agencies:

"...The term "position" generally refers to a collection of tasks and behaviors for a particular worker, with as many positions as there are workers in an organization. A job can be defined as a position or a group of positions with similar tasks and/or behaviors. Except in rare instances, job relatedness evidence of personnel selection and promotion procedures is developed in the context of tasks and/or behaviors common to the jobs, job classes, or job families.

The term "position" in both Acts should only be used to ensure that job relatedness is established for the tasks and/or behaviors which comprise the position, job, job class, or job family, in question. Any narrowing of the bases for determining the job-relatedness of selection or promotion procedures is not warranted by or consistent with accepted professional and scientific principles and practices. This is particularly true of job relatedness demonstrations based on statistical relationships between scores on selection procedures and work outcomes where studies require groups of people in jobs, or job classes, or job families. In these studies, the term "position" has no operational meaning whatsoever.

Yet another aspect of the definitional issue is its relationship to the common scientific objective of demonstrating the generalizability of results, one of the cornerstones of all scientific endeavors. Stated another way, research is conducted in all sciences in order to apply the results to similar problems in new situations. This is just as true with employee selection and promotion research as it is in medical research. In medical research, when clinical trials are complete and results are established, a procedure is presented as useful in a range of situations involving similar symptoms. One does not then insist on new trials in each city with each doctor for each patient. Similarly, when sufficient evidence is available to demonstrate that a particular selection or promotion procedure is job-related for a particular job, class of jobs, or job family, the generally accepted principles and practices of personnel psychology do not require repeated re-establishment of the job relatedness of the procedure's outcomes in every new situation, particularly those involving similar jobs elsewhere. In short, job-related procedures are transportable from one situation to another, as long as evidence demonstrates that jobs are similar across situations.

In addition, "position in question" must take into account accepted practices of job progression in various career paths. For example, it is often essential that entry-level workers be capable of progressing to higher-level or more complex jobs within a reasonable period of time. Under these circumstances, it is equally essential that pre-employment practices be allowed to be used if shown to be job related to the higher-level or more complex jobs.

In summary, relative to the use of the phrase "position in question," (1) job-relatedness showings involving jobs, job classes, or job families are scientifically acceptable and should satisfy the requirement indicated by the language "job-related for the position in question" in both the ADA and the Civil Rights Act of 1991; (2) it is not necessary to re-establish job-relatedness for each job when sufficient evidence exists to demonstrate that a selection procedure is job-related for similar jobs or job classes or families; (3) evidence of expected progression to higher-level or more complex jobs or job classes or families is appropriate; and (4) any interpretation of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (or the Americans with Disabilities Act) that does not permit job-relatedness showings of these types is inconsistent with generally accepted principles and practices of personnel psychology."

The APA statement was designed to be consistent with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (APA, 1985) and the Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures (1987). It was not intended to minimize the role and importance of job analysis and the proper determination of the content domain for jobs. The Principles note that researchers have an obligation to compile reasonable evidence establishing jobs in question are similar in terms of work behavior and/or required knowledge, skills, and abilities (p. 5). They acknowledge the extent to which job families may provide a legitimate level of specificity among jobs that are similar and note that selection procedures designed for higher level jobs than that for which candidates are initially selected may be considered an appropriate target if the majority of available workers are expected to progress to the next level (p. 13).
The "position-job" arguments will eventually be decided by the courts. Yet several federal agencies have responded favorably to APA's statement, agreeing to take it under consideration in interpreting this legislation.

A related issue that the Court will ultimately determine is the extent or strength of relationship required between the challenged practice and business necessity in disparate impact cases. Several legal analyses imply that operative sections of the bill (such as Section 105 and others) may be interpreted as requiring a more "substantial" relationship, while the preamble and purpose of the bill suggest a looser relationship:

"to codify the concepts of 'business necessity' and 'job related' enunciated by the Supreme Court in Griggs v. Duke Power Co.... and in the other Supreme Court decisions prior to Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio."

It is ironic that the terms "business necessity" and "job related," which posed the greatest concerns for industrial-organizational psychologists, as well as many other parties involved with this legislation, are not defined in the final law. The preamble, which extends beyond just Griggs v. Duke Power Co. to other decisions that followed, is viewed as possibly providing some justification for a looser interpretation of the relationship by the Court. Pre-Wards Cove opinions found that business objectives other than actual job performance and qualification standards loosely related to performance were sufficient to demonstrate business necessity (Gewirtz, 1991). The Courts are also left to determine if this bill applies to cases pending before the bill was signed into law.

The Civil Rights Act of 1991 does include a statement that limits the legislative history to an interpretative memorandum agreed upon by Congress and the Administration at the last stages of the political debate. Yet, several members of Congress entered related statements into the Congressional Record following passage of the legislation (Sen. Dole, Sen. Danforth, Sen. Kennedy, Rep. Ford, and Rep. Edwards). Several other provisions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1991, not discussed above, (e.g., prohibition against score adjustments, Sec. 106; and "Price Waterhouse" discussion, Sec. 107) may eventually prove to be more contentious issues for applied I-O psychologists.

References
Research has shown:
The most accurate way to select top employees is through valid tests. PSI has been a leader in the development and validation of fair, job-related procedures for employee selection for over 40 years.

Our test publications include:

- **Basic Skills Tests (BSTs)** - designed to identify top clerical and administrative applicants.

- **Employee Aptitude Survey (EAS)** - designed to test aptitudes that are appropriate for a wide variety of jobs.

- **Professional Employment Test (PET)** - developed to measure abilities which are vital in most professional applications.

To review specimen copies, please contact:

Stephanie Jackson
Customer Support Mgr/Test Publications Division
Psychological Services, Inc.
100 West Broadway, Suite 1100
Glendale, CA 91210

Phone: (800) 367-1565
Fax: (818) 247-7223
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ADA: We Assume We Will Still be Testing

Margaret Ingate
Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.
Professional Affairs

The following discussion is based on unscientific conversations with a non-random sample of psychologists in industry and the public sector, representatives of three testing companies, and a couple of lawyers. In recent months, many I/O psychologists have been engaged in frantic debate with their attorneys trying to develop sensible pre-employment testing practices for disabled applicants. Most are assuming that cognitive and clerical ability tests will not be construed to be medical examinations and can continue to be administered prior to an offer of employment.

These discussions ignore philosophic and policy issues. Decisions about values are likely to drive practice to a far greater extent than are technical or legal issues. An organization can choose to maximize inclusiveness and opportunity for individuals, to minimize legal exposure, or to minimize risk to the productivity and comfort of the workforce, supervisors, and managers. While these are not mutually exclusive choices, the weights placed on these values will determine whether ADA is seen primarily as a threat or as a challenging opportunity.

A number of pressing issues for practitioners in organizations have not been clearly dealt with in the Interpretive Guidance (EEOC, 1991). Some of these issues may be clarified in the final Guidance, due in July 1992.

1. **How to identify applicants whose disabilities would affect test performance**

   The regulations clearly forbid asking applicants if they are disabled. However, written or verbal descriptions of test materials or conditions, or sample test materials may be presented. Applicants can then be asked if they will need any accommodation or assistance in completing the tests as usually administered. It is the applicant's responsibility to identify herself or himself as disabled and in need of accommodation in testing and to request a specific accommodation. Realistically, organizations should expect that some applicants will identify themselves as disabled only after performing poorly on a test. Having alternate forms and a clear re-testing policy will make it much easier to respond to this situation.

   Most employers contacted are planning to require documentation from a psychologist or physician, when presented with requests for accommodation in testing due to hidden disabilities such as learning disabilities, but not from applicants with visible disabilities.
2. Whether to provide accommodations in testing to those whose disability would affect their test performance

Corporate attorneys are divided on whether to provide requested accommodations and then use the resulting difficult-to-interpret score in the selection process or simply to waive test requirements for disabled applicants.

There are two common arguments for testing the disabled. First, to waive the requirements for one group imperils the testing program for all groups. If a company's policies imply that job requirements can be assessed adequately without testing for the disabled then, the argument goes, a plaintiff can argue that job requirements can be assessed adequately without testing for any group. Second, not testing disabled applicants who request accommodations in testing may be seen as discriminatory treatment.

The psychometric arguments for not testing are relatively straightforward. First, given the idiosyncratic nature of disabling conditions that may affect test performance and the variety of accommodations that might be requested, in practical terms it will be impossible for employers to conduct the research that could establish the equivalence of tests administered under different accommodations. Second, changes in administration or format may affect reliability and construct validity.

The simplest accommodation is to administer timed tests without time limits. In the case of a highly speeded test, this accommodation eliminates the discriminating power of the test. With the use of “power” tests, the problem is less acute.

Changes in test format, such as use of large type or reading aloud the items to a written test, may radically change the nature of the constructs measured by the instrument. For example, responding to an item in an oral administration of a test of computational skill requires encoding and storage in auditory memory that is not required when the same item appears in print. Oral administration of a test by a reader also raises the possibility of cueing. The use of tape-recorded material eliminates this problem, but does not avoid the problem of changed cognitive and perceptual demands. These problems are much less important in the case of job knowledge tests than in the case of ability tests.

In the public sector, where test scores are normally used for ranking applicants, accommodations for the disabled have been made for many years. Common accommodations include providing readers, Braille versions, or taped versions of tests for the visually impaired; providing readers for applicants claiming to be dyslexic; waiving highly speeded tests for applicants with sensory or perceptual deficits; providing printed instructions for deaf applicants; waiving language dependent tests for pre-lingually deaf applicants.

One major publisher of cognitive and clerical ability tests is recommending that its clients waive testing for disabled applicants and conduct “better interviews and evaluations of job related education and experience” or administer work sample tests. Educational Testing Service is referring callers inquiring about testing and ADA to Willingham, Ragostu, Bennett, Braun, and Powers, Testing Handicapped People, 1988.

Representatives of another publisher contend that “no modification of test administration is necessary if the test is validated.” This seems overly optimistic because for most employers, it will not be technically feasible to test for differential validity and differential prediction in the various sub-populations of disabled applicants. Several attorneys consulted indicated that this position is not likely to be defensible in the case of cognitive or clerical ability tests. This is because the typical ability test is a predictor of a criterion that may not be found to reflect an “essential job function.” Work sample tests that sample “essential job functions”—if anyone can decide what those are—may avoid or minimize both difficulties.

3. How to evaluate scores derived from non-standard administrations

The answers given to this depend in large part on how scores are used currently. Where cut-off scores are used, two philosophies are apparent: 1) Treat the score as if it were equivalent to a score derived from a standard administration; or 2) if the score of a disabled applicant is below the cut-off, search for other evidence of job related skills or abilities in the applicant's education, training or experience. The first strategy ignores the measurement issues. The second strategy amounts to waiving test requirements, or having dual standards, and might be construed to be in violation of the prohibition in the Civil Rights Act of 1991 against the use of within group norms, though such a challenge is thought to be unlikely.

Where scores are used to rank applicants, typically in the public sector, scores from non-standard administrations generally are treated as if they were equivalent to scores from normal administrations. Where only portions of a test battery have been administered, a score that is treated as equivalent to the total score is developed. The methods used to do this vary agency by agency. A total battery score may be predicted from the available sub-scores, based on the intercorrelations of the sub-scores with the total score, or projected on an equi-percentile basis. In other cases, an “algebraically pro-rated score” based on the number of items administered and the total number of items in the complete battery is computed. However they are derived, these scores are then used to rank the disabled candidates among the non-disabled candidates. These practices are questionable from a measurement point of view, but have, by-and-large, been found to be practical and acceptable to various stakeholders.

Other aspects of public sector experience offer useful guidance to those in industry. As I spoke to colleagues in agencies across the country, over and over I was told that the real issue for psychologists in organizations is not how
to test, whether to test, or how to use test scores. It is not accommodation in the workplace. The major issue is changing the attitudes of managers and co-workers that prevent disabled individuals from achieving full acceptance and productivity in the workplace. And that requires identifying our values and choosing policies and practices that will best implement them.

References

Notes
The final version of the Interpretive Guidance will be published in the Federal Register in July. Copies can be ordered from the EEOC at 202-663-4900 (Five free copies per phone call.)

Numerous business publishing houses have produced manuals offering employers guidance in complying with the ADA. None of them treat pre-employment testing in any depth. A good general reference, used by several of the firms and agencies I spoke with is Americans with Disabilities Act Manual, Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1992.
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Committees

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Committee Members, 1991-1992

The following Society members participated in a SIOP committee in 1991-1992. Our thanks to everyone!

Awards—Wayne J. Camara, Chair
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Klein, Howard J.           Robinson, Nancy L.

Continuing Education and Workshop Committee—
Georgia Chao, Co-Chair
Craig Williams, Co-Chair
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Scientific Affairs—Paul R. Sackett, Chair
Conard, Maureen A.
Gast, Ilene
Gottfredson, Gary D.
Hough-Dunnette, Leaetta
Kennedy, John K., Jr.
Mattieu, John E.
Murphy, Kevin R.
Stone, Eugene
Waldman, David
Zeidner, Joseph

Thomas, Jay C.
Vandaveer, Vicki V.
Whetzel, Deborah
Williams, Craig
Nilan, Kevin
Noe, Raymond A.
Olian, Judy
Orr, John M.
Paese, Paul W.
Page, Ronald C.
Rentsch, Joan
Reynolds, Douglas H.
Rosse, Joseph G.
Russell, Joyce E. A.
Salas, Eduardo
Sawyer, John E.
Schauwoeck, John
Schneier, Craig Eric
Sharf, James
Shore, Lynn M.
Steiner, Dirk D.
Tarulli, Beverly A.
Taylor, M. Susan
Tetrick, Lois
Tippins, Nancy T.
Tubbs, Mark E.
Turban, Daniel
Wiesen, Joel P.
Williams, Larry J.
Williams, Margaret L.
Wilson, Mary
Wing, Hilda
Wright, Patrick M.
Yammarino, Fran
Zohar, Dov
Society Conference—Ronald D. Johnson, Chair
Chao, Georgia Klimoski, Richard J. Martin, Beth
Klein, Katherine J. Landy, Frank J.

State Affairs Committee—Val Markos, Chair
Arnold, David Hayes, Ted Reece, Susan
Bethscheider, Janine Kay Hertz, Norman Spanberger, Peter
Cornwell, John Knapp, Deirdre Tanulic, Beverly
Fischer, Donald Lowe, Rosemary Thomas, Jay C.
Gormanous, Greg Macon, Therese Wilson, Mark

The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist—Steve W. J. Kozlowski
Editor: Michael K. Lindell, Business Manager
Baker, Thomas Russell, Craig J. Sharf, James C.
Kragier, Kurt Salas, Eduardo Wagner, Margaret

PUBLICATION OF GRADUATE STUDY IN I/O PSYCHOLOGY AND RELATED FIELDS

The 3rd edition of Graduate Study in I/O Psychology and Related Fields was recently published. This publication describes Ph.D. and M.A./M.S. programs in I/O psychology and Ph.D. programs in organizational behavior, human resource management, and related fields. It is an extremely valuable resource if you advise undergraduates who are interested in I/O psychology and related fields.

Complimentary copies are being sent to all graduate programs that responded to the questionnaire and to all Departments of Psychology. Complimentary copies are also available for all SIOP members through December 31, 1992. After that date, there will be a $5.00 charge for each order.

If you would like to receive a complimentary copy of Graduate Study in I/O Psychology and Related Fields, please complete the form below and mail it to: SIOP Administrative Office, 657 East Golf Road, Suite 309, Arlington Heights, IL 60005. Please allow four weeks for delivery.

Please send me a copy of the 3rd Edition of Graduate Study in I/O Psychology and Related Fields.

NAME:
MAILING ADDRESS:

HELP TO SAVE OUR HISTORY!

Frank J. Landy
Penn State University

As a subdiscipline, I/O psychology is a “relatively” recent player. A critical year was 1915. That was the year that the Carnegie Institute of Technology decided to develop a Division for Applied Psychology. Although Walter Dill Scott and Hugo Munsterberg had both written books outlining a program for application of psychology to industry, there had been no formal institutional recognition of the new field until that year.

The person chosen to lead the new Carnegie unit was Walter Van Dyke Bingham. He received his Ph.D. degree at the University of Chicago before going to Columbia to work with Thordike, and then on to Dartmouth to head the department there. He had an illustrious career, remaining quite active until his death in 1952. He was the spokesperson for the field from 1919 until the late ’40s.

Some years ago, his family donated all of his papers to Carnegie Mellon Institute. That was good news and bad news. The good news was the collection was spectacular—60 linear feet of correspondence, manuscript drafts, documentation of APA activities of applied psychologists, etc. The bad news was that the collection had been handled terribly from an archival perspective. The collection currently resides in the rare books department of Carnegie and is being administrated by a wonderful person who has a real grasp for the importance of the works as well as a good background in our field. Gabrielle Michalak has assisted many scholars in the use of this material, including Michael Sokal and Richard Mayerhauser, who have used the materials to write some outstanding pieces on the relationship of WWI to the development of applied and industrial psychology.

Currently, the collection is so fragile that only small parts can be used for scholarly research. There is a desperate need to preserve the collection through microfiche before it completely deteriorates. Carnegie Mellon is prepared to undertake this preservation but they need financial help. The cost will be about $120,000. Carnegie will put up half of that. That means that they need an additional $60,000. This money is being solicited from several sources, including SIOP, APA, APS and the Academy of Management. SIOP is trying to raise $10,000 of that amount. The mechanism chosen is a voluntary addition to dues plus a matching fund of up to $5,000 from general funds.

I have used these papers and similar collections at other libraries and assure you that these papers contain information unavailable from any other sources. We have three “founders” in our subdiscipline—Munsterberg, Scott, and Bingham. Munsterberg’s papers are in decent shape at Harvard and the Boston
Public Library. Scott’s papers are well maintained at Northwestern. Bingham’s papers will be lost within two years if steps are not taken to preserve them right now. One reason that these papers are so important is that our history has not been written. Unlike experimental and clinical and social, we have not had a historian who has undertaken this task. The good news is that there is a re-awakening of interest in this area and I am certain that we will have our history soon enough. The October issue of JAP and recent issues of TIP are clear indications of these developments.

Please consider making a contribution to this fund. The timing could not be better. This is the Centennial year for APA. If you have any questions about the papers or the project, please contact me at 814-237-5997 and I will be happy to provide details. In addition, if you know of any individual or corporate sources that I might pursue, let me know. Why not ask your organization if they have a mechanism for providing support, no matter how modest, for this project.

Stanford University’s Contributions to I/O Psychology

Thomas W. Harrell
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University

Arthur S. Otis (1918) did his Ph.D. thesis under Lewis Terman who then was in the Department of Education, before Terman transferred to the Department of Psychology in 1922. Otis’ thesis was the basis for the Otis Self-Administering Tests of Mental Ability (Robertson, n.d.), the first group test of mental ability. It was initially developed for use in schools but was revised for industry to be easily administered and scored. The tests were used widely for 30 years.

When E. K. Strong was at Carnegie Tech from 1917 to 1923 some of his colleagues were active in interest measurement and had developed some questions for testing. At the closing dinner of the Industrial Psychology organization at Carnegie, Walter Bingham, its head, observed that interest measurement was its most important contribution. Upon arriving at the Stanford University Psychology Department in 1923, Strong remembered the importance of interest measurement and guided Cowdery (1923), his first Ph.D. student, for his thesis on “An Evaluation of the Expressed Attitudes of Members of Three Professions (Medical, Engineering and Legal).” Cowdery’s questions were from M. Freyd of Carnegie. The results impressed to Strong that occupational interests were present early on before technical training and occupational experience. This and later results led him to conclude that

interests led men to enter an occupation rather than that vocational interests were formed by occupational experience.

The Graduate School of Business (GSB) was established at Stanford University in 1925 at which time Strong’s appointment became half-time in the GSB and half in the Psychology Department. In 1927 Strong first published his test (SVIB) using the 166 items in Cowdery’s inventory with the addition of 254 new items (Strong, 1943, p.694). Strong substituted better items in later editions of the SVIB.

Strong conducted research on reliability and primarily on predictive validity of the SVIB almost to the date of his death in 1963. He found that men continuing in an occupation had an interest higher than in any other occupation (Campbell, D., 1971, p.361). There were “78 chances to 22 that a man with an A rating will enter that specific occupation and 83 chances to 17 that a man with a C rating will not enter the occupation” (Strong, 1955, p.4). Vocational interest scores were almost as stable as IQ scores. “Interest profiles based on 34 occupational scales correlated .74 on the average” for a twenty-two year interval (Strong, 1955, p.65).

Strong considered vocational guidance to be the main use for the SVIB, although he saw some use in selection. He found it to be “satisfactory as an aid in the selection of candidates for life insurance sales” (Strong, 1943, pp. 487-500). After the Men’s form of the SVIB, a Women’s Form was published in 1933 (Strong, 1943, p.62).

Research on the SVIB was conducted at many other places besides Stanford. “...The number of technical publications directly related to the SVIB...By 1967...was well over 800” (Campbell, D., 1971, p. 345). The use of the SVIB increased to 800,000 in one year of the 1980s. “Recognized as the paragon of applied behavioral measures and widely acclaimed as the bellweather of career counseling and personnel selection, the several editions of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank have a venerable history and reputation...” (Crites, 1978).

Floyd Ruch (1930), who became President of Division 14 in 1948-49, did his Ph.D. dissertation at Stanford on “The Differentiative Effects of Age on Human Learning” under Walter Miles.

In 1931 Robert Bernreuter submitted his dissertation, “The Evaluation of a Proposed New Method for Constructing Personality Trait Tests” (Bernreuter, R., 1931). His dissertation was under Lewis Terman. “The traits which the test was designed to estimate are ...neurotic tendency, introversion-extroversion, ascendance-submission, and self-sufficiency.” Females had higher scores on neurotic tendency and introversion than males; males had higher scores on ascendance-submission, and self-sufficiency. The differences were in same direction for high school students, college students and adults. The dissertation led to the Bernreuter Personality Inventory first published in 1931 with the
copyright renewed in 1959. It has been used in student counseling and for selection in industry.

R. K. Campbell (1940) studied engineering students at Stanford with Strong as his dissertation adviser. Campbell compared grades in engineering courses, grades in social science courses with their answers to items on the SVIB. A third criterion was the score on an intelligence test that had been taken for admission. He found a set of interest items to correlate significantly with engineering grades, a separate set, significantly different, to correlate with social science grades, and a third, but different set, to correlate with the intelligence test scores.

T. W. Harrell and M. S. Harrell made a 20-year longitudinal study of the careers of Stanford MBAs compared with scores on a psychological test battery and other predictors (Harrell, M. S., Harrell, T. W., Mcintyre, & Weinberg, 1977; Harrell, T. W., & Alpert, 1989). Social extraversion was the personality trait that correlated highest with earnings at 20 years; admission test scores correlated negatively.

I/O Psychology, at Stanford, was initially in the Psychology Department. After the GSB was started, the I/O program straddled Psychology and the GSB. In 1952 when T. W. Harrell came to the GSB, with a courtesy appointment in the Psychology Department, there was a minor in Industrial Psychology in the Psychology Department. This was eliminated in the '50's to locate I/O fully in the GSB.

In 1958, Alex Bavelas came to Stanford half in the GSB and half in Psychology, but later became full-time in the GSB, and Albert Hastorf arrived at the GSB in 1961, soon became Chairman of the Psychology Department, and later Provost.

In the '60's the GSB designated a new field: Organizational Behavior (OB). OB took over what had been the Psychological Aspects of Business. Now its broadened scope included not only Psychology but Sociology and Political Science. There have been 57 Ph.D. dissertations in OB.

Harold Leavitt was brought to Stanford from Carnegie-Mellon in 1966. Leavitt's interest lay in the organization as the unit for level of analysis, as evident in The Organizational World (Leavitt, Dill, & Eyring, 1973). He had earlier introduced the term "Managerial Psychology" to the scholarly and professional world with his book of that title in 1958. His Readings in Managerial Psychology (Leavitt, Pondy, & Boje, 1989) has gone into four editions, as has the earlier Managerial Psychology. To have two books go into fourth editions shows some of the respect Leavitt has gained in the field of organizational psychology.

The central theme of the work of Strong and Harrell and their Ph.D. students was selection. There was a brief switch to small group studies in the 60's. In a notable study, Bavelas, Hastorf and two Ph.D. students, Gross and Kite, modified the behavior of quiet discussants in a group to speak more frequently (Hastorf, 1965). Then the formerly quiet ones were seen as leaders by group members. This is one of the few demonstrations in the literature for the measurement of a change from training.

James G. March came to Stanford in 1970 with multiple appointments where he is in Political Science, but with a primary affiliation in Sociology, Education, and the Graduate School of Business. He is the only member of the faculty in the OB area of the GSB who is a member of the National Academy of Sciences. He represents a major turnaround in the field — with his and Simon's focus on the micro issues of decision making and modeling, and his work at Stanford on careers and the introduction of the ideas associated with "organizational anarchy."

In the 1970's Stanford's two most famous Ph.D.'s in OB, Pfeffer and Peters, made management the theme. Thomas J. Peters, with E. Webb as his dissertation adviser, studied "Patterns of Winning and Losing: Effects of Approach and Avoidance by Friends and Enemies" (1977). Peters and Waterman, both Stanford MBAs wrote In Search of Excellence (1982) which became the most widely bought business book of all time. After finding a number of excellent companies based on their performance the behavior of top managers was analyzed to find common denominators. The resulting conclusions sounded reasonable but in a few years there was a considerable change in the performance ranking of the previously designated excellent companies. So Peters (1988) changed the focus to find that to be successful in the rapidly changing business environment the top manager needed to emphasize delegation of authority and responsibility.

Jeffrey Pfeffer, with J. R. Miller as advisor for his Ph.D. dissertation, studied "Organizational Ecology: A System Resource Approach" (1971). He attempted to develop a political science of organizations through their interdependency. Pfeffer's book with Salancik (1978), The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective, explained and elaborated the perspective of resource dependencies: A manager needs to look outside to the resources which are essential to the success of the organization—towards, labor sources, governmental regulators and the like. It is desirable to be able to control resources so that surprises are minimized or hedged. Pfeffer's was the first to call attention to the necessity of looking externally for control.

Three of the major management works of the '80's came from Stanford faculty. Peters' work dominates everyone (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters, 1987). The books by Ouchi (1981), and Pascale (Pascale & Athos, 1981) were at the center of the interest in Japanese management styles.

I/O Psychology at Stanford has moved from the Psychology Department to the Organizational Behavior area of the Graduate School of Business where
the scope has been broadened to include not only Psychology, but Sociology and Political Science.

**REFERENCES**
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**Author’s Note**

Eugene Webb made editorial suggestions which have significantly improved this paper. It has been typed by Daphne Wheeler.

**Footnotes**

1 This is one of a series of articles on the history of I/O doctoral programs initiated prior to World War II. The series is a project of the SIOP Task Force on History and the Centennial and is under the coordination of Edward L. Levine.
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**Fellowship Committee Report**

Angelo DeNisi
Rutgers University

**NEW FELLOWS:**

Let me begin by congratulating the eight new Society Fellows. They are listed below along with their citations.

**TERRY A. BEEHR**—Cited for his outstanding contributions to the field of I/O Psychology throughout his career. Especially noted is his long term work on the development and testing of models dealing with the effects of stress at work. Also noted are his contributions in the development of an outstanding Psy.D. program in I/O Psychology at Central Michigan.

**FRITZ DRASGOW**—Cited for his outstanding contributions to the field of I/O Psychology, and especially to the study of measurement issues in our field. Noted especially are his work in the areas of job design and the application of item response theory to the development of tests and measures in I/O Psychology.

**DOV EDEN**—Cited for his outstanding contributions to the field of I/O Psychology in such areas as team development, stress, and leadership. Especially noted is his contribution to our understanding of the role of self-fulfilling prophecies at work and the "Pygmalion Effect."

**PAUL S. GOODMAN**—Cited for his outstanding contributions to the field of I/O Psychology over many years, in such areas as equity theory, organizational change, absenteeism, and especially in the area of work team effectiveness. Also noted are his contributions to field through his efforts at building and developing an outstanding Ph.D. program at Carnegie Mellon.

**HAL G. KAUFMAN**—Cited for his outstanding contributions to the field of I/O Psychology, especially in the areas of the technological obsolescence of workers, career development and job loss. Also noted are interdisciplinary nature of his research, and the importance for applied problems in this country as well as worldwide.

**BRUCE M. MEGLINO**—Cited for outstanding contributions to research in the field of I/O Psychology, in such areas as work values and performance
appraisal, but most especially in the area of realistic job previews and turnover. Also noted is his record as an outstanding teacher in both credit and non-credit programs.

**Lawrence H. Peters**—Cited for outstanding contributions to the field of I/O Psychology in such areas as attitudes toward women at work, turnover, and performance appraisal. Especially noted are his important contributions to our understanding of the role of situational constraints on work performance.

**Elaine D. Pulakos**—Cited for her contributions to the field of I/O Psychology, in the finest tradition of the scientist-practitioner. Especially noted are her contributions in the areas of performance measurement and ratings, rater training, and race and sex effects on performance ratings.

The Society is truly proud to welcome these individuals to the rank of Society Fellow.

**Call for Fellowship Nominations:**

We will soon begin the process of naming Society Fellows for next year. This process involves several reviews and so must begin early in the year. Any member of the Society can suggest a candidate for Fellowship, but the official nomination must be made by a Fellow. Furthermore, we will eventually require supporting letters from at least three other Society Fellows. If you are NOT a Fellow, but feel strongly about someone you believe should be a Fellow, please let me know and I will try to find a nominator as well as other supporters. If you ARE a fellow and wish to nominate someone, please let me know that as well, and I will contact you with instructions on what to do next. In addition, the Fellowship Committee will also try to identify new candidates. If you wish to recommend or nominate someone for Fellowship, please write to:

Angelo DeNisi, Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rockefeller Road—Livingston Campus, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, (908) 932-5972

To aid you in identifying potential Fellows, the basic criteria for Fellowship read as follows: “Active engagement in the advancement of psychology in any of its aspects, and evidence of unusual and outstanding contribution or performance in the field of psychology” (APA Fellowship Status Manual).

Fellowship status can be attained through teaching, practice, and administration as well, but documenting cases for these latter routes is recognized (by APA and SIOP) as more difficult. If you wish to nominate someone whose contribution is not primarily in the area of research (e.g., a practitioner), BE SURE THAT LETTERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS STRESS THE CONTRIBUTION IN THAT AREA (that is, do not try to “package” a practitioner as a researcher), and every effort must be made to DOCUMENT that contribution, by citing (for example) procedures and practices that have been adopted by other organizations, or that have been influential in the practices of other organizations. If you are nominating a researcher, the emphasis is on impact upon the field and “unusual and outstanding” contributions. Thus, a good vita may not be sufficient.

If you have any questions or would like more information, please feel free to write or call.

**Impact Factors of Journals Related to I/O Psychology**

by David Aihstrom, John Mezias, and William H. Starbuck

New York University

In SSCI Journal Citation Reports, the Institute for Scientific Information summarizes the bibliographic citations in social science journals. Among other statistics, this summary reports impact factors. An impact factor is the average number of citations received in one year by the articles that appeared during the two previous years. For example, the 1990 impact factor for Psychological Review is the average number of citations during the year 1990 to articles the Review published during 1988 or 1989.

Table 1 lists estimated impact factors for 137 journals of interest to Industrial-Organizational psychologists. The list is long partly to accommodate the interests of diverse psychologists, and partly to create a context for focal journals. The list includes all the journals that the Institute classifies as applied psychology; nearly all of those classed as management, ergonomics, industrial relations, or social psychology; plus some from business, education research, educational psychology, (general) psychology, or social science.

The numbers in Table 1 are estimates. Because the raw data include random errors, smoothed data are generally more accurate. Also, the most recent figures are roughly two years old, and strong trends have likely continued during the last two years. Thus, we have used exponential smoothing both to remove some of the random errors and to extrapolate the data up to 1992.

Exponential smoothing produces weighted averages that give more weight to more recent data. We varied the smoothing coefficients while comparing the actual outcomes for 1990 with estimates generated from the 1981-89 data. The smallest average errors occurred when (a) estimates of the current values give 50% weight to the most recent observation, 25% weight to the next most recent, 12.5% weight to the third most recent, and so on, but (b) estimates of trends give nearly equal weight to every observation. The estimates for 1992 use such weights. Because the raw data have a lognormal distribution, we made all computations with logarithms.
What Do Impact Factors Mean?

Impact factors measure visibility. They do not measure quality or intellectual rigor as such. Journals low on the list may publish high quality articles or uphold rigorous standards, but people rarely cite the articles published in these journals.

Review articles and theoretical articles tend to receive more citations than do empirical articles. For instance, authors cite articles in the Academy of Management Review 76% more often than those in the Academy of Management Journal, but few would argue that this reflects a quality difference.

Journals with larger circulations tend to have higher impacts.

Impact factors incorporate systematic biases arising from the citation practices in different fields. For example, articles in applied psychology or management cite around 20 references on the average. Articles in educational psychology or social psychology cite around 29 references each, and articles in the general psychology category cite around 41 references each. If articles cited only other works in their own category, articles in general psychology would receive over twice as many citations per article as those in applied psychology or management. This is roughly what happens. Articles in general psychology have an average impact factor of 1.2, those in educational psychology ,8, those in social psychology ,6, and those in applied psychology or management ,5.

Table 1: Journals in Decreasing Order of Citations per Article (1981-90 trends are extrapolated to 1992.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Estimated Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychol Rev</td>
<td>6.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rev of Psychol</td>
<td>5.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychol Bull</td>
<td>5.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>5.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Mgmt Rev</td>
<td>4.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Intelligence</td>
<td>4.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Consumer Resrch</td>
<td>3.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Psychologist</td>
<td>3.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resrch in Orgnl Behavior</td>
<td>3.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Mgmt J</td>
<td>2.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychol Quart</td>
<td>2.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosomatic Medicine</td>
<td>2.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Personality &amp; Social Psychol</td>
<td>2.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Mgmt J</td>
<td>2.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Abnormal Psychol</td>
<td>2.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas Eval &amp; Counsel Develop</td>
<td>2.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Applied Psychol</td>
<td>2.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Health &amp; Social Behavior</td>
<td>1.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Psychol</td>
<td>1.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Sex Resrch</td>
<td>1.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business Rev</td>
<td>1.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Science Quart</td>
<td>1.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Counseling Psychol</td>
<td>1.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Vocational Behavior</td>
<td>1.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Genetics</td>
<td>1.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Marketing</td>
<td>1.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Educational Television</td>
<td>1.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Marketing Resrch</td>
<td>1.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS Quart</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Expertl Social Psychol</td>
<td>1.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev Educational Resrch</td>
<td>1.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Educational Psychol</td>
<td>1.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Intl Business Studies</td>
<td>1.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Personality</td>
<td>1.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Business</td>
<td>1.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Mgmt Rev</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indust Relations</td>
<td>1.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Educational Resrch J</td>
<td>1.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Mgmt</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Occupational Psychol</td>
<td>1.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Therapy &amp; Resrch</td>
<td>1.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Resrch &amp; Therapy</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Resrch</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychologist</td>
<td>1.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British J Psychol</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Science</td>
<td>1.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Personality Assessment</td>
<td>1.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indust &amp; Labor Relat Rev</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Mathematical Psychol</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Communications Resrch</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgnl Behav &amp; Human Decision Proc</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Science</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Mgmt Rev</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Social Psychol Bull</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer J. Psychology</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer J Community Psychol</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessing the Activities and Values of Organization Development Practitioners

Allan H. Church
W. Warner Burke
Columbia University Teachers College

Values are at the core of everything we do as organizational change agents and HRD professionals. They stipulate the mode and processes by which we work, and the outcomes that are desired most for our efforts. As a general field devoted to working with organizations and their people, however, it is quite interesting to note that regarding our work, very little empirical research has been done on assessing and measuring the values that we hold. When we start asking questions about what motivates people in the I/O, OD, and HRD fields, we tend to look for answers among those seminal texts, professors, or mentors who have influenced our ways of thinking about what we do and why (regarding OD, see for example: Gellerman, Frankel & Ladenson, 1990; Greiner, 1980; Margulies & Raia, 1990). These writers, academics and practitioners who have applied their specific brand of knowledge to organizational case studies or examples, have filled our heads with visions of value-laden concepts such as quality of worklife, empowerment, participation, transformational leadership, and open communication. What would be useful is the provision of any data to go along with these attributes, that is, empirical information that suggests the relative degree of agreement between those doing the work and what has been written. In fact, little seems to have been done by way of actually trying to measure the relative weighting or importance of these values among those people in the field whose practices are affected and influenced the most by such concepts.

The field of organization development (OD) is particularly susceptible to this charge, especially since it began as a value-laden field with a vision to impart humanistic values into organizations while attempting to work with the whole system and all of its interrelated parts. Founded in values directly opposed to the more traditional styles of business and management, OD has often been associated with a soft, touchy feely, and somewhat evangelistic approach to generating change in organizations. In the late 50’s and early 60’s it would have been easy to identify the primary forces and motivators behind the field, since these very concepts were heralded by those leading the crusade. To what extent these values describe people in the field today, however, may be another matter. Changes in organizational values and goals, and in the practice of the discipline itself may have had an impact on where we are in relation to these originating concepts. If one were to ask questions regarding change in direction and/or the relative importance of such values
today, the lack of information in the literature suggests that we turn to the people working in the field itself for some answers.

To this end, we recently conducted a mail survey of organization development practitioners to measure the values that these change agents have concerning their work. Using a random sample of 500 names from each of three membership rosters (SIOP, ASTD-OD Professional practice area, and OD Network), we mailed an eight-page questionnaire, cover letter and return envelope to a total of 1500 people in the field. The questionnaire contained items for measuring the degree to which people engaged in different activities, importance assessments about the values of the field today and in the ideal, ratings of what drives people to do OD, and some assorted demographics.

Results of many of these items and sections of the questionnaire have been described in greater detail elsewhere (e.g., Church & Burke, 1992; Van Eynde, Church, Hurley, & Burke, 1992). The purpose of this article is to report specifically on SIOP members’ data, to highlight the major overall findings and the specific differences between this and a combination of the other respondent groups (to be referred to as ODN/ASTD). The following results are focused specifically on the activities section, the ideal importance values ratings, and the ideal rewards ratings.

Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they engaged in a list of 22 activities and interventions commonly associated with the practice of OD (using a scale from 0 = not at all to 5 = to a very great extent). In order to assess the relative importance of values and motivators in the field, ratings were obtained for 31 value statements and 11 motivator items based on respondent perceptions of the field today and their ideal. Thus, each value or motivator item yielded two data points. The values scale produced importance ratings (on a scale of 1 = of little importance to 5 = extremely important), while the rewards and motivators scale asked for descriptive, i.e., the extent to which, ratings (1 = to a small extent to 5 = to a very great extent). Further details on instrument construction, other multivariate analyses and related issues can be found in the referenced papers.

In total, 416 practitioners returned their questionnaires yielding an overall response rate of 27.7%. There was relatively equal representation from the three sample sources of names for the initial mailing: SIOP 23%, ODN 34%; ASTD 25.4%. Overall the sample was comprised of 64% males and 36% females, though the SIOP sample was highly skewed toward males (82%). Similarly, while the total 416 practitioners were evenly split between internal (51%) and external practitioners (49%), SIOP members were more likely to be external (67%) while ASTD/ODN people leaned slightly more toward internal status (56%).

On the average, respondents had been working in the field for a little over 11 years, and about half were associated in some way with academic institutions. While the vast majority of SIOP respondents had received doctorate degrees (86%), the other two sample groups were more evenly spread among doctoral (22%), master’s (48%) and bachelor’s (17%) level training. Of the half that considered themselves to be primarily internal change agents, there was representation from a wide range of industries, including health care, insurance, communications, education, military, oil, finance, automotive, sales-marketing, and personnel. On the average, these internal practitioners have been with their current employer for almost 8 years.

Data collected from the activities, values, and motivators sections of the questionnaires were analyzed using a MANOVA design to test the presence of significant multivariate effects. Since the multivariate Fs were significant for the activities items, F(22,354)=10.62, p < .001, ideal values ratings, F(31,275)=2.32, p < .001, and ideal motivators section F(11,347)=4.42, p < .001, multiple comparisons tests were conducted to pinpoint differences between group means. All follow-up examinations were generated using Bonferroni corrected univariate F's to control for inflated Type I error rates. Tables 1, 2 and 3 list the results of these analyses.

Listed below is a summary of the important findings that emerged from these analyses: (It is important to remember that all ratings other than for the 22 activities were based on an ideal state of the field). The data presented in Tables 2 and 3 are not a direct reflection of the values of those practicing OD today, rather these ratings represent their perceptions of the ideal state of what should drive and motivate people in the field).

1. SIOP members place far more emphasis and energy in conducting research to collect hard data, and on utilizing that data for generating and testing theory than do practitioners associated with the ODN/ASTD group. This finding is clearly evident in the activities section, where the item “Using research and statistical skills” was rated significantly higher by SIOP respondents than others (2.54 vs 1.19) in our respondent pool. Similarly, although the data survey and feedback item means for the two groups were not statistically different from each other, their relative rating and subsequent ranking across this section (3 vs 7) lend credence to this finding as well. Thus, ODN/ASTD people tended to rate themselves as engaged in data survey and feedback less often relative to other activities on the list, while SIOP members ratings put this practice as the 3rd most cited. Also in support of this finding is the item “Collecting data and generating theory” from the ideal motivators section. SIOP practitioners significantly rated this item as more descriptive of the ideal state for OD efforts than did their ODN/ASTD counterparts. Again, the relative ranking (2 vs 6) suggests that SIOP members place more worth and tend to be engaged in data survey work more so than others in our sample. Given the greater percentage of SIOP respondents with doctoral level training as well as the greater
likelihood of being a tenured professor (29% vs 3%) if one is a member of SIOP, such a finding, while not surprising, is certainly comforting to have empirically verified. The fact that those who endure the rituals of research training and the dissertation defense are more likely to value research and empiricism is a plausible interpretation for understanding these results.

2. **SIOP members rate themselves as less engaged in traditional OD interventions than other practitioners.** SIOP respondents indicated being significantly less involved in certain activities versus members of OD/ASTD including such classic OD interventions as problem solving sessions, group goal setting skills and process consultation. Although there was a tendency for SIOP-affiliated practitioners to rate all activity items across the entire section lower, the above practices stand out as having particularly lower means than those among the total sample. Other items with significantly lower rated mean scores included efforts to achieve long term change, strategic planning, role analysis, and conducting futuring/visioning activities. Interestingly enough, two of the traditional OD methods associated with the interpersonal and group dynamic oriented Tavistock and NTL origins of the field, T-groups, human relations, and Gestalt methods etc., were also rated significantly lower by SIOP members than by respondents from the other two groups, despite the fact that these two items received the dubious honor for both groups of being the lowest ranked interventions listed. For the remaining set of interventions and activities, no real differences existed between the two groups.

3. **When rating the ideal values for the field, SIOP members regarded classic OD concepts as less important than those people from other groups.** Significant differences between the two groups consisted of values relating to promoting autonomy and freedom, establishing systems based on equality, facilitating ownership of process and outcome, promoting a culture of collaboration and creating openness in communication. This finding can be alarming if taken at face value; that is, that the SIOP members in our sample of practitioners rated several of the key traditional OD values as well as those items relating to diversity and equality lower than their respective comparison group. Although lower mean scores on some of the more traditional items could be understandable (e.g. autonomy and freedom, collaboration) given the different orientation of this group, it is unclear why values relating to communication, continuous learning and especially the diversity issues would be rated lower by SIOP members than by others. One alternate explanation for this outcome is that, as before with the activities section, SIOP members in general tended to be more conservative in their ratings of items across the total 31 listed. This pattern is probably a result of their greater attention to survey work and understanding of the limited nature of ratings scales with ceiling effects. Knowing of the problems inherent in collecting data, perhaps people simply tried not to give universally high ratings to all the items. On the other hand, there were value items grounded in people related concerns that did not yield significant differences between the groups (e.g., empowerment, concern for human dignity, continuous learning, self-awareness and growth, etc.), which would suggest that this pattern of lower means for SIOP members does not adequately describe all humanistic value items in general. The reason for these significantly lower ratings, then, is unclear.

4. **Helping people was the highest rated ideal motivator in the field of OD for both SIOP and ASTD/ODN respondents.** It was quite encouraging (if you share this value) to note that both groups rated helping people as the number one motivator in the ideal. This suggests the endurance of a true concern for working with and helping people among those surveyed. Given that the roots of the field are centered in psychology and the study of personal and interpersonal relations, this finding is a positive sign that people are still the central focus and ideal motivator to those working in the field today. Further evidence of this trend can been seen among the mean scores for those motivator items related to increasing one's own personal power and material gain (e.g. financial rewards, recognition in the field, and interjection of one's own values into organizations), which received significantly lower ratings across both groups as well. Another indicator is in the low ratings (ranked 10 by SIOP and ASTD/ODN members) for the item, selling one's own skills and techniques. While the popular perception of many people in business today is that of money-hungry consultants selling whatever and wherever they can, this is not the image that practitioners themselves feel describes the heart of the field today. Perhaps this is just wishful thinking on our part. After all, as business people ourselves we must make our internal and external clients aware of the products and services we can provide or we will soon be without a customer.

Likewise, the increasing growth and popularity of the field has resulted in fiercer competition for clients, a situation which was present several decades ago. We would like to believe, however, that this continued emphasis and belief in working with people is vital to
those working in the field of OD. These sentiments should apply to all I/O and HRD people as well.
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Table 1.
Activities and Intervention Items by Respondent Group
Mean Scores and Univariate ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Intervention Items</th>
<th>SIOP Mean Rank</th>
<th>ODN/ASTD Mean Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management development</td>
<td>3.21 1</td>
<td>3.55 5</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational assessment &amp; diagnosis</td>
<td>3.14 2</td>
<td>3.33 6</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data survey and feedback</td>
<td>2.93 3</td>
<td>2.97 7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to achieve long-term change</td>
<td>2.77 4</td>
<td>3.57 2</td>
<td>25.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using research and statistical skills</td>
<td>2.54 5</td>
<td>1.19 20</td>
<td>71.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving sessions</td>
<td>2.49 6</td>
<td>3.63 1</td>
<td>57.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process consultation</td>
<td>2.43 7</td>
<td>3.36 4</td>
<td>29.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>2.18 8</td>
<td>2.93 8</td>
<td>20.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group goal setting skills</td>
<td>2.10 9</td>
<td>3.33 5</td>
<td>63.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational design</td>
<td>2.08 10</td>
<td>2.51 11</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning</td>
<td>1.78 11</td>
<td>1.34 17</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role analysis, responsibility &amp; negotiations</td>
<td>1.69 12</td>
<td>2.54 10</td>
<td>23.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting visioning/futuring activities</td>
<td>1.68 13</td>
<td>2.77 9</td>
<td>40.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing reward systems</td>
<td>1.55 14</td>
<td>1.37 16</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower planning</td>
<td>1.39 15</td>
<td>1.20 19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job redesign</td>
<td>1.35 16</td>
<td>1.73 13</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work life activities</td>
<td>1.35 17</td>
<td>1.95 12</td>
<td>10.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating technology into workplace</td>
<td>1.21 18</td>
<td>1.50 14</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of sociotechnical systems 0.87 19 1.48 15 11.76*
Stress management 0.85 20 1.24 18 7.68
Gestalt Psychology methods 0.33 21 0.76 21 11.12*
T-groups 0.21 22 0.68 22 13.18**

Note: (1.375) * p < .05, ** p < .01
Significance levels have been adjusted for inflated Type I error rates.

Table 2.
Importance of Ideal Values Ratings by Respondent Group
Mean Scores and Univariate ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Values</th>
<th>SIOP Mean Rank</th>
<th>ODN/ASTD Mean Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing effectiveness and efficiency</td>
<td>4.61 1</td>
<td>4.45 7</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing productivity</td>
<td>4.52 2</td>
<td>4.39 10</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting quality of products and services</td>
<td>4.46 3</td>
<td>4.45 8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering employees to act</td>
<td>4.37 4</td>
<td>4.68 1</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a concern for human dignity</td>
<td>4.32 5</td>
<td>4.48 6</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating openness in communication</td>
<td>4.27 6</td>
<td>4.59 2</td>
<td>12.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing competitive advantage</td>
<td>4.26 7</td>
<td>4.11 18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting inquiry and continuous learning</td>
<td>4.22 8</td>
<td>4.52 4</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting excellence</td>
<td>4.21 9</td>
<td>4.33 12</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing organizational leaders</td>
<td>4.21 10</td>
<td>4.37 11</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling organizations to grow more effectively</td>
<td>4.18 11</td>
<td>4.25 15</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating ownership of process and outcome</td>
<td>4.17 13</td>
<td>4.56 3</td>
<td>14.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting employee self-awareness and growth</td>
<td>4.17 12</td>
<td>4.42 9</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a culture of collaboration</td>
<td>4.13 14</td>
<td>4.52 5</td>
<td>10.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning people with jobs</td>
<td>4.11 15</td>
<td>4.02 20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting organizational participation</td>
<td>4.07 16</td>
<td>4.30 14</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanizing the workplace</td>
<td>4.06 17</td>
<td>4.30 13</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on profitability/bottom line results</td>
<td>3.96 18</td>
<td>3.88 22</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing worker satisfaction</td>
<td>3.88 19</td>
<td>4.15 16</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating employee commitment to organization</td>
<td>3.74 20</td>
<td>3.92 21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferring OD skills and technologies</td>
<td>3.70 21</td>
<td>4.07 19</td>
<td>9.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a code of ethics for OD</td>
<td>3.64 22</td>
<td>3.74 23</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversifying the workplace 3.57 23 4.12 17 19.89**
Promoting autonomy and freedom 3.56 24 3.73 24 3.22
Applying and utilizing organizational theory 3.54 25 3.73 25 1.25
Promoting democratic systems and policies 3.51 26 3.65 28 0.30
Protecting the natural environment 3.41 27 3.70 26 2.68
Fostering corporate citizenship in the community 3.35 28 3.68 27 4.37
Establishing systems based on equality 3.13 29 3.52 29 13.18**
Emphasizing individual welfare over the organization 2.68 30 2.62 31 13.18**
Specializing in certain OD techniques 2.55 31 2.83 30 6.56

Note: (1,305) * p < .05, ** p < .01
Significance levels have been adjusted for inflated Type I error rates.

---

### Table 3.

**Importance of Ideal Motivator Ratings by Respondent Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Motivators</th>
<th>SIOP Mean Rank</th>
<th>ODN/ASTD Mean Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping people</td>
<td>4.23 1</td>
<td>4.38 1</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting data and generating theory</td>
<td>3.86 2</td>
<td>3.36 6</td>
<td>19.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising power to change systems</td>
<td>3.64 3</td>
<td>3.62 4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as a mentor</td>
<td>3.59 4</td>
<td>3.47 5</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having social contact/human interaction</td>
<td>3.51 5</td>
<td>3.77 3</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving self-awareness and growth</td>
<td>3.41 6</td>
<td>3.84 2</td>
<td>9.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining financial rewards</td>
<td>3.31 7</td>
<td>3.47 3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving recognition in the field</td>
<td>2.93 8</td>
<td>2.87 9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting immediate feedback from the work</td>
<td>2.88 9</td>
<td>3.08 8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling one’s own skills and techniques</td>
<td>2.84 10</td>
<td>2.87 10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjecting one’s own values into organizations</td>
<td>2.21 11</td>
<td>2.49 11</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1,375) * p < .05, ** p < .01
Significance levels have been adjusted for inflated Type I error rates.
Three Keys to TQM: An I-O Perspective

Practice Network conversed with Larry Axline (Management Action Planning) about TQM. Larry is excited and concerned about the continuing growth of TQM in American organization. His excitement is predicated upon the unifying force of the quality movement for tying together many otherwise conflicting organizational themes. He is concerned that many I/O psychologists may be missing out on this transformation in organizational leadership. He cites three opportunities for I/O practitioners.

1. Process Synthesis. I/O psychologists may be uniquely qualified to synthesize the processes of quality, employee relations, customer service, profitability, safety and other competing priorities. TQM is not just a new form of participative management or a more effective means of determining customer needs. Larry Axline suggests that it is the synthesized, pervasive and unwavering commitment to quality through continuous process improvement by all stakeholders interacting with the organization. I/O psychologists can help an organization make its processes more coherent and manageable.

2. Stakeholder Analyses. I/O practitioners may wish to consider conducting a TQM readiness study to assist organization in identifying significant problems and opportunities. This can involve a pre-implementation analysis of key stakeholders outside the organization. Examples include studies of customer expectations and concerns, supplier relationships, and, where practical, relationships and expectations of providers of capital and regulators of the business. Doesn’t it make sense to obtain objective input from internal and external stakeholders? Many organizations believe that it does, and this trend should not be overlooked by I/O practitioners.

3. Vertical Implementation. Many companies report that 80% of organizational quality problems are traceable to the processes, not to employees. Training employees to more effectively execute faulty and disjointed procedures is not the solution. Nor is stratified training. All levels of employees learn a great deal from each other when they are involved together in training and quality improvement teams. Cross-functional teams also provide increased understanding and appreciation for the contributions of others. New strategies are needed to counter points of resistance typically occurring at middle first-line management levels. Vertical slicing of training can be successful in piercing the bureaucratic armor that exists in hierarchical organizations.
Larry recommends I/O practitioners immerse themselves in a wide range of journals and organizations to obtain increased perspectives about TQM, including: Management Review by the AMA, The Journal of Management Consulting by the Institute of Management Consultants, Training and Development Journal by ASTD and TQM conferences sponsored by the Society of Manufacturing Engineers and the Department of Defense.

SCANS: Not a New Pair of Sunglasses

Practice Network brought you information about SCANS in the January 1992 edition of TIP. As promised, here is an update:

SCANS (the Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills) was appointed by ex-Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole to determine the fundamental skills needed to succeed in the world of work. A national job analysis, to say the least! The SCANS “message to employers” is:

Look outside your company and change your view of your responsibilities for human resource development. Your old responsibilities were to select the best available applicants and to retain those you hired. Your new responsibilities must be to improve the way you organize work and to develop the human resources in your community, your firm, and your nation.

Norm Peterson (American Institutes of Research), a contributor to the research effort that provided information to the commission, reports that the formal work of the commission is done. Several documents are now available detailing the conclusions of the Commission. The following documents are available by calling (202) 523-4840.

1. Learning and Living: A Blueprint for High Performance—Part I. The executive summary of SCANS. (36 pages)
2. Learning and Living: A Blueprint for High Performance—Full Report. It is what it says...the full report. (110 pages)
4. Teaching the SCANS Competencies. This report provides expanded definitions of the five SCANS competencies as well as the key learning concepts and “best practice” programs. This document should be available in August.

Norm also wrote an 80 page “Technical Report” for the Department of Labor outlining the job analysis methodology and scaling procedures that were used, although this document is not widely available.

Bigger Than A Bread Box

37,000 test questions! 320 different job content categories! What is bigger than a bread box and could save you a ton of item writing? The Western Region Item Bank.

The WRIB is a non-profit group with 155 members in 17 states. Ted Darany (San Bernadino County) breaks down the WRIB members as 80% city and county governments, 10% school districts with the remaining percentage comprised of state governments and special districts. The $1,500 membership gets you one year of unlimited access to the database’s 37,000 job knowledge questions. Items in this database are used most often to test job knowledge in a civil service environment.

In constructing a test, the WRIB gives you a photo-ready proof of the final items your expert panel has chosen and performs the scoring for you. The WRIB commits to a 24-hour turnaround time on scoring. This database keeps a record of all essential test use information (where and when used, etc.) as well as records of what types and levels of jobs have received this item (e.g., Accountant or Accounting Clerk). Additionally, item difficulty and discrimination indexes are stored.

Interested? You have to be a public sector business to utilize the WRIB. If you are and want to do yourself a favor, contact Ted Darany at (714) 387-5586.

Help Wanted: Test Norming

Pam Waits (United Airlines) would like to speak to any I/O Practitioner who is able to assist her in finding alternatives to race and gender norming. Pam works in United’s flight officer selection process. Can you help? Call Pam at (708) 952-4684.

Keep It Coming!

Have something to share? Maybe something old, something new or something borrowed (but nothing blue please, let’s leave that to the clinicians)? I look forward to speaking with you on any topic you find of interest. Maybe even something for Practice Network! Contact Tom Baker, Micro Motion, Inc. in Boulder, CO at (303) 530-8143 or through my Prodigy® address, VTCJ69A, or fax to (303) 530-8422.
Join the thousands of companies nationwide that have discovered how to benefit both their workers and the bottom line—

GAINSHARING: PLANS FOR IMPROVING PERFORMANCE

By Brian Graham-Moore
Professor of Management
University of Texas at Austin
and Timothy L. Ross
Director, Productivity and Gainsharing Institute
Bowling Green State University

By sharing your company's gains with your employees, you can improve competitiveness, product quality, communication, job satisfaction, labor relations, and customer service. This book on gainsharing shows you how!

- Find out about various gainsharing systems
- Review basic theories, measurement techniques, and change processes
- Examine a 17-year case study of gainsharing in action
- Understand the dynamics of gainsharing in business, industry, union, government, and service sectors

TO ORDER CALL (800) 372-1033 or FAX (800) 253-0332
BNA Books, P.O. Box 6036
Rockville, MD 20850-9914

30-DAY APPROVAL • NO-RISK MONEY-BACK GUARANTEE

BNA Books is a Division of The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D.C.

---

IOTAS

Kurt Kraiger
University of Colorado at Denver

Speaking to my qualifications for writing this column: It never dawned on me until this morning why it was called IOTAs. Knowing the minds of some of my predecessors, I had always guessed there was a pun in there somewhere, but for reasons I choose not to share, the joke had always escaped me.

Conference Wrap-Up

Another great conference! My congratulations to everyone who helped to put it together, especially Katherine Klein, program chair; Georgia Chao and Craig Williams, workshop chairs; Frank Landy (race coordinator); and (especially) Ron Johnson, conference chair. As always, next year's committee chairs will have tough benchmarks to top. One final conference note: For most of us, one of the joys of SIOP meetings is discovering out-of-the-way restaurants, catching up with good friends, even if they are from our home institutions. This year, two colleagues from a large eastern University tried to hold a congenial conversation in a small Montreal deli, but one of them couldn't cut the mustard. Actually, it's closer to the truth that the other could cut it, much to the chagrin (and dry cleaning bill) of the other.

And speaking of conferences, check out this year's APA program, elsewhere in TIP. "Nobody goes to APA anymore," yet Lynn Offerman has found enough somewheres to put together an attractive convention.

Comings and Goings

Kevin Murphy and Jan Cleveland have returned to Colorado State University after a year's sabbatical on the Left Coast. They started by the Bay, spending the fall semester at the Center of Industrial Relations; Kevin also taught within the Psychology Department and Business School at the University of California—Berkeley. They finished down the coast where Jan taught at Occidental College in UCLA.
By the time you read this, Jim Farr will have arrived at the University of Western Australia, Department of Management, in Perth. Jim plans to spend the first part of his sabbatical tossing shrimp on the barbie, then returning to Penn State in late November. And, since you asked, I too will be on sabbatical this coming academic year. I hope to learn the business side of consulting by working as a project manager for International Learning Systems of Golden, CO, and to continue as an associate editor on a training effectiveness book and to start as a co-author on a training evaluation book. Due to severe space limitations, I am unable to explain the differences between the two constructs. Too bad, inquiring minds want to know!

Also, the Hay Group, the international management consulting firm, is staffing up with expertise from SIOP to break into the Human Resources Planning and Development (HRPD) business in a major way. The company has recently hired the following SIOP members: Kevin Hummell, based in Atlanta, has taken on the role of Director of Marketing—National Accounts, HRPD; Sam Modoono is the new Regional Director of HRPD for New England and is based in Boston; Don Moretti has joined Hay as Senior Consultant in Chicago; Peter Uhr, based in Atlanta, heads HRPD for the Southeast Region; and Vickie Vandaveer will soon start up and head HRPD for the Southwest Region, with offices in Dallas and Houston. They join a rapidly growing multi-disciplinary team of Human Resources consultants.

Moving Up

Mike McAnulty reports that he has been promoted to principal scientist of Anacapa Sciences, Inc. Mike is the research coordinator for the Anacapa office at Fort Rucker, Alabama, and is active in research on the selection and training of Army Aviators, and the development of aviation systems.

Ron Shepps is now an internal organizational development consultant to Amoco Oil's refining, engineering, and environmental operations, focusing on TQM-ish, large-scale change. He was also recently elected to the Board of Chicago OD Network, and in June (along with OD consultant Art Freedman), made a presentation to the Network entitled: "Computer assisted group work: New directions in meeting facilitation and group decision-making." Practicing what they preached, the duo used IBM's Chicago electronic meeting room and IBM's Team Focus LAN as a communication medium.

Awards and Accolades

SIOP member Robert Mayer, Personnel and Public Relations Manager for Nationwide Insurance, was recently selected as one of 10 "rising stars" in human resources by the editors of the magazine Human Resources Executive. Elsewhere, Hal Hendrick, Professor of Human Factors at the University of Southern California, was recently elected to a three-year term as president of the International Ergonomics Association. Finally, Rick Jacobs of Penn State and two students David Hoffman (now at Purdue) and Joe Barratta, were selected to receive the annual Yoder-Heneman Personnel Research Award at this year's conference of the Society for Human Resource Management. Congrats to all!

Seams Like Old Times

Finally, I want to express my appreciation to Steve Kozlowski for his efforts in promoting me for the editorship position (blame him, not me) and for helping me learn the ropes. It has been a nearly seamless transition, and all the credit goes to Steve.

Problems with Licensing?

Rosemary H. Lowe
University of Western Florida

The State Affairs Committee will be collecting critical incidents about difficulties and successes by I/O psychologists seeking to become licensed for the practice of psychology. We want to assist our members who desire licensure by identifying obstacles and suggesting strategies that may be successful in obtaining licensure. The information may also be useful in communicating with licensing boards about the degree of fit between credential procedures and training, experience, and practice in I/O psychology. SEND US YOUR STORIES!

Critical incidents may be sent to Jay C. Thomas, J. C. Thomas & Associates, 4303 NE 34th Avenue, Portland OR 97211; (503) 281-8060.

Master's Matters

Rosemary H. Lowe
University of West Florida

Future editions of TIP will include a column on issues of concern to students, graduates, and faculty of Master's level training programs in I/O psychology. The idea for this column grew out of the need for better communication among these programs, as expressed by participants in a roundtable at the Montreal conference. Several issues dealing with I/O Master's training were raised at the Roundtable organized by the E & T Committee and chaired by Greg Dobblin. Preliminary information was presented from the survey conducted for the next revision of Graduate
Training in I/O and OB. The data led to a discussion of several ways in which SIOP might address the needs of Master's programs.

Some suggestions were:
— development of guidelines for training at the Master's level;
— an expanded role in SIOP for Master's graduates;
— sharing of information on topics such as curriculum, faculty, and jobs held by graduates;
— strengthening of linkages between graduates in the field and faculty members for purposes of research and/or consulting.

Future columns dealing with these or other issues of concern to readers will be prepared by the group listed below.

Please communicate with one of us about what you would like to see on this page in the issues to come.

Laura Koppes
Department of Psychology
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
Oshkosh, WI 54901
(414) 424-2071

Bill Siegfried
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina-Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223
(704) 547-4752

Rosemary Lowe
Department of Psychology
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514 (904) 474-2366
Bitnet: RLOWE@UWF

Gordon Simerson
Department of Psychology
University of New Haven
300 Orange Avenue
West Haven, CT 06516
(203) 932-4005.


Notes from the International Affairs Subcommittee

Barbara B. Ellis
University of Texas at El Paso

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
A comparison of the 1991 and 1992 programs from the St. Louis and Montreal meetings indicates that SIOP's interest in international issues is on the rise. In 1991, only two of 74 scheduled events included international topics. In contrast, nine of 79 events in 1992 dealt with international or cross-cultural issues.

The International Affairs Subcommittee continues to support efforts that will develop our contacts with I/O psychologists in other countries. We are investigating the possibility of setting up an electronic bulletin board to facilitate an international exchange of information, research opportunities, etc. We will keep you posted on our progress.

If you have any suggestions or ideas about ways to stimulate international relationships, or if you are aware of any obstacles that we should work to overcome, please drop me a note, preferably by BITNET - DQ00@UTEP or by snailmail - B. Ellis, Department of Psychology, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968.

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR WORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
Robert Roe, of Tilburg University, reports that a new association for I/O psychologists has been formed. The European Association for Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP) was formed to support the development and application of work and organizational psychology in Europe. Non-Europeans are able to apply for associate membership. EAWOP organizes meetings and conferences, publishes a newsletter, and is starting an electronic communication network. EAWOP works in close cooperation with a number of psychological associations throughout Europe. SIOP and EAWOP have set up an informal arrangement for the exchange of newsletters; in this way, you will be informed of EAWOP's activities via TIP. We will pursue the possibility of an exchange of information through the electronic network. Stay tuned for further details. In the meantime, if you want more information about EAWOP, contact Robert A. Roe, Tilburg University, P. O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands (FAX to 31-13-662370).

THE ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE
For those of you who are interested in international organizational development, you may want to contact Don Cole, President of the
Organizational Development Institute (ODI). ODI is a non-profit educational association. ODI publishes a monthly newsletter, Organizations and Change, and an annual edition of the International Registry of OD Professionals. The latter includes ODI members and addresses, OD/OB academic programs, OD networks worldwide, and the OD code of ethics. For more information, contact Don Cole, c/o The Organization Development Institute, 11234 Walnut Ridge Road, Chesterland, Ohio 44026.

Vantage 2000 will now be coordinated by:

Charmine Hartel
Department of Psychology
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, OK 74104-3189
(918) 631-2248

Please submit relevant material to Charmine.

ADVERTISE IN TIP

If you have written a book, offer a product or service, or have a position opening in your organization, advertise in TIP. TIP is the official newsletter of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. TIP is distributed four times a year to more than 2,500 Society members, who include academicians and professional practitioners in the field. In addition, TIP is distributed to foreign affiliates, graduate students, leaders in the American Psychological Association and American Psychological Society, and individual and institutional subscribers.

For more information contact the TIP Business Office:

SIOP Administrative Office
657 East Golf Road, Suite 309
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
Phone: 708-640-0068
Self-Nomination Form
Standing Committees, 1993-1994
Society for
Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Deadline: December 1, 1992

If you are interested in serving on a standing committee of the Society for the 1993-1994 period, please complete this form (or a copy of it) and mail it to Nancy Tippins, Chair, Committee on Committees, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Bell Atlantic, 1310 N. Courthouse Road, Arlington, VA 22201.

Name: ________________________________

Mailing Address:

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

Phone Number: Area Code (______) ______

Job Title:

Educational Data:

Highest earned degree: _______ Year granted: _______

Educational Institution: ____________

Society Status:

[ ] Associate [ ] Member [ ] Fellow

Committee Preference:

If you have preferences concerning placement on committees, please indicate them by writing the number 1, 2, and 3, respectively, by the names of your first, second, and third most preferred committee assignments. If you wish reappointment to a committee on which you presently serve, please rank that committee as 1. Note, however, that you need not provide these ranks if you are indifferent about committee placement.

______ Award
______ Committee on Committees
______ Continuing Education and Workshop
______ Education and Training
______ External Affairs
______ Fellowship (Fellows only)

______ Membership
______ Professional Affairs
______ Program (APA meeting)
______ Program (SIOP Conference)
______ Scientific Affairs
______ State Affairs
______ TIP Newsletter

Prior Society Service:

If you have previously served on Society committees, please list their names and the years you served on each.

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

Prior APA Service:

If you have previously served on one or more American Psychological Association Boards or Committees, please list their names and the years you served on each.

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

Special Interests and/or Qualifications:

If you have any special interest or qualifications that the Committee on Committees should consider in making decisions about committee assignments, please note them here.

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

References:

Please provide the names and addresses of two Members or Fellows of the Society who the Committee on Committees may contact to obtain additional information about you.

Name ____________________________ Address ____________________________

Name ____________________________ Address ____________________________

Your Signature: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________

Please mail the completed form (or a copy of it) by December 1, 1992, to:

Nancy Tippins
Committee on Committees
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Bell Atlantic
1310 N. Courthouse Road
Arlington, VA 22201
APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP
SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, INC.
DIVISION 14 OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
(Please Type)

Name and Address

Telephone No. (Wk) (Hm) (Fax)

BITNET Address:

Current Fellow Year Current APS Fellow Year
APA status & Member Year Status & Member Year
Year elected: Associate Year Year elected:
Foreign affiliate Year

Check status in SIOP for which you are applying: Member Associate Foreign affiliate

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND (Show undergraduate and graduate education)

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

Master's thesis title

Advisor(s)

Ph.D. thesis title

Advisor(s)

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.  

2.  

3.  

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

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

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

Date Signature of Applicant

Return to: SIOP Administrative Office, 657 E. Golf Road, Suite 309, Arlington Heights, IL 60005
APPLICATION FOR STUDENT MEMBERSHIP

SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL & ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, INC.

DIVISION 14 OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
(Please Type or Print)

Name _______________________________ Date _____________________

Mailing Address ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:
Name of Institution __________________________________________

Department __________________________________________________

Address of Institution _________________________________________

Check the degree you are pursuing:

_____ Doctorate  _____ Bachelor's level

_____ Master's level  _____ Other, specify:

Year you expect degree ________________________________

Check the area of specification:

_____ I/O Psychology  _____ General Psychology

_____ Organizational Behavior  _____ Business

_____ Psychometrics  _____ Other, specify:

_____ Social Psychology

Advisor: __________________ Advisor's signature: ________________

- Student Affiliate Annual Dues are $10.00 and include a subscription to The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist (TIP) and all other SIOP mailings
- Please enclose a check or money order payable in U.S. currency to: SIOP
- Mail to: SIOP Administrative Office, 657 East Golf Road, Suite 309, Arlington Heights, IL 60005

New Members Sought for APA's Media Referral Service

The Public Affairs Office of the American Psychological Association is actively recruiting APA members to participate in its free Media Referral Service (MRS), which is used by the news media to obtain interviews with psychologists for stories in newspapers, magazines, radio and television. There are currently 1,100 APA members in the MRS. They give interviews on 800 different subtopics in psychology ranging from addictive behaviors to workplace stress.

The Public Affairs Office has been aggressively promoting the service to the news media, resulting in a 30 percent increase in media requests during the past year. From January 1991 to January 1992, APA members were referred nearly 5,000 times for press interviews, resulting in nearly 3,000 news and features stories. Because of its increasing popularity, more psychologists are needed to participate in the Media Referral Service, particularly in the science areas.

The 800 different topics in the Media Referral Service are grouped into 13 broad categories: aging-related topics; child-related topics (pre-teen); teen/adolescent issues; crime/criminals/abuse/victimization; disorders, diseases & bad habits; racial/ethnic/religious/cultural topics; education/learning/school-related areas; marriage/family-related issues; money/finance/economy; sex/sexuality/intimacy/pregnancy; sports/fitness/performance-related topics; work/job/career/and employment; and women's issues.

More psychologists are needed in all categories, but are particularly needed in these areas: child development, interpersonal relations, adolescent development, criminal personality, pornography, political psychology, seasonal affective disorder, child behavior, crime, behavioral genetics, twins, rites of passage, shame, and weather.

The Media Referral Service works like this: a reporter from the New York Times may call the Public Affairs Office and say they are doing a story on honesty testing. The APA public affairs specialist will then go into the MRS database and locate the file on honesty testing. He or she will then give the reporter the name and telephone number of two or three psychologists who are specialists in that area along with information about their specific expertise. The reporter will then contact the participating psychologist directly, usually by telephone, and set up an interview.

The service is widely used by the nation's premier news organizations. Regular callers include The Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, Associated Press, Wall Street Journal, NBC Evening News, National Public Radio, CNN,

APA members can join the Media Referral Service by filling out an MRS application which asks questions about degrees received, areas of specialization, and media experience, if any. An APA member does not have to be experienced in giving interviews to participate in the MRS. The Public Affairs Office also publishes two helpful guides for APA members called: "Handling the Media Interview: A Guide for Psychologists" and "Questions and Answers About Dealing with the News Media." The Public Information Committee (PIC) and Division 46 (Media Psychology) also are sponsoring a six-part media training workshop at the APA convention this summer to help novices and pros alike to develop and hone their media skills.

To obtain an application for the MRS service or for a free brochure write (please include a self-addressed stamped envelope) or call: Public Affairs Office, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002, (202) 336-5700.

---

**SIOP CALENDAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APA Centennial Convention</td>
<td>August 14 - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Deadline for October Issue</td>
<td>August 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP Conference (1993)</td>
<td>October 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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!

THE SIOP/APS CONNECTION

Lee Herring
American Psychological Society

Eugene F. Stone
State University of New York, Albany

Fourth Annual Summit

The APS-sponsored Accreditation summit held April 10-12, 1992, in Chicago, drew 140 invited delegates from departments offering Ph.D. programs that are accredited by the current American Psychological Association (APA) system. The summit was held in conjunction with the meeting of the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOP) and was the outcome of an escalating concern among many academic and applied psychologists that the APA system has become too heavily oriented toward the concerns of practicing clinical psychologists—to the detriment of research-oriented psychologists.

SIOP's own Milton Hakel served as moderator of the several hours of plenary sessions. The meeting generated amicable and lively debate, and not only ended an hour ahead of schedule but also ended in unanimous agreement that:

1. A steering committee should be formed to monitor the policies and procedures of the APA Committee on Accreditation as they evolve;

2. This steering committee should be charged with proposing criteria, procedures, and scope for evaluating practitioners; and

3. The steering committee should be charged with proposing alternate structures for implementation of accreditation and its relationship to parent or sponsoring organizations, and for the composition of the accrediting body and its fiscal operations.

While COGDOP had earlier agreed last year to continue with APA's accreditation system, it did so on an interim basis and with a mandate to explore alternative governance strategies for accreditation that would ensure balanced representation of diverse specialties, programs, and cultures. All summiters agreed that the steering committee will be composed of some or all members of the current steering committee plus others to be appointed from nomination by summit participants and by representatives of relevant
training councils. Finally, the summiteers agreed that APS should host another summit on accreditation in a year or two.

The steering committee that organized the 1992 summit included Marilyn Brewer, Chair of the APS Graduate Education Committee Accreditation Task Force; Richard Bootzin, Director of the University of Arizona’s clinical psychology program; Emanuel Donchin, Chair of the Psychology Department at the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign; and Richard Weinberg, Director of the Institute of Child Development at the University of Minnesota.

The fourth annual APS was held at the Sheraton Harbor Island Hotel, San Diego, California, June 20-22. The program included a total of 451 posters, paper presentations, symposia, and invited addresses. SIOP members had a considerable presence at the conference: 46 of the posters had industrial and organizational psychology (I/O) issues as their primary focus and many other program events dealt with topics of considerable relevance and interest to individuals in the I/O specialty area.

The 1992 Program Committee was Chaired by Thomas Nelson and the Poster Subcommittee was chaired by Eugene F. Stone. Other members of the Poster Subcommittee were Scott Brown, Helen Crawford, Donn Byrne, Michael Renner, William Simmons, and Dianna L. Stone.” SIOP members who reviewed poster proposals for the 1992 conference included Ralph Alexander, George Alliger, William Balzer, Janet Barnes-Farrell, Robert Boldt, Arthur Brief, Robert Caplan, Robert Cardy, Kenneth Carson, Steven Cesare, Donald Davis, Robert Dipboye, Fritz Drasgow, Jack Edwards, James Farr, Donald Gardner, Kurt Gelsinger, Gary Gottfredson, Paul Hanges, Jo-Ida Hansen, William Howell, Joseph Hurrell, David Kravitz, Robert Lord, Virginia O’Leary, Lawrence Peters, Elizabeth Ravlin, John Rohrbaugh, Joe Rosse, Kenneth Wexley, and Mary Zalesny.

New Journal

Two issues of APS’s second journal, Current Directions in Psychological Science, have now been published and they are being well-received by specialists and non-specialists alike.

Membership

Since the last TIP update on APS, the Society’s membership, has climbed by another 1,000 members and stands at over 13,500. It is worthy of note that at present 47 Student Caucus Chapters have been established at colleges and universities across the country.

Additional Information

For further information about APS, including membership application forms, contact: APS, 1010 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005-4907, Tel.: 202-783-2077, Fax: 202-783-2083.

Upcoming Conferences and Meetings

This list was prepared by Julie Rheinstein for SIOP’s External Affairs Committee. If you would like to submit additional entries please write Julie Rheinstein at Room 6462, OPRD, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E. Street, NW Washington, DC 20415, or call (202) 606-0388, or FAX entries to (202) 606-1399.

1992

July 5-10  Congresso Iberoamericano de Psicologia, Madrid, Spain. La direccion postal de la Secretaria del Comite, Organizador y del Congreso sera, C/ Nunez de Balboa, 58 5 Deha, 28001 Madrid, Spain. Tel: 435-52-12, FAX: 577-91-72.

July 12-15 Third International Conf. on Work and Organizational Values by the International Society for the Study of Work and Organizational Values (ISSWOV). Karlsbad, Czech. Contact: Prof. George W. England, The Univ. of OK, 307 West Brooks St., Rm. 4, Norman, Oklahoma 73519-0450, FAX (405) 325-7688.

July 14-18 12th Organization Development World Congress. Lithuania.


July 19-25 XXV International Congress of Psychology. Brussels, Belgium. Contact: Brussels International Conference Centre, Parc des Expositions, Place de Belgique, B-1020 Brussels, Belgium. Tel: 32-2-478-48-60; Fax: 32-3-478-80-23; E-mail: gery@bleuull11.earn.

August 9-12 Academy of Management Annual Convention. Las Vegas, NV. Contact: Greg Oldham, University of Illinois, (217) 333-6340.


Oct. 12-16  Human Factors Society 36th Annual Meeting. Atlanta, GA. "Innovations for Interactions." Contact: HFS, P.O. Box 1369, Santa Monica, CA 90406-1369, (310) 394-1811, FAX (310) 394-2410.


1994

CALL FOR COMMENT ON THE HUMAN CAPITAL INITIATIVE

Scientific and professional organizations in the behavioral sciences have had limited success in lobbying federal and other research agencies for increased support for behavioral science research, in part because of their somewhat piecemeal and uncoordinated efforts. The Human Capital Initiative is an attempt to coordinate the efforts of various organizations to make a strong case for support for behavioral science research and application. Sixty-five organizations (including SIOP) have worked for several years to develop this initiative, which will attempt to define long-term research agendas in six areas of broad national concern: (1) Productivity in the workplace, (2) Schooling and literacy, (3) The aging society, (4) Drug and alcohol abuse, (5) Health, and (6) Violence in America.

A coordinating committee, chaired by Milt Hakel, is now working to develop Research Initiative Statements in each of these six areas, which are designed to outline proposed research agendas for the next 5-10 years. The Scientific Affairs Committee has been assigned the task of soliciting input from SIOP members that can be used in helping to draft research initiatives, particularly as they relate to productivity in the workplace. SIOP members who have suggestions (anything from very general ideas to integrated position papers), or who are interested in keeping informed about the Human Capital Initiative should contact the chair of the Scientific Affairs Committee at the following address: Kevin Murphy, Scientific Affairs Committee, Department of Psychology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, BITNET: KRMURPHY@LAMAR.COLOSTATE.EDU

We hope that both academics and practitioners in SIOP will contribute their ideas and suggestions to this initiative, which could profoundly affect the future directions of behavioral science research and development.
HUMAN FACTORS SOCIETY ANNUAL MEETING

The Human Factors Society will hold its 1992 Annual Meeting October 12-16 at the Westin Peachtree Plaza Hotel in Atlanta.

The meeting, whose theme is “Innovations for Interactions,” will feature more than 100 technical sessions on a broad range of ergonomics-related topics, including aerospace systems, aging, biomechanics, communications, computer systems, consumer products, education, forensics, organizational design/management, safety, system development, test and evaluation, training, transportation, and visual performance. Hands-on workshops geared toward professionals at all levels will be offered on Monday, October 12, and Friday, October 16.

Exhibits are invited, and registration and housing information, along with a preliminary program, will be available in early August. Contact the Human Factors Society, P.O. Box 1369, Santa Monica, CA 90406-1369; (310) 394-1811, fax (310) 394-2410.

ACCOMMODATION UNDER THE ADA

Mary L. Tenopyr is chairing a Division 5 task force to prepare a paper on accommodation in testing under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Ideas from Division 14 members will be welcome. You can reach Mary at AT&T, Rm W430, One Speedwell Avenue, Morristown, NJ 07962-1906. Voice (201) 898-3450 or FAX (201) 538-9748.

CALL FOR ARI ALUMNI

The U.S. Army Research Institute is currently planning an ARI celebration and reunion. In order to make this event a success, we are trying to get the word out to as many alumni as possible. The event will be held August 15, 1992 in Washington, DC. Plans are for an evening of fun, food, looking at old pictures, and reuniting with old friends. If you are an ARI alumnus, we hope you will plan to attend. If you know some ARI alumni, please pass this announcement on to them.

To receive further information about the event, please contact Dr. Joe Zeidner at the address below. Include names and addresses of other ARI alumni you think would like to receive information about the event. Dr. Joe Zeidner, George Washington University, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 2136 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, DC 20052, (202) 676-8609 FAX: (202) 676-5232.

Science Weekend—1992

Science Weekend, a highly popular feature of the APA Convention for the last four years, will occur again at the APA Centennial Convention this August. Plans are underway for an exciting three-day concentration of science programs—this year, August 14-16 will be the weekend to take in the best of psychological science.

Scientists and academicians will be able to attend three solid days of "cutting edge" research presentations with a central theme for each day. Eighteen invited addresses and symposia, organized along the three themes "Stress and Health: Human and Animal Approaches," "Increasing Competence and Adaptive Behaviors," and "Can Personality Change?" are the features of the coordinated programs, planned by program chairs of the 16 sponsoring divisions of Science Weekend.

For more information about Science Weekend, please contact the Science Directorate, APA, 750 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002-4242; 202/336-6000; APASD@GWUV,M.BITNET.

CCL Named Outstanding Training Supplier

GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA—The Center for Creative Leadership has been selected 1991/1992 Outstanding Training Supplier by training executives of some of America's largest corporations in the categories of "Management Skills/Development" and "Executive Development." It is the fourth year the Center has been named Outstanding Training Supplier for Executive Development and the second year the Center has received Outstanding Training Supplier for Management Skills/Development.

The award was presented on February 10, 1992, during the Hall of Fame Awards ceremony at the annual Best of America Conference and Expo in Tampa, FL. Walter F. Ulmer, Jr., president and CEO of the Center, commented that "we are very gratified to be selected once again as the most outstanding provider of training in the areas of Executive Development and Management Skills/Development. We appreciate this vote of confidence from among 2,400 training directors nationwide. These awards challenge us to work even harder in the months ahead to provide the highest quality of service to our clients and, we hope, to society overall."

The award is a result of a national poll taken of members of the Training Directors' Forum—training and human resource development executives for American corporations, educational institutions, and government bodies—who feel they receive the best value for their training investments. The Center for Creative Leadership has received this recognition in 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991.
CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

Call for Participation, HCI International '93, 5th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction jointly with 9th Symposium on Human Interface (Japan) to be held at the Hilton at Walt Disney World Village in Orlando, Florida, U.S.A., August 8-13, 1993. In cooperation with: ACM SIGCAPH • Chinese Academy of Sciences • Chinese Institute of Industrial Engineers • EEC-European Strategic Programme for Research and Development in Information Technology-ESPRIT • Finnish Institute of Occupational Health • Human Factors Society • IEEE Communications Society • IEEE Systems, Man & Cybernetics Society • Institute of Management Services (U.K.) • Institute of Industrial Engineers • International Ergonomics Association • Japan Ergonomics Research Society • Japan Association for Medical Informatics • Japan Society of Health Science • National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health-NIOSH (USA) • National Institute of Industrial Health (Japan) • Software Psychology Society. To receive a copy of the four page Call for Participation please contact the General Conference Chair: Gabri D. Salveny, HCI International '93, 1287 Grissom Hall, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1287 USA; phone: 317-494-5426; fax: 317-494-0874; or electronic mail: salveny@ecn.purdue.edu.

Call for Papers: The Kenneth E. Clark Research Award

The Center for Creative Leadership is sponsoring the Kenneth E. Clark Research Award, an annual competition to recognize outstanding unpublished papers on leadership by undergraduate and graduate students. The award is named in honor of the distinguished scholar and former Chief Executive Officer of the Center.

The first place award will include a prize of $1,500 and a trip to the Center to present the paper in a colloquium. The Center also will assist the author in publishing the work in an appropriate outlet. Additionally, a prize of $750 will be awarded for a paper judged as deserving honorable mention status.

Submissions may be either empirically or conceptually based. Nontraditional and multi-disciplinary approaches to leadership research are welcomed. The theme for the 1992 award is “The Dynamics and Context of Leadership”, which includes issues such as: (a) leadership during times of rapid change, (b) leadership for quality organizations, (c) leadership in teams, (d) cross-cultural issues in leadership, (e) meta-studies or comparative studies of leadership models, (f) other innovative or unexplored perspectives of leadership.

Submissions will be judged by the following criteria: (1) The degree to which the paper addresses issues and trends that are significant to the study of leadership; (2) The extent to which the paper shows consideration of the relevant theoretical and empirical literature; (3) The degree to which the paper develops implications for research into the dynamics and context of leadership; (4) The extent to which the paper makes a conceptual or empirical contribution; (5) The implications of the research for application to leadership identification and development. Papers will be reviewed anonymously by a panel of researchers from the Center and selected external authorities.

Papers may be submitted only by graduate or undergraduate students. Entrants must provide a letter from a faculty member certifying that the paper was completed by a student or students, and is an unpublished work. Entrants should submit four copies of an article-length paper. Electronic submissions will not be accepted. The name of the author(s) should appear only on the title page of the paper. The title page should also show the authors’ affiliations, mailing addresses and telephone numbers.

Papers are limited to 30 double-spaced pages, including title page, abstract, tables, figures, notes, and references. Papers should be prepared according to the third edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.

In the absence of a paper deemed deserving of the award, the award may be withheld. Entries (accompanied by faculty letters) must be received by August 31, 1992. Winning papers will be announced by October 30, 1992. Entries should be submitted to: Dr. Walter Tornow, Vice President, Research and Publication, Center for Creative Leadership, One Leadership Place, P.O. Box 26300, Greensboro, N.C. 27438-6300.

Metropolitan I/O Associations

The Atlanta Society for Applied Psychology is interested in learning more about other metropolitan I/O associations, and to be placed on their newsletter mailing lists. To interact with their Society, contact Hodges L. Golson, c/o Management Psychology Group, P.C., Suite 2590, Tower Place, 3340 Peachtree Road, NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30326. Phone: (404) 237-6808.

Revised Dictionary of Occupational Titles Released


A useful feature of the 1991 DOT is that more job analysis ratings were included. Each occupational definition includes a trailer line with: (a) the Guide for Occupational Exploration code used in career counseling; (b) a physical demands rating coded as either sedentary, light, medium, heavy, or very heavy; (c) the general educational development ratings for reasoning,
math, and language; (d) the specific vocational preparation rating that ranges from 1 (short demonstration only) to 9 (over 10 years), and (e) the date of last update that indicates the last year the entry was updated.

**Call for Papers on Feedback**

Avraham Kluger is soliciting feedback studies (pre-print, unpublished, dissertation, M.A. thesis) for a meta-analysis he is conducting. Specifically, he is interested in any feedback experiment or quasi-experiment (laboratory and field studies) that (a) has at least one control group which received no feedback, and (b) has any performance data. A control group may be a group that receives no treatment at all, or a group that receives no-feedback treatment which was also given to the experimental group(s) e.g., control receiving goal setting, and experimental receiving goal setting and feedback. Please send any relevant material (including performance reliability, if known) to: Avraham N. Kluger, Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903-5062. Phone: (908) 932-5823; e-mail: “kluger@cancer.”

**Sex and Gender Issues at Work**

Jan Cleveland, Frank Saal, and Margaret Stockdale are co-authoring a book to be entitled *Women and Men in Organizations: Sex and Gender Issues at Work* (to be published by Lawrence Erlbaum). Jan is looking for any unpublished manuscripts or papers in progress, under review, or in press to be used as a reference. Both theoretical and empirical papers are of interest. You may also want to contact her if you are a recently trained researcher in the area (who may not have gained national visibility yet). Jan can be reached at (303) 491-6808.
Positions Available

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR—INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY (FALL, 1992). Dowling College seeks applicants with a Ph.D. (in field) for a position in a growing Department. Eligibility for N.Y. State licensure is required. This is a tenure-track position with an excellent starting salary (over $34,000), a comprehensive benefit package, with “overload” pay possibilities regularly available. Candidates must be strongly committed to teaching. Dowling College is located on Long Island which offers to I/O practitioners many professional opportunities in the New York City metropolitan area that is 30-45 minutes away. This search will be conducted during July, and early August if necessary. SEND a vita, 3 current reference letters, and transcripts of all graduate work to: Director of Human Resources, Dowling College, Oakdale, NY 11769-1999. Dowling College is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Upcoming SIOP Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIOP Conference—San Francisco, San Francisco Marriott</td>
<td>April 29 - May 2, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP Conference—Nashville, Opryland Hotel</td>
<td>April 7-10, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP Conference—Orlando, Hilton at Walt Disney World Village</td>
<td>May 25-28, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP Conference—San Diego, Sheraton Harbor Island Hotel</td>
<td>April 25-28, 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT

The largest and oldest network of company presidents is now seeking organizational development consultants to facilitate new groups in the United States.

The position is part-time. The qualified candidate will have ten (10) years of successful consultation and facilitation experience with executives in the private sector, and a Ph.D. in management, industrial psychology, organizational development or related field.

Please send resume to: The Executive Committee, Attention: Personnel Director, 3737 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 206, San Diego, California, 92108.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
CONSULTANT OR SENIOR CONSULTANT. HRStrategies (previously Personnel Designs, Incorporated) is a full-range human resources consulting firm with offices in the Detroit, Hartford, Houston, Los Angeles, and New York City areas. Across the offices, HRStrategies has one of the largest complements of Industrial-Organizational Psychologists in the nation. Our business spans a range of industry groups, including the manufacturing, electronics, retail, transportation, pharmaceutical, petroleum, health care and entertainment industries. We work in both the public and private sectors. We are seeking Ph.D. or Master’s level I-O psychologists who have strong writing, presentation, psychometric and statistical skills. Initial job duties would depend upon previous experience, and would include participation in a range of activities associated with the construction and implementation of selection systems (e.g., test development, test validation, interview construction and training, assessment center design), performance appraisal systems, career developmental programs, compensation programs, and attitude surveys. Advancement potential within the firm is commensurate with performance and ongoing development of skills. Salary competitive. Send resume to: Dr. John D. Arnold, Vice President, HRStrategies, P.O. Box 36778, Grosse Pointe, MI 48236.

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH INTERNS. BellSouth Corporation, a leader in the telecommunications industry, is currently accepting applications for pre-doctoral industrial/organizational psychology internships. These positions provide an excellent opportunity to conduct applied research, develop human resource programs and gain insight into the environment of a major corporation while interacting with licensed I/O psychologists and human resources professionals. The internships are full-time and last six to twelve months, beginning in January or July. All positions are located in Atlanta, Georgia.

Qualified applicants will be enrolled in an I/O doctoral program and have completed a Master’s degree or equivalent (admitted to doctoral candidacy). Applicants should possess strong research, analytical, interpersonal, and communications (both oral and written) skills. Expertise in PC SAS is highly desirable.

The deadline for completed applications is October 15 for internships beginning in January and April 15 for internships beginning in July. Qualified applicants are invited to submit a cover letter, resume, and two letters of recommendation to: Deborah Uher, Ph.D., BellSouth Corporation, Room 13C02, 1155 Peachtree St., N.E., Atlanta, GA 30067-6000.

Special Issue!
Journal of Business and Psychology

Announces the Publication of the
“Test Validity Yearbook: Volumes 1 & 2”

Guest Editor:
Dr. Frank Landy
The Pennsylvania State University

Receive the new “Test Validity Yearbook” which will appear in the Journal of Business and Psychology. Subscribe now to receive Volumes 1 and 2 of the Yearbook which will appear as two special issues in 1992. Future Yearbooks will be published in JBP annually! Address subscriptions to: Subscription Department, Human Sciences Press, Inc., 233 Spring Street, New York, N.Y., 10013-1578. Annual Rates: $39 (Personal Use), $135 (Institutional Rate). (These prices vary for foreign subscriptions.)

Management and Organizational Behavior

Allen J. Schuh
California State University, Hayward
Contact Jon K. Earl for examination copies
1-612-934-6707 / 1-800-338-3987 (hit #2 button)

This is a beginning level management textbook with an organizational behavior emphasis. The textbook contains many inventories and group/team exercises including a soccer game simulation to demonstrate the effects of leadership and team structure on effectiveness in competition. Objective item test bank in ASCII is available to adopters.
ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT FACILITATOR

Facilitating cultural change in an organization is a challenge only a few can accomplish. We are looking for one of these few.

We are Beltone Electronic Corporation, a leading healthcare manufacturing company, located in an attractive neighborhood on the northwest side of Chicago. We have committed ourselves to changing our organization from a "top down" communication structure to a "bottoms up" communications organization with the introduction of cell manufacturing teams eventually leading to a self-directed work force.

The main responsibilities will be observing and evaluating the effectiveness of production management line facilitators and cell team members. The position will be responsible for evaluating progress and for making recommendations for needed remedial programs dealing with such subjects as problem solving, communications, team member communications, and conflict resolution.

In addition, the position requires the development of action plans to effectively change our "top down" management style to a participatory style. The position reports to the Vice-President & Chief Operating Officer.

To qualify you should have a good knowledge of cell manufacturing and self-directed team concepts and have a demonstrated successful track record in implementing such programs. The position requires excellent interpersonal and communications skills as well as a college degree with a preference for a concentration in organizational behavior. It is necessary that the person have formal training and experience in assessment processes, facilitator skills, leadership training and group dynamics.

This is an excellent opportunity to have important impact on the future growth of the organization and as such offers an exceptional opportunity for personal and financial growth. Interested candidates should send their resume in confidence to: Robert F. Riefke, BELTONE ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, 4201 W. Victoria St., Chicago, IL 60646.

THE EXECUTIVE CONSULTANT IN PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC'S ORGANIZATION PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. Extensive experience with senior-level clients in large system change interventions. Direct experience working with unions, line operations and the functional human resource departments. Lead and facilitate high-level senior leadership groups in the design and redesign of HR systems.

Outstanding instructional design and delivery techniques based on the current research in adult learning theory. Demonstrated ability to develop instrumentation to effectively collect and analyze data.

Organization design, benchmarking and continuous improvement process and application skills.

Fifteen years experience and a Ph.D. or equivalent in Psychology, Organization Behavior or in a related field.

Interested candidates should send resume to: Inga Olson, HR Representative, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Organization Planning & Development Department, 201 Mission Street, 17th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105.

TEAM LEADERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION TRAINER

We have a newly created position, within the Human Resources Division, available for an experienced Employee Training Specialist to assist us in the implementation of self-directed production work teams.

The position will be responsible for self-directed production-workers training programs dealing with such subjects as manufacturing team concepts, problem solving techniques, leadership development, communications, and cooperative decision making. Constant monitoring, evaluation, and documentation of results are critical to the success of these programs.

MANAGER, PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

Our client a 4,500+ employee North Carolina-based pharmaceutical firm seeks a Ph.D, I/O Psychologist with at least 2 years of experience in human resources research, planning, organization development and/or human resources management. An additional 2 years experience in diverse psychological applications such as consulting, research or university teaching is also required. Experience as a Human Resources Generalist along with pharmaceutical or manufacturing exposure is preferred. Assessment center development, internal and external consulting experience with diverse client
groups, demonstrated project leadership and good communications skills, combined with professional ethical standards are also highly desired.

The successful candidate will:

- Design, critique and approve psychological strategies for testing, job analysis and design and assessment.
- Merge business needs, legal considerations with a high level of professional practice into appropriate programs for internal clients.
- Research and recommend changes to current corporate compensation procedures to comply with regulations such as ADA.
- Develop and monitor testing and assessment practices.
- Identify job families through job analysis and recommend solutions encompassing career progression, skill assessment and job design.

The client provides an outstanding compensation and benefit package along with an ideal location between beautiful beaches and scenic mountains.

Interested candidates should mail or fax their resume/C.V.'s by September 20, 1992 to: The Andre Group, Inc., 460 N. Gulph Road, Suite 410, King of Prussia, PA 19406. Or Fax to: (215) 337-1333, Attn: Michael E. McDonald

MODERATE TRAVEL WILL BE REQUIRED. SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES WILL HAVE A PH.D. IN I/O PSYCHOLOGY AND 8-10 YEARS OF RELEVANT EXPERIENCE.

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGIST—This Minneapolis-based position will provide services in individual coaching, assessment centers, and individual assessments. Responsibilities will also involve client management and business development. Qualified candidates must have a Ph.D. in counseling, clinical, or I/O psychology; 3-5 years experience in an applied business setting; skills in counseling, coaching, assessment and test interpretation, and interviewing; and excellent written and verbal communication skills.

To apply for either of these positions, or to express interest in future opportunities, please send your resume and salary expectation to: Cathy Nelson, Director of Human Resources, Personnel Decisions, Inc., 2000 Plaza VII Tower, 45 South 7th Street, Minneapolis, MN 55402. PDI is an equal opportunity employer committed to employing a team of diverse professionals. Individuals from all cultural backgrounds are encouraged to apply.

SENIOR CONSULTANT/PROJECT MANAGER • COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGIST. If you are interested in a diversity of professional growth opportunities offered in a dynamic team environment, you are interested in Personnel Decisions, Inc.

A firm of psychologists who specialize in assessment-based development, PDI was founded 25 years ago. Having grown at rates of up to 30% per year, we have more than 60 consulting psychologists, and offices in Minneapolis, New York, Dallas, Houston, and Detroit. We are on the leading edge of our profession and will remain at the forefront through strategic alliances with the University of Minnesota and the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina. PDI serves organizations in both the public and private sectors; our clients range from Fortune 100 companies to small family businesses in virtually all industry groups. We are interested in applicants who can meet the following descriptions:

SENIOR CONSULTANT/PROJECT MANAGER—This Minneapolis-based consultant position will design processes for selection, development, succession management, performance management, and organizational change. This role will involve client management, business development, and management of large-scale projects involving the design and implementation of assessment and development processes and systems for managers and executives. Job duties will include: job and organization analysis, development and validation of assessment tools (test batteries, interviews, simulations) and HR systems, training, assessment, coaching, and research.
JOB OPENING
Training Director
Immediate Opening For Senior Level Manager

Hay Systems, Inc. is a management consulting firm, specializing in human resource issues and work process improvement. Its training directorate is rapidly growing and is staffed with talented, specialized training professionals. This directorate requires a senior manager to oversee, focus, and sustain continued growth.

Functional expertise must include the systems approach to training, training technologies, and management/career development training. Consulting expertise must include business development, client/program management, and expertise in management personnel. 8-10 years experience required. Applicant should be active in training related professional organizations and have publications.

Position has 2 direct reports: one responsible for Training Technologies (with 2 direct reports) and one responsible for Training Delivery (with 2 direct reports). Position reports directly to the Vice President for Organization and Workforce Management.
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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.
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